## Connecticut State Department of Education

# DISTRICT PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2013–14



## Orange School District

Ms. Lynn Mcmullin, Superintendent • 203-891-8020 • http://www.oess.org

#### **District Information**

PK-6
4
1,192
\$15,041
\$18,905,983

<sup>1</sup>Expenditure data reflect the 2012-13 year.



### **Community Information**

<u>CERC Town Profiles</u> provide summary demographic and economic information for Connecticut's municipalities

### **Related Reports/Publications**

CT Reports (CMT/CAPT)

District and School Performance Reports

Special Education Annual Performance Reports

#### Contents

Students 1	L
Educators	<u>,</u>
Instruction and Resources 2	
Performance4	ŀ
Narratives5	

#### **Notes**

Unless otherwise noted, all data are for 2013-14 and include all grades offered by the district.

In most tables, data are displayed only for the three major race/ethnicity categories. For additional race/ethnicity categories, please visit <a href="EdSight">EdSight</a>.

State totals are not displayed as they are not comparable to district totals.

Special Education tables reflect only students for whom the district is fiscally responsible.

\* When an asterisk is displayed, data have been suppressed to ensure student confidentiality. N/A is displayed when a category is not applicable for a district or school.

### **Students**

October 1, 2013 Enrollment			
		District	State
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Female	587	49.2	48.3
Male	605	50.8	51.6
American Indian	*	*	0.2
Asian	139	11.7	4.6
Black or African American	*	*	12.9
Hispanic or Latino	59	4.9	21.2
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.0
White	946	79.4	58.4
Two or More Races	26	2.2	2.3
English Language Learners	35	2.9	5.7
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	81	6.8	37.3
Students with Disabilities <sup>1</sup>	113	9.5	12.8

<sup>1</sup>Students in this category are students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) only. This category does not include students with Section 504 Plans.

### **Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension/Expulsion**

	Chronic		Suspe	ension/
	Absenteeism <sup>2</sup>		Expu	ılsion³
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	26	4.5	*	*
Male	32	5.4	*	*
Black or African American	0	0.0	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*	*
White	42	4.5	13	1.3
English Language Learners	*	*	0	0.0
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	8	10.7	*	*
Students with Disabilities	10	9.0	*	*
District	58	4.9	16	1.3
State		10.8		7.4

Number of students in 2012-13 qualified as truant under state statute: 0

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>A student is chronically absent if he/she misses ten percent or greater of the total number of days enrolled in the school year for any reason. Pre-Kindergarten students are excluded from this calculation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The count and percentage of students who receive at least one in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension or expulsion.

## **Educators**

### Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)<sup>1</sup> Staff

	FTE
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	82.0
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	12.1
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	10.8
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	33.5
Administrators, Coordinators and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	1.5
School Level	3.5
Library/Media	
Specialists (Certified)	3.0
Support Staff	0.0
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers	9.8
Counselors, Social Workers and School Psychologists	4.5
School Nurses	4.0
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services/Support	70.5

<sup>1</sup>In the full-time equivalent count, staff members working part-time in the school are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in a school contributes 0.50 to the school's staff count.

### **Educators by Race/Ethnicity**

		District	State
	Count Percent of Total (%)		Percent of Total (%)
Asian	1	0.9	1.0
Black or African American	0	0	3.5
Hispanic	0	0	3.6
Native American	0	0	0.1
White	116	99.1	91.7

### Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers<sup>2</sup>

	Percent of Total (%)			
District	100.0			
District Poverty Quartile: Low				
State High Poverty Quartile Schools 97.8				
State Low Poverty Quartile Schools	99.5			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Core academic classes taught by teachers who are fully certified to teach in that subject area.

