

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

THOMAS A. FORCELLA, Superintendent

Location: 701 New England Road
Guilford,
Connecticut

Telephone: (203) 453-8210

Website: www.guilford.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: 21,398

1990-2000 Population Growth: 7.8%

Number of Public Schools: 7

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$37,161

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 6.4%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.8%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.3%

*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 3,711
5-Year Enrollment Change -2.8%

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	254	6.9	7.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	40	1.1	2.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	81	2.2	6.5	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	374	10.1	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	222	89.9	90.7	80.5
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	87	14.8	12.1	13.6

*60.5 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	3	0.1
Asian American	154	4.1
Black	42	1.1
Hispanic	166	4.5
White	3,346	90.2
Total Minority	365	9.8

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.3%

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 16.

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.

Guilford Public Schools provides exchange programs for students, multicultural events lasting several days, and extra curricular clubs designed to reduce bias. The faculty and staff have made conscientious efforts to incorporate diversity in a school community with few minority students by providing opportunities to work and study with other students from a variety of ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds. In 2009-2010, at least one elementary school participated in the One World Classroom, a nonprofit organization that builds bridges of learning between the classrooms of the world. This represents the third year that all Guilford students in grades 1-4 participate in FLES Spanish, which integrates Hispanic art, songs, foods, language and stories to develop a better understanding of the culture and its traditions. All elementary schools in Guilford also use the Responsive Classroom model to empower students to use conflict resolution. Each class focused on the importance of understanding each other's needs in order to help all students grow. Both middle schools in Guilford support character and citizenship development throughout the school year. Staff and students meet monthly to promote sensitivity to gender, racial, ethnic, and economic differences. One middle school uses technology to Skype with students from Spain. Other middle school students participated in local charity events, field trips to community dining rooms, and in the collection and donation of goods to charity organizations. All schools focused on raising funds for victims of the Haiti disaster. Through exchange programs, inter-district programs, diverse curricula, and interscholastic competitions and clubs, students at Guilford High School had numerous opportunities during the 2009-2010 school year to interact with students of varying backgrounds and increase cultural awareness. Several students participated in choice programs including the Educational Center for the Arts, the Sound School, High School in the Community, and the Hyde Leadership School in New Haven. The Guilford ABC Program sponsored students from the New York City area, who will spend their entire high school experience at GHS. Approximately 1,100 high school students and staff participated in a prejudice-reduction program during U.N.I.T.Y. Spirit Week. Several other students participated in outreach programs, leadership seminars, and diversity 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	<p>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.</p> <p>For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Grade 3 Reading	70.0	57.0	62.6	
Writing	75.0	58.3	81.0	
Mathematics	81.5	62.4	84.0	
Grade 4 Reading	77.4	59.9	77.4	
Writing	79.3	63.6	74.4	
Mathematics	81.6	67.0	73.6	
Grade 5 Reading	79.9	61.8	75.8	
Writing	85.5	68.2	80.1	
Mathematics	87.0	72.4	74.1	
Science	79.3	59.4	74.1	
Grade 6 Reading	91.4	74.9	85.3	
Writing	83.8	65.9	76.8	
Mathematics	88.9	70.7	79.8	
Grade 7 Reading	94.2	77.4	87.0	
Writing	83.8	61.2	87.0	
Mathematics	93.9	68.5	94.8	
Grade 8 Reading	93.1	73.3	91.1	
Writing	88.1	62.6	93.0	
Mathematics	94.1	67.3	98.7	
Science	87.8	62.8	91.1	

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	<p>For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Reading Across the Disciplines	71.2	45.9	85.6	
Writing Across the Disciplines	85.4	59.6	90.2	
Mathematics	78.9	48.7	90.9	
Science	77.1	45.3	94.7	

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
	71.4	50.7	91.6

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		82.0	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	534	508	70.5
	Critical Reading	539	503	80.6
	Writing	544	506	81.4

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	97.0	91.3	70.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.5	3.0	78.7

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.6	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.4	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	249.95
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	4.20
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	32.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	89.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	12.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	17.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	23.80
School Nurses	7.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	165.40

