

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11**Regional School District 13**

SUSAN VICCARO, Superintendent

Location: 135-a Pickett Lane
Durham,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860)-349-7200

Website: www.rsd13ct.org/

This regional school district serves Durham, Middlefield

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: Middlesex

Town Population in 2000: 10,830

1990-2000 Population Growth: 12.1%

Number of Public Schools: 6

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,911

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 11.0%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.5%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: N/A

*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): C 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, 2010 2,036
5-Year Enrollment Change -6.6%

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	118	5.8	7.6	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	10	0.5	0.7	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	35	1.7	4.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	275	13.5	10.7	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	112	89.6	85.4	80.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	42	15.3	12.6	13.2

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	7	0.3
Asian American	40	2.0
Black	20	1.0
Hispanic	56	2.8
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	1,905	93.6
Two or more races	8	0.4
Total Minority	131	6.4

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.9%

Non-English Home Language:

1.5% 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 11.

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.

Regional School District 13 continuously looks for opportunities for our students that will reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. At the elementary level, some of our students have been involved in a pen pal program with students from China. Other students studied different ethnic cultures and researched their family's genealogy. The District was also fortunate to be involved with Victoria Christgau and the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Presentation. This performance provided songs, film clips and a review of the freedom songs that played such a large part in the American Civil Rights Movement. At the middle school level, students participated in a Sister Schools Interdistrict Grant program offered by ACES with students from Carrigan Middle School. This resulted in a variety of activities between the schools, culminating with staff and administration from both schools meeting to plan programs that will extend into the next school year. In addition, middle school students participated in several interdisciplinary units involving the study of film. Students focused on the definition of racism and how sports have courageously combated racism during the last half century. At the high school level, members of the Diversity, Edge, and Helping Hands clubs participated in a White Out Day, programs that focused on healthy decision making, as well as participation in diversity-themed service projects and conferences. All junior and senior students participated in volunteer work or service learning projects that allowed them to interact with and give back to their local communities. Several hundred students, across the district, participated in the fourth annual Community Round Up, collecting canned goods and food for local food pantries. In addition, two schools participated in the Rachel's Challenge Program that resulted in a myriad of student activities that reviewed and celebrated the differences among us. Every school continued to focus on the District's core ethical values of respect, responsibility, kindness, courage and honesty with a variety of activities highlighting each value.

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	64.9	58.4	48.1	
Writing	67.5	61.1	53.4	
Mathematics	69.2	63.0	51.6	
Grade 4 Reading	71.3	62.5	52.8	
Writing	70.1	65.5	43.9	
Mathematics	66.1	67.0	32.9	
Grade 5 Reading	77.6	61.4	72.4	
Writing	82.9	66.8	75.5	
Mathematics	80.6	72.5	54.6	
Science	76.2	59.9	67.5	
Grade 6 Reading	86.6	76.0	64.3	
Writing	69.2	65.2	46.4	
Mathematics	86.2	71.3	72.6	
Grade 7 Reading	86.1	77.8	50.3	
Writing	68.8	58.9	56.3	
Mathematics	78.2	68.4	54.5	
Grade 8 Reading	86.0	74.7	62.4	
Writing	86.9	64.8	83.4	
Mathematics	85.4	66.6	77.1	
Science	84.0	63.1	75.2	

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	55.2	44.7	56.8	
Writing Across the Disciplines	81.3	61.2	79.7	
Mathematics	69.8	49.5	77.4	
Science	61.3	47.0	65.4	

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
	61.3	51.0	72.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		78.7	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	530	510	66.4
	Critical Reading	536	505	76.3
	Writing	537	510	74.0

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 with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2010	92.2	81.8	75.6
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.3	2.8	78.4

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	91.3	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	2.0	9.1

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	144.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	14.50
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	20.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	32.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.60
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	9.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	11.10
School Nurses	6.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	97.10

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	14.0	14.7	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	84.1	81.3	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.6	17.6	18.4
Grade 2	16.9	19.1	19.9
Grade 5	18.6	20.7	21.2
Grade 7	21.2	19.6	20.6
High School	18.8	19.2	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	966	988	992
Middle School	1,041	1,026	1,017
High School	969	1,012	1,010

*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*	3.9	3.0	3.1
Middle School	3.1	2.3	2.4
High School	2.4	2.4	2.2