#### Classroom Teacher Attendance: 2012-13

	District	State
Average Number of FTE Days Absent Due to Illness or Personal Time	10.0	9.3

## **Instruction and Resources**

# Students with Disabilities Who Spend 79.1 to 100 Percent of Time with Nondisabled Peers<sup>4</sup>

	Count	Rate (%)
Autism	*	*
Emotional Disturbance	N/A	N/A
Intellectual Disability	0	0
Learning Disability	33	80.5
Other Health Impairment	13	*
Other Disabilities	*	*
Speech/Language Impairment	21	70.0
District	71	67.6
State		69.2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Ages 6-21

### Students with Disabilities by Primary Disability<sup>1</sup>

	Dis	State	
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Autism	14	1.2	1.4
Emotional Disturbance	0	0	1.0
Intellectual Disability	*	*	0.4
Learning Disability	41	3.5	4.2
Other Health Impairment	17	1.5	2.5
Other Disabilities	*	*	1.0
Speech/Language Impairment	32	2.7	1.9
All Disabilities	109	9.3	12.4

# Students with Disabilities Placed Outside of the District<sup>2</sup>

	Dis	State	
	Count	Rate (%)	
Public Schools in Other Districts	0	0	2.8
Private Schools or Other Settings	7	6.4	8.1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Grades K-12

Overall Expenditures: 2012-13

		Per Pupil	
	Total (\$)	District (\$)	State (\$)
Instructional Staff and Services	11,553,600	9,265	8,769
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	285,385	229	275
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	662,149	531	487
Student Support Services	1,683,679	1,350	965
Administration and Support Services	1,593,155	1,278	1,600
Plant Operation and Maintenance	1,781,645	1,429	1,472
Transportation	963,902	395	786
Costs of Students Tuitioned Out	239,900	N/A	N/A
Other	142,568	114	178
Total	18,905,983	15,041	14,642
Additiona	al Expenditures		
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	432,450	347	1,434

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources.

#### **Special Education Expenditures: 2012-13**

	Disti	State	
	Total (\$)	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Certified Personnel	1,691,854	40.1	35.6
Noncertified Personnel	965,253	22.9	14.5
Purchased Services	361,459	8.6	5.0
Tuition to Other Schools	239,900	5.7	21.4
Special Ed. Transportation	222,016	5.3	8.5
Other Expenditures	742,708	17.6	14.9
Total Expenditures	4,223,190	100.0	100.0
PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Educ	22.3	21.9	

# Expenditures by Revenue Source:<sup>4</sup> 2012-13

	Percent of Total (%)				
	Including	Excluding			
	School	School			
	Construction	Construction			
Local	93.3	93.1			
State	5.0	5.1			
Federal	1.7	1.8			
Tuition & Other	0.0	0.0			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>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 Correction).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Grades K-12

### **Performance**

#### **District Performance Index (DPI)**

A District Performance Index (DPI) for the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) is the test performance of all subjects tested for all students in the district. The DPI ranges in value from 0 to 100 points. Connecticut's ultimate target for a DPI is 88 because in a district with a DPI of 88 or above, students will have performed at or above the "goal" level on the majority of tests. Detailed reports of CMT assessment results are available at <a href="www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>. School and District Performance Reports produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) are also available online.

CMT	DPI			2013-14			Note: If no		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Count	DPI	Target	Achieved	data are displayed for
Black or African American	78.0	80.8	84.8						2013-14, the
Hispanic or Latino	92.2								district
English Language Learners									implemented the Smarter
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	80.2	70.3	77.0	75.6					Balanced Field
Students with Disabilities	71.7	72.0	65.7	64.9					Test.
High Needs	75.2	74.7	71.2	71.1					_
District	92.4	91.8	91.8	91.2					

# 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Percent At or Above Proficient<sup>1</sup>

READING	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	43%	45%	50%
National Public	34%	34%	36%
MATH	Cuada 1	Cuada 0	Cunda 13
IVIAIT	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	45%	37%	32%

<sup>1</sup>NAEP is often called the "Nation's Report Card." It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. This table compares Connecticut's performance to that of national public school students. Performance standards for state assessments and NAEP are set independently. Therefore, one should not expect performance results to be the same across CMT/CAPT and NAEP. Instead, NAEP results are meant to complement CMT/CAPT results.

### Physical Fitness Tests: Students Reaching Health Standard<sup>2</sup>

	Percent of Students by			All Tested Grades		
	4	6	8	Count	Rate (%)	
Sit & Reach	91.9	86.2	N/A	374	89.0	
Curl Up	76.9	88.8	N/A	374	82.9	
Push Up	67.2	68.6	N/A	374	67.9	
Mile Run/PACER	80.1	79.8	N/A	374	79.9	
All Tests - District	52.2	57.4	N/A	374	54.8	
All Tests - State	50.2	50.7	50.3		51.1	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment (CPFA) is administered to all students in Grades 4, 6, 8 and 10. The health-related fitness scores gathered through the CPFA should be used to educate and motivate children and their families to increase physical activity and develop lifetime fitness habits.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Only students assessed in all four areas are included in this calculation.