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	15.0	14.2	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	85.6	84.7	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.3	18.4	18.5
Grade 2	17.8	19.6	19.7
Grade 5	23.1	21.8	21.1
Grade 7	20.1	21.7	20.8
High School	19.5	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	977	990	992
Middle School	1,020	1,023	1,018
High School	1,006	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*	2.4	3.3	3.2
Middle School	3.9	2.5	2.5
High School	1.1	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	\$27,610	\$7,333	\$7,819	\$7,576	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,007	\$267	\$274	\$268	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,096	\$291	\$474	\$503	\$459
Student Support Services	\$3,197	\$849	\$863	\$912	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$6,118	\$1,625	\$1,405	\$1,364	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$4,958	\$1,317	\$1,469	\$1,412	\$1,462
Transportation	\$3,209	\$822	\$701	\$617	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,589	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$699	\$186	\$163	\$159	\$162
Total	\$50,484	\$13,320	\$13,458	\$13,145	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,437	\$913	\$1,864	\$1,228	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$11,703,013	23.2	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	88.9	9.3	1.7	0.1
Excluding School Construction	89.5	8.5	1.8	0.1

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 process for budget development begins at the building and program levels with input from teachers, principals, directors, and central office administrators in the fall. Collectively, principals share budget priorities with the Board of Education very early in the process. Once schools complete a draft budget, the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent, and the School Business Administrator review building level requests in individual meetings with principals and program directors. Major expenditures such as staffing, technology acquisition, and site improvement are based on school enrollments, the age and condition of equipment, and multi-year purchasing plans. Textbooks are purchased in adoption cycles to coincide with curricular reviews. Renovations/additions are funded through the town's referendum process and are proposed based on code compliance requirements, efforts to provide comparable facilities at all schools, and enrollment needs. This year was difficult to budget based on limited funding and resources. Supplies for the elementary schools were apportioned through a per pupil expenditure in order to ensure equity. After the town budget approval, the original requests were adjusted by the Superintendent in consultation with the District Leadership Team based on priority needs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	393
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.6%

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	47	1.3	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	134	3.6	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	18	0.5	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	25	0.7	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	64	1.7	2.0	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	82	2.2	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	23	0.6	0.7	0.9
Total	393	10.6	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	98.3	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	46.5	31.6	84.6	67.5
	Writing	37.9	19.6	82.7	63.3
	Mathematics	53.0	32.9	88.0	68.1
	Science	43.3	23.7	83.8	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	28.6	13.8	71.2	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	38.7	16.8	85.4	59.6
	Mathematics	22.2	16.7	78.9	48.7
	Science	25.8	13.0	77.1	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	26.4
	% With Accommodations	73.6
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.6

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	33	8.4

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	286	72.8	77.2	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	74	18.8	15.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	33	8.4	7.0	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

During the 2009-2010 school year, Guilford Public Schools continued its partnership with the Institute for Learning at the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. Our work in the first year concentrated on the Principles of Learning and how they function in the classroom to invite effort and support academic rigor. In our second year, we studied the implementation of Principles of Learning through classroom observations and simulations and in the context of Professional Learning Communities. Last year, a team of teachers focused on Disciplinary Literacy in mathematics and language arts in the secondary schools. This year, Learning Walks were instituted in all buildings to help us understand the degree of implementation and plan next steps in the effective use of the Principles of Learning. We took a big step by recruiting and hiring literacy coaches in elementary schools for the 2010-2011 school year and expanding Disciplinary Literacy training for middle and high schools. Our efforts to enhance instruction in a more consistent and comprehensive fashion continues to be a district-wide initiative. Another district improvement initiative for 2009-2010 was the addition of tutoring sessions beyond the school day for students who need extra support. As an outgrowth of response to intervention, all seven schools in the district organized and implemented additional instructional time to better meet the needs of individual students. Guilford High School piloted capstone projects as a means to engage students in meaningful, personalized learning experiences aligned with the revised school mission. The high school spent the bulk of the year completing a self-study in preparation for the accreditation visit from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges which will occur in the fall of 2010. In an effort to increase effective uses of technology, all schools installed smartboards and provided training for teachers. At least eleven mobile labs were purchased to increase the availability of 1:1 computer use for students. Guilford Public Schools collaborated with TEAM Guilford to support community youth during this school year. The Developmental Assets Survey was administered to all students grades 7-12 and analyzed so that the organizations can establish goals for increasing the social and emotional stamina of students and reducing negative behaviors.
