

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**Monroe School District**

ALAN R. BEITMAN, Superintendent
Telephone: (203) 452-2862

Location: 375 Monroe Turnpike
Monroe,
Connecticut

Website: www.monroeeps.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.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Fairfield	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$34,161
Town Population in 2000: 19,247	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.3%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.9%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.4%
Number of Public Schools: 6	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 93.0%

*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, 2007 4,221
5-Year Enrollment Change 1.7%

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	133	3.2	5.3	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	11	0.3	2.2	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	102	2.4	6.2	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	406	9.6	10.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	186	79.1	91.3	79.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	152	24.2	15.5	20.2

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	15	0.4
Asian American	128	3.0
Black	90	2.1
Hispanic	173	4.1
White	3,815	90.4
Total Minority	406	9.6

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.1%

Open Choice: 12 students 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: 2.4% 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 26.

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 Monroe Public School District provides exchange programs for teachers and students, multicultural events, extra curricular clubs and community service projects designed to reduce bias. Parent and community wellness programs give additional support to school efforts to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation by fostering a stronger sense of community. Faculty and staff have made conscientious efforts to incorporate diversity, within each school community, despite their relatively low minority student enrollments. They provide opportunities to work and study with other students from a variety of ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, through inter-district grants and by networking with teaching colleagues from other districts. Exchange programs focusing on curricular themes take place between Monroe and partnering schools in Bridgeport. One example is TEAMS an inter-district science and math exchange program involving the Bridgeport Discovery Museum. The district also maintains a long-standing relationship with the Stratford Public Schools, where students and teachers from both districts come together for a summer reading and mathematics acceleration program.

Masuk High School participates in various exchange programs with Bridgeport. One example is a summer theatre program featuring students from Harding High School (Bridgeport) and Masuk High School in Monroe who share their common interest in theatre and musical productions. Learning to live and work in a more culturally diverse society is supported by age appropriate developmental guidance programs in the elementary schools. This extends into the middle school and includes a Creative Response to Conflict (CRC) program. The high school also includes special guidance programs, such as the Anti-Defamation League's (ADL) Name Can Really Hurt program. This fall Monroe hosted a professor from the Shandong University of Finance, Peoples Republic of China to foster larger world view of living and working in a more diverse society. The district also supports student participation in regional programs, such as the 6-to-6 Magnet School, Regional Center for the Arts, and the Aquaculture School.

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	71.8	52.0	84.7
Writing	81.3	63.4	85.3
Mathematics	82.9	60.0	88.3
Grade 4 Reading	77.9	55.9	86.7
Writing	80.2	62.9	81.1
Mathematics	85.4	60.3	91.8
Grade 5 Reading	79.3	62.2	75.9
Writing	80.5	64.5	73.5
Mathematics	81.7	65.9	72.8
Science	76.9	54.9	77.2
Grade 6 Reading	75.4	66.3	53.0
Writing	60.7	61.9	34.5
Mathematics	80.1	66.4	69.6
Grade 7 Reading	83.4	71.1	61.3
Writing	75.2	62.0	62.6
Mathematics	76.0	63.0	62.6
Grade 8 Reading	83.8	64.8	79.2
Writing	77.6	63.4	64.2
Mathematics	77.9	60.8	70.4
Science	78.2	58.6	73.0

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 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	69.2	45.5	80.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	77.9	57.9	75.4
Mathematics	67.3	50.1	67.7
Science	61.8	46.3	64.6

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
	41.8	36.1	63.1

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		85.9	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	521	504	65.4
	Critical Reading	523	502	70.0
	Writing	525	503	73.1

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 2007	99.5	92.6	92.3
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	0.5	6.2	90.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.3	1.7	83.7

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.3	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.4	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	249.73
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	18.50
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	37.68
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	61.20
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	9.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	15.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	3.50
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.65
School Nurses	7.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	128.10