### **Narratives**

### **School District Improvement Plans and Parental Outreach Activities**

The Board of Education continues to be vigilant in its commitment to continuous improvement and is focused on the achievement of all students. In 2013-2014 our Board of Ed approved long-range Strategic Plan, called "Together We Can." A large group of school and community volunteers worked all last year to write the plan which was BOE approved in Spring 2013. The new Plan was well-publicized and is available on-line. Each principal is using the plan's goal-setting model to present his/her goals for the school year: one (1) goal – three (3) reasons – five (5) action steps.

The Board of Education successfully bonded for \$8.1 million in significant improvements, including three new roofs, two new boilers, one parking lot improvement, and school security improvements for all four schools. The security plan is being implemented in two phases, and phase 1 is complete. It includes hiring security monitors, locking all doors and using ID badges for entry of staff at front and at recess doors, and the installation of a panic button system. Phase 2 will include interior doors locks, Shatterguard on glass, video surveillance, and the installation of sally-port entrances. Three additional district-wide goals are representative of concentrated efforts to improve and standardize instruction. The first is the implementation of new LA Common Core instructional model, Grades K – 6. To further support this implementation, the district hired Nancy Boyles to lead embedded, classroom workshop PD at each school. A new EVAL Plan for both teachers and principals was implemented. Full implementation will take place during the 2014-2015 school year.

The District implemented PowerSchool, and has purchased additional netbooks and iPads in carts for student use. Changes in technology include: 1.the implementation of PowerSchool; 2. A new fiber-optic Internet connection; 3.changing our email service over to the cloud; 4. implementing the ID badge system; and 5. using School Gate Guardian software for visitor recognition at the door.

Orange continues to be data driven. Our efforts to improve SRBI and our tiered interventions have already begun to blur the lines between Special Education and regular education in that our paraprofessionals can service all students with the same need in the same group. Through web-based programs such as Lexia, interventionists can use the reporting features to identify area of need for servicing. Our new math curriculum is differentiated, thereby increasing teachers' knowledge of and experience with implementing classroom differentiation.

The District formed a Healthy Lifestyles committee. The Board's Policy Committee revised and reviewed several series of policies and those policies are available in an on-line manual. Work in this area continues.

### Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic and Economic Isolation

The Board of Education continued to welcome Project Choice students in 2013-2014. Through classroom and school reach-out efforts, our principals and teachers continue to demonstrate their commitment to the program.

The Orange Board of Education has seen a burgeoning ESL program. Increased enrollment and 26 different languages; resulted in the hiring of a full-time ESL teacher. The district specially trained 4 paraprofessionals, one per school for a day of servicing. New curriculum and Rosetta Stone were purchased. Multiple evening events were offered to our ESL families with the wider school community to increase relationships with the newest members of our school community.

Orange continues to provide all students in Grades 1-6 with Spanish instruction. In addition to acquiring oral communication skills, the program enables students to view the Spanish culture through study of its art, music, customs, and traditions. Students also heighten their awareness of the greater world community through various cultural arts programs sponsored by our PTO's. We continue to make efforts to attract and recruit some minority candidates for teaching and administrative assignments.

### **Equitable Allocation of Resources among District Schools**

Restructuring of Central Office and an increased collaboration among our district-level Leadership Team, ensured equitable, high-quality programming across the district. The Director of Curriculum & Instruction worked with staff to standardize the curriculum and in-house assessments, data analysis, and interventions. Three district-wide goals were established to further emphasize fidelity to district programs. Web-based SRBI tools as both universal screening tools and intervention tools were purchased. These products continue our commitment to a planned 'suite of interventions' that will ensure equitable access to support services across the district. Staff were trained as reading and math interventionists, and work with children accordingly. The Special Education Department was restructured to maximize time and human resources to better serve the students. Our administrators meet twice monthly to ensure policy, services, resources, curriculum, etc. are implemented district-wide. Likewise, math and LA consultants meet regularly to ensure curriculum across the district. All schools have equal access to Lexia, Dreambox, STAR, Accelerated Reader and SMI.