

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10****New Haven School District**

REGINALD R. MAYO, Superintendent

Location: 140 Dewitt Street

Telephone: (203) 946-8888

New Haven,  
ConnecticutWebsite: [www.nhps.net/](http://www.nhps.net/)

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: New Haven

Town Population in 2000: 123,626

1990-2000 Population Growth: -5.2%

Number of Public Schools: 40

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$16,393

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 25.2%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 6.3%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 92.0%

\*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): I 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 19,858

5-Year Enrollment Change 0.2%

**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                            | 15,992             | 80.5     | 86.4 | 32.6  |
| K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English                               | 2,360              | 13.0     | 15.0 | 5.4   |
| Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*                            | 907                | 4.6      | 2.2  | 4.1   |
| PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District           | 2,017              | 10.2     | 13.0 | 11.4  |
| Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart | 1,159              | 73.9     | 67.7 | 80.5  |
| Homeless  | 222                | 1.1      | 0.9  | 0.2   |
| Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week                     | 214                | 10.8     | 10.4 | 13.6  |

\*83.4 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

| Student Race/Ethnicity |        |         |
|------------------------|--------|---------|
| Race/Ethnicity         | Number | Percent |
| American Indian        | 39     | 0.2     |
| Asian American         | 371    | 1.9     |
| Black                  | 9,487  | 47.7    |
| Hispanic               | 7,363  | 37.1    |
| White                  | 2,598  | 13.1    |
| Total Minority         | 17,260 | 86.9    |

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 27.7%

**Open Choice:**

42 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:**

27.9% 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 61.

---

### 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 New Haven Public Schools system has the largest Choice Program in the State of Connecticut. It has reduced the racial, ethnic and economic isolation for thousands of students in the region. Parents and students have a choice of the regular, comprehensive Schools, Interdistrict Magnet Schools, Intradistrict Magnet Schools (just for New Haven students), Lighthouse Schools, Charter Schools, two Regional Magnet Schools and schools that fall under "Project Choice" which include New Haven students attending suburban schools. Our Magnet schools accommodate the challenges and interests of all kids. Each school has a specific theme integrated into a rigorous academic curriculum. Students are chosen through a lottery; many schools have a wait list which shows how popular these schools have become. The number of white suburban students accepted into our Interdistrict magnet schools has increase as well. This year the Magnet Office aggressively recruited new students by holding two magnet fairs, extensive mailing of new brochures, and by producing a professional commercial which was shown at the movie theaters and on television. The number of applications increased from 5,200 to 7,077. New Haven provides opportunities for low performing students to transfer to high performing schools through the Voluntary Public School Choice grant. Students are sent a letter which lists the schools that they can apply to provided there are seats available in that grade. With the expansion of Cooperative Arts and Humanities Magnet School, Metropolitan Business Academy and New Haven Academy, more seats became available in the lottery to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Finally, opening John Daniels Dual Language Academy has opened the doors and increased student awareness of the diversity of individuals and cultures. The theme spreads over the entire curriculum and through the halls and classrooms. Each part of the school is divided into a country and is celebrated throughout the year

---

## 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            | 24.9     | 57.0  | 1.8  |
| Writing                    | 28.7     | 58.3  | 2.5  |
| Mathematics                | 32.6     | 62.4  | 4.3  |
| Grade 4 Reading            | 30.2     | 59.9  | 3.8  |
| Writing                    | 37.6     | 63.6  | 4.4  |
| Mathematics                | 40.7     | 67.0  | 6.9  |
| Grade 5 Reading            | 30.8     | 61.8  | 5.5  |
| Writing                    | 38.7     | 68.2  | 3.6  |
| Mathematics                | 43.6     | 72.4  | 3.6  |
| Science                    | 27.9     | 59.4  | 6.0  |
| Grade 6 Reading            | 55.9     | 74.9  | 9.2  |
| Writing                    | 42.0     | 65.9  | 6.7  |
| Mathematics                | 49.3     | 70.7  | 9.2  |
| Grade 7 Reading            | 52.8     | 77.4  | 6.5  |
| Writing                    | 24.8     | 61.2  | 2.6  |
| Mathematics                | 42.6     | 68.5  | 7.8  |
| Grade 8 Reading            | 48.5     | 73.3  | 7.6  |
| Writing                    | 29.6     | 62.6  | 5.1  |
| Mathematics                | 40.5     | 67.3  | 7.0  |
| Science                    | 30.5     | 62.8  | 6.4  |

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 | 18.5     | 45.9  | 9.1  |
| Writing Across the Disciplines | 30.7     | 59.6  | 9.0  |
| Mathematics                    | 13.3     | 48.7  | 4.5  |
| Science                        | 14.4     | 45.3  | 4.5  |

