

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

GREG FLORIO, Superintendent

Location: 29 Main Street

Telephone: (203) 250-2420

Cheshire,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.cheshire.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: New Haven

Town Population in 2000: 28,543

1990-2000 Population Growth: 11.1%

Number of Public Schools: 7

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$33,903

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 11.2%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.2%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 90.2%

*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 4,949
5-Year Enrollment Change -3.9%

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	268	5.4	7.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	27	0.6	2.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	1,130	22.8	6.5	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	488	9.9	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	289	92.3	90.7	80.5
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	161	20.6	12.1	13.6

*100.0 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	9	0.2
Asian American	417	8.4
Black	94	1.9
Hispanic	168	3.4
White	4,261	86.1
Total Minority	688	13.9

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.2%

Open Choice:

11 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:

5.2% 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 28.

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 Cheshire Public Schools continued to participate in the Open Choice program and offered five additional seats during the 2009 – 2010 school year for students from New Haven. A major emphasis in our efforts to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation was to connect our learners with students from other communities through various learning opportunities and experiences. Students from every seventh grade team at Dodd Middle School participated in the ACES Prudence Crandell Project that included two days of diversity activities and training with students from Hamden, Fair Haven, New Haven, and Wallingford. Cheshire High School students participated in organized events with other schools in the Southern Connecticut Conference including A World of Difference, Dream Team, and a Diversity Club. Elementary-aged students in our district participated in Project Lucid, Destiny Africa, and the Right Stuff. Our schools continued to provide learning experiences, in partnership with parent organizations, which supported our efforts to learn about different cultures, customs, and traditions. Guest speakers, food festivals, focused assemblies, and cultural arts programs were among the activities that took place at the kindergarten and elementary level. Students at Dodd participated in Rachel's Challenge, a program committed to developing empathy and compassion for all people. Hundreds of middle school students signed a pledge to kindness and subsequently joined Chain Link clubs. In addition, students participated in numerous community service projects throughout the 2009 – 2010 school year as a result of the Rachel's Challenge program. At Cheshire High School, the tenth annual "Be One Day" was held to educate students and staff members about the diversity in our school community. In addition, an after school program entitled ENOUGH (Education Necessity Opportunity Understanding Giving Helping) took place. This program offered an opportunity for students from different cultural backgrounds to come together weekly to learn about various cultures and traditions. We plan to continue the process of implementing meaningful and productive experiences that will help broaden our connections with students from other districts and plan to build on the activities that were successful this school year to enhance student learning and understanding of differences to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation for the students in the Cheshire Public 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	70.4	57.0	65.0
Writing	79.9	58.3	92.0
Mathematics	73.2	62.4	58.3
Grade 4 Reading	78.4	59.9	79.9
Writing	79.1	63.6	72.5
Mathematics	82.9	67.0	76.1
Grade 5 Reading	84.7	61.8	89.1
Writing	86.8	68.2	88.0
Mathematics	88.5	72.4	81.3
Science	79.3	59.4	74.1
Grade 6 Reading	90.0	74.9	80.4
Writing	82.5	65.9	73.2
Mathematics	89.0	70.7	80.4
Grade 7 Reading	93.7	77.4	84.4
Writing	82.9	61.2	85.7
Mathematics	88.3	68.5	83.1
Grade 8 Reading	91.7	73.3	87.3
Writing	84.6	62.6	87.9
Mathematics	87.5	67.3	84.1
Science	87.5	62.8	89.2

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	73.9	45.9	89.4
Writing Across the Disciplines	81.3	59.6	82.7
Mathematics	74.9	48.7	87.1
Science	66.5	45.3	78.8

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
	58.3	50.7	69.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		85.5	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	555	508	86.0
	Critical Reading	530	503	72.1
	Writing	532	506	73.6

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, Class of 2009	98.2	91.3	80.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.6	3.0	72.1

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	93.0	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.2	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	283.70
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	38.85
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	46.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	87.20
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	18.70
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.00
School Level	18.84
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.50
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	21.10
School Nurses	8.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	192.60

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	78.2	84.7	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.6	18.4	18.5
Grade 2	18.9	19.6	19.7
Grade 5	21.6	21.8	21.1
Grade 7	24.5	21.7	20.8
High School	17.6	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,009	990	992
Middle School	1,021	1,023	1,018
High School	1,001	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*	3.8	3.3	3.2
Middle School	2.7	2.5	2.5
High School	3.0	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	\$35,102	\$7,012	\$7,819	\$7,576	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,248	\$249	\$274	\$268	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,344	\$468	\$474	\$503	\$459
Student Support Services	\$3,823	\$764	\$863	\$912	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$5,548	\$1,108	\$1,405	\$1,364	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$6,125	\$1,223	\$1,469	\$1,412	\$1,462
Transportation	\$3,360	\$635	\$701	\$617	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,580	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$987	\$197	\$163	\$159	\$162
Total	\$60,117	\$11,997	\$13,458	\$13,145	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,041	\$608	\$1,864	\$1,228	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$13,684,270	22.8	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	79.5	17.4	2.3	0.7
Excluding School Construction	79.8	17.0	2.5	0.7

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.