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	13.7	13.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	78.7	82.7	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.8	18.3	18.1
Grade 2	21.1	19.8	19.3
Grade 5	25.6	22.3	20.9
Grade 7	21.9	21.2	20.5
High School	23.6	19.8	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	975	988	987
Middle School	1,022	1,022	1,017
High School	980	977	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*	4.4	3.6	3.4
Middle School	2.8	2.7	2.7
High School	3.4	3.2	2.7

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2006-07

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	\$27,026	\$6,194	\$7,153	\$6,939	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$566	\$130	\$262	\$237	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,929	\$442	\$443	\$491	\$429
Student Support Services	\$3,415	\$783	\$764	\$803	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$4,288	\$983	\$1,256	\$1,217	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,520	\$1,265	\$1,329	\$1,365	\$1,322
Transportation	\$2,221	\$516	\$605	\$537	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,001	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$436	\$100	\$147	\$159	\$145
Total	\$46,401	\$10,505	\$12,203	\$11,984	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,758	\$861	\$1,875	\$1,397	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$7,223,555
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	15.6%

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	14.2	1.6	4.7
Excluding School Construction	79.1	14.0	1.8	5.1

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 Monroe Board of Education adheres to a policy that every school in the district has appropriate resources that address equity and equality issues. The superintendent and business manager maintain a systematic process for involving administrators, teachers, curriculum specialists, board of education members, the community, and central office staff to build a budget that achieves the goal of directing resources based on student need and opportunity for student success. A five-year cycle of curriculum review ensures that every content area across the district has up-to-date materials and reflects appropriate standards and practices. Budget workshops are held with each building principal and department to identify these needs and supporting rationale.

Enrollment figures and projections are closely monitored across the district to ensure that staff and resources are adequate. The per pupil allotment for supplies and equipment is used as a guideline for developing the district budget. Each school receives a proportional share of the budget, reflective of its enrollment. District initiatives are identified through a strategic planning process involving school groups and the community at-large.

Budget recommendations are reviewed by the superintendent and a consolidated budget for the district is presented to the board of education. The Board of Education reviews the superintendent's recommended budget, conducts public hearings on the budget, and amends as it deems appropriate before sending on to the town for the formal approval process governed by the town charter.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	379
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.2%

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	23	0.6	0.9	0.7
Learning Disability	55	1.3	3.5	4.0
Intellectual Disability	19	0.5	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	14	0.3	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	89	2.2	2.2	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	161	3.9	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	18	0.4	0.6	0.9
Total	379	9.2	10.4	11.5

*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 2006-07 with a Standard Diploma	92.6	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	1.6	2.8

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	25.8	20.4	78.8	62.1
	Writing	24.7	19.3	75.7	63.0
	Mathematics	30.7	22.6	80.6	62.7
	Science	24.1	22.2	77.6	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	20.8	11.4	69.2	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	39.1	16.3	77.9	57.9
	Mathematics	8.3	14.7	67.3	50.1
	Science	8.3	14.4	61.8	46.3

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	23.8
	% With Accommodations	76.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		2.2

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	3	0.8
Private Schools or Other Settings	16	4.2

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	266	70.2	75.0	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	98	25.9	17.7	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	15	4.0	7.3	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Students in Monroe Public Schools perform overall very well on the CMTs, CAPT, AP, and SAT assessments. They continue to achieve at high levels as ranked by state and national comparisons. As a district, graduates of Masuk High School to institutions of higher learning at a rate exceeding 90%.

However, through the use of data-driven decision making, any specific grade or subgroup that is not performing at an acceptable level is examined carefully, root causes identified, and targeted strategies for improvement implemented. Each school has an active School Development Team that monitors performance data and other indicators of success. Additionally, school data is forwarded to the District Data Team, that meets quarterly to review the overall progress of the district.

Embedded within key strategic goals for the district are: 1) development of further common formative and benchmark assessments which will inform educators of student learning, 2) implementation of district data warehouse and online assessment builder, and 3) focus on execution of high yield strategies at all schools and all levels of instruction. Extensive professional development to support these goals is provided for certified and non-certified staff working with students. These efforts, embedded within a systematic improvement process, ensure continuous growth for the district.