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 |
|--|----------|-------|---|
|  | 33.4     | 50.7  | 13.1  |

| SAT® I: Reasoning Test<br>Class of 2009 |                  | District | State | % of Districts in<br>State with Equal or<br>Lower Scores |
|---|------------------|----------|-------|--|
| % of Graduates Tested                   |                  | 77.5     | 68.5  |  |
| Average Score                           | Mathematics      | 400      | 508   | 7.0  |
|   | Critical Reading | 409      | 503   | 7.0  |
|   | Writing          | 416      | 506   | 7.0  |

**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<br>with Equal or Less<br>Desirable Rates |
|--|----------|-------|--|
| Graduation Rate, Class of 2009                     | 76.0     | 91.3  | 4.6  |
| 2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12 | 8.6      | 3.0   | 3.7  |

| Activities of Graduates                                      | District | State |
|--|----------|-------|
| % Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs) | 87.4     | 84.5  |
| % Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)       | 6.1      | 10.4  |

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

| Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff                                      |          |
|---|----------|
| General Education   |          |
| Teachers and Instructors  | 1,307.55 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants                                       | 324.00   |
| Special Education   |          |
| Teachers and Instructors  | 198.55   |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants                                       | 148.00   |
| Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants                                     | 38.00    |
| Staff Devoted to Adult Education  | 11.00    |
| Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs                             |          |
| District Central Office   | 31.00    |
| School Level  | 99.00    |
| Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists) | 86.00    |
| Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists                            | 103.00   |
| School Nurses   | 34.50    |
| Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support                    | 964.00   |

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 | 10.0     | 12.9 | 13.8  |
| % with Master's Degree or Above          | 68.6     | 73.3 | 77.8  |

| Average Class Size | District | DRG  | State |
|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| Grade K            | 22.9     | 21.1 | 18.5  |
| Grade 2            | 21.6     | 21.6 | 19.7  |
| Grade 5            | 19.7     | 21.8 | 21.1  |
| Grade 7            | 21.5     | 22.8 | 20.8  |
| High School        | 19.2     | 19.6 | 19.6  |

| Hours of Instruction Per Year* | Dist  | DRG   | State |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Elementary School              | 1,009 | 1,004 | 992   |
| Middle School                  | 989   | 998   | 1,018 |
| High School                    | 1,008 | 1,002 | 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*             | 2.6  | 2.8 | 3.2   |
| Middle School                  | 2.4  | 2.5 | 2.5   |
| High School                    | 1.9  | 2.0 | 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<br>All figures are unaudited.                | Total<br>(in 1000s) | Expenditures Per Pupil |                    |                 |                 |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|   |                     | District               | PK-12<br>Districts | DRG             | State           |
| Instructional Staff and Services                          | \$186,455           | \$9,449                | \$7,819            | \$8,202         | \$7,829         |
| Instructional Supplies and Equipment                      | \$4,809             | \$244                  | \$274              | \$316           | \$279           |
| Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services | \$11,170            | \$566                  | \$474              | \$557           | \$459           |
| Student Support Services                                  | \$9,420             | \$477                  | \$863              | \$777           | \$859           |
| Administration and Support Services                       | \$36,769            | \$1,863                | \$1,405            | \$1,528         | \$1,426         |
| Plant Operation and Maintenance                           | \$34,233            | \$1,735                | \$1,469            | \$1,497         | \$1,462         |
| Transportation  | \$19,209            | \$1,025                | \$701              | \$896           | \$694           |
| Costs for Students Tuitioned Out                          | \$14,073            | N/A                    | N/A                | N/A             | N/A             |
| Other   | \$4,504             | \$228                  | \$163              | \$158           | \$162           |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>\$320,642</b>    | <b>\$16,015</b>        | <b>\$13,458</b>    | <b>\$14,300</b> | <b>\$13,386</b> |
| <b>Additional Expenditures</b>                            |                     |                        |                    |                 |                 |
| Land, Buildings, and Debt Service                         | \$128,906           | \$6,532                | \$1,864            | \$3,292         | \$1,825         |

| Special Education Expenditures | District Total | Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education |      |       |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--|------|-------|
|                                |                | District   | DRG  | State |
|                                | \$57,968,744   | 18.1   | 21.6 | 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 | 24.4          | 66.4          | 7.9             | 1.3             |
| Excluding School Construction | 26.0          | 61.2          | 11.0            | 1.8             |