Included in the Cheshire Board of Education Policy Manual is a statement that each student in the school district shall be supplied with the appropriate level of material and resources to assure adequate opportunities to achieve academic success. Each year the Cheshire Board of Education takes a "zero based" approach to budgeting. Each school submits requests for supplies, materials, textbooks and equipment based on needs for the coming year. Those requests are reviewed by Central Office staff and the Board of Education to determine the level of funding for the next school year. As curriculum is approached on a districtwide basis, monies to support curriculum must be allocated equitably. Supplies are allocated based on curriculum needs and enrollment and a per pupil average at each grade level. In some years schools will receive a greater amount of money based on specific needs and unique items. For example, a large purchase of equipment required to open a new classroom at one school would make one school's budget greater in a given year than a school without the need to open a new classroom due to enrollment changes. Students with special needs are evaluated on an individual basis and decisions to purchase the appropriate materials, supplies and equipment to meet their individual education programs are made based on that information.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	479
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.8%

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	48	1.0	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	141	2.9	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	20	0.4	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	30	0.6	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	85	1.7	2.0	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	122	2.5	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	33	0.7	0.7	0.9
Total	479	9.8	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	96.8	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	1.1	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	49.7	31.6	85.2	67.5
	Writing	30.8	19.6	82.8	63.3
	Mathematics	45.6	32.9	85.1	68.1
	Science	42.7	23.7	83.5	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	13.8	13.8	73.9	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	20.5	16.8	81.3	59.6
	Mathematics	15.4	16.7	74.9	48.7
	Science	10.5	13.0	66.5	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	21.7
	% With Accommodations	78.3
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	9.1
	% With Accommodations	90.9
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.2

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	29	6.1

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	357	74.5	77.2	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	76	15.9	15.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	46	9.6	7.0	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Cheshire Public Schools Strategic Planning Initiative provides a framework for school and district improvement and outlines action plan steps to enhance the teaching and learning process. Our Strategic Plan emphasizes: 1) differentiating teaching and learning activities to support and challenge students with different learning styles and varying needs and interests; 2) fostering an understanding of the Cheshire Public Schools' performance standards; and 3) using student assessment data to guide instructional decisions. An important component to school and district improvement is our Cheshire Strategic Planning Initiative Council. Our council is made up of teachers, staff members, parents, community members, and administrators that meet monthly to review and discuss progress related to school and district initiatives. A major focus for our council during the 2009 – 2010 school year was the development and implementation of an online survey to elicit input from students, parents, community members, teachers, and the business community in Cheshire to help in the process of reviewing our District's Mission, Vision, and Core Beliefs. The council will use this feedback for future planning. During the 2009 - 2010 school year, we implemented our district's SRBI (Scientific Research-Based Interventions) plan to help low performing students meet standards in reading and math. We devoted a portion of three professional development days to provide time for content area teachers to meet and discuss student needs aligned with universal assessment results as outlined in our SRBI plan. We worked closely with special educators to coordinate services around a tiered system of providing more intensive interventions over time as progress monitoring results dictated the need. We continued our efforts to provide services for students with special needs in an inclusive setting as appropriate to achieve their individual education plans. Professional development in the area of co-teaching was offered to help educators work together to meet the specific needs of our students within the classroom setting. We continued to place emphasis on important 21st century skills as outlined in the Cheshire Public Schools' performance standard expectations to help our students acquire the skills needed to be successful in a dynamic and diverse world. A revised elementary report card was developed by a task force of teachers, parents, and administrators that includes a standards-based reporting system aligned with our performance standards. In addition, we implemented two new technology applications "Inform" and "PowerSchool". Inform allows teachers to review, analyze, and share student assessment data and use this information linked with their daily observations of student learning and teaching experience to guide interventions and instructional strategies to meet individual student needs. PowerSchool enhances our ability to communicate our goals with parents at the high school and middle school levels so that we work with them as partners to help all students achieve their fullest potential.