## 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.

NHPS continues to work with its state and local partners to formulate structures and systems that will allow each school and individual student to reach their potential. The strong data driven academic process is also utilized in the facility management and food service arenas. NHPS remains a leader in the state with this data driven model and the significant and sustained gains in test scores are reflective of this success. In both the facility and food service areas NHPS has implemented on-line data systems to monitor work orders, food sales and inventories. In addition, NHPS has enacted proactive preventative maintenance schedules and long range planning and capital investment reviews. Further, NHPS is working with its local agriculture programs, greenhouses and farms to produce local food to be used in the Food Program. All of these elements will allow for well reasoned and cost effective budget decision making for both the long and short term through data driven analysis which are designed to create a safe and healthy learning environment for all students at each school.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible           | 2,014 |
| Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities | 11.3% |

| 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   | 165          | 0.9              | 0.9         | 1.0           |
| Learning Disability  | 630          | 3.5              | 5.0         | 3.9           |
| Intellectual Disability  | 149          | 0.8              | 0.8         | 0.5           |
| Emotional Disturbance  | 242          | 1.4              | 1.5         | 1.0           |
| Speech Impairment  | 338          | 1.9              | 2.4         | 2.2           |
| Other Health Impairment*   | 365          | 2.0              | 2.2         | 2.1           |
| Other Disabilities**   | 125          | 0.7              | 1.2         | 0.9           |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>2,014</b> | <b>11.3</b>      | <b>14.0</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 2008-09 with a Standard Diploma  | 71.2     | 81.0  |
| 2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21  | 5.8      | 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                        | 26.4                       | 31.6  | 40.3         | 67.5  |
|                  | Writing                        | 4.3                        | 19.6  | 33.6         | 63.3  |
|                  | Mathematics                    | 19.2                       | 32.9  | 41.5         | 68.1  |
|                  | Science                        | 6.9                        | 23.7  | 29.1         | 61.1  |
| CAPT             | Reading Across the Disciplines | 3.3                        | 13.8  | 18.5         | 45.9  |
|                  | Writing Across the Disciplines | 8.3                        | 16.8  | 30.7         | 59.6  |
|                  | Mathematics                    | 3.1                        | 16.7  | 13.3         | 48.7  |
|                  | Science                        | 3.6                        | 13.0  | 14.4         | 45.3  |

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 | 15.4 |
|                                   | % With Accommodations    | 84.6 |
| CAPT                              | % Without Accommodations | 46.7 |
|                                   | % With Accommodations    | 53.3 |
| % Assessed Using Skills Checklist |                          | 11.1 |

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 | 91    | 4.5     |
| Private Schools or Other Settings | 230   | 11.4    |

### 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        | 1524              | 75.7                | 67.6 | 73.4  |
| 40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time       | 266               | 13.2                | 17.1 | 15.3  |
| 0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time        | 224               | 11.1                | 15.3 | 11.3  |

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

District Improvement Plan (New Strategies/Interventions) New Haven is a Data Driven District confirmed by Cambridge Review and Data Teams have been established in every school as well as central office. Our Comprehensive Professional Development Program continues to focus on classroom practice and teachers' professional knowledge. We have developed a Comprehensive Curriculum Package with a five-year cycle of review. Regular district-wide formative assessments in the core areas continue to be planned and we have strengthened the ELLs. Also, we have significantly reduced identification rate of students with disabilities and will continue to do so. We plan to continue our proactive effort to reach out to parents and the community with detailed communications and engagement strategies. Our key stakeholder groups - the High School Leadership Council, teachers' union, administrators' union and senior management provide regular and valuable feedback. The School Development Program of the Yale Child Study Center continues to be behavioral supports-partners. New Haven has implemented the following School Change Initiative: Vision for Change: Students learning through meaningful and coherent experiences in individual classrooms, among different classrooms, and in the rest of their lives; schools as the centers for learning, where teams of adults take collective and empowered responsibility for students, working separately and together to move students from where they start to the highest performance levels, collaborating without fault; the district and schools acting to support development, innovation, and adaptation, both by schools and by individuals. Strategies: Portfolio of Schools: Each school will be organized and supported on its own unique path to success; Talent: Adults in the system will be managed as professionals to encourage collaboration, empowerment, and responsibility for outcomes-and this will enable us to attract, develop, and retain the highest caliber staff; Community: the work of the school system will be as aligned as possible with the other adults who work on behalf of students, including in particular parents and community organizations. Overall District Performance Goals: Eliminate the achievement gap with the rest of the state, cut the drop-out rate in half, ensure that every students can be successful in college, initiatives over 5 years, with accelerating impact as reforms accelerate and extend to full system, from 27% drop out (class of 2008) to 13.5% dropout, with 10% still enrolled for 5 or 6 year diploma, and 76.5% 4 year graduation rate, from 50% of graduating class of 2008 still enrolled in college in 2 years to 75% of class.

---