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2009-10

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	\$16,186	\$7,771	\$8,232	\$7,683	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$433	\$208	\$299	\$267	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$932	\$447	\$477	\$388	\$463
Student Support Services	\$3,735	\$1,793	\$875	\$893	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$3,328	\$1,598	\$1,433	\$1,410	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,347	\$1,607	\$1,421	\$1,346	\$1,410
Transportation	\$1,711	\$788	\$701	\$664	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$995	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$582	\$280	\$161	\$171	\$159
Total	\$31,248	\$14,838	\$13,878	\$13,335	\$13,780
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,142	\$1,508	\$1,622	\$1,101	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,724,481	21.5	21.2	21.5

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	73.9	21.2	4.5	0.4
Excluding School Construction	75.0	19.6	5.0	0.4

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 recent fiscal year in both communities challenged the Board of Education and the administration to provide an equitable allocation of resources among all of the district's schools. The Board always strives to provide comparable resources to all schools, recognizing that some of the requirements of secondary education, including equipment, specialized courses and supplies, result in additional costs. The Board of Education holds both a fall and a spring retreat to identify budget and district priorities, as well as the goals identified in the 5 year strategic plan. Budgets are first developed at the building level, ensuring that new programs and individual student needs are addressed by those with the most knowledge. Building administrators meet with central office staff and district priorities are determined before the budget is presented to the Board of Education in March. Four Board of Education meetings, a public hearing and a district meeting allow for significant input from members of the community during the months of March, April and May. The budget is voted on during a district-wide referendum held in May. The budget format and presentation continue to be refined each year in order to provide greater clarity and transparency for the citizens in both communities.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	273
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.4%

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	30	1.5	1.1	1.1
Learning Disability	95	4.7	3.8	3.9
Intellectual Disability	9	0.4	0.4	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	13	0.6	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	63	3.1	1.9	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	57	2.8	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	6	0.3	0.7	0.9
Total	273	13.4	10.5	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 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma	71.4	62.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.9

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	47.7	33.0	79.0	68.6
	Writing	26.4	19.3	74.0	63.7
	Mathematics	45.8	33.4	77.6	68.2
	Science	40.0	21.2	80.4	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	37.5	14.1	55.2	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	45.5	17.3	81.3	61.2
	Mathematics	30.8	15.8	69.8	49.5
	Science	31.8	13.1	61.3	47.0

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	18.2
	% With Accommodations	81.8
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	20.0
	% With Accommodations	80.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.8

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	2	0.7
Private Schools or Other Settings	11	4.0

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	227	83.2	77.4	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	36	13.2	15.5	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	10	3.7	7.1	11.0

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Brewster School focused on early literacy skills including comprehension and editing and revising as the mainstay of their School Improvement Plan. A focus on the kindergarten literacy program resulted in the redesign of the program that allowed for literacy skills to be integrated throughout the entire program. Students were involved in literacy centers and participated in guided reading groups at their individual skill level. Older students participated in Reader's Workshop and Guided Reading. Teachers continued to be trained in differentiated instruction and assessment. At Korn School, the focus was on strengthening reading comprehension skills and on making reader/text connections. In the area of writing students focused on composing and revising their work. Common formative assessments and scoring rubrics were developed to address concerns in the area of reading comprehension. Classroom teachers focused on fluency and identified individual students needing intervention based on the results of the DIBELS benchmark assessment. John Lyman focused on reading comprehension, math and writing in their School Improvement Plan. Students were taught a combination of strategies that addressed meaningful text connections supported by information from the text and their own life. Teams of teachers continued to work collaboratively to share "best practices," implementing teaching and learning activities designed to improve student performance. Memorial Middle School also had a focus on reader/text connects and on the Degrees of Reading Power. Grade level data teams reviewed student performance in the area of non-fiction reading. Teams developed assessments, determined essential teaching strategies and reviewed student work on a regular basis. Strong School continued to focus on common formative assessments and differentiated instruction aligned with Scientific Research Based Instruction (SRBI). Common formative assessments were developed in each content area and helped to drive instruction. All teacher professional growth projects were directly tied to the School Improvement Plan. At Coginchaug High School, the focus was also on the development of common formative assessments and the use of student assessment data to improve instruction. Department teams met regularly and discussed ways to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners. In addition, teachers focused on emerging technologies, improved communication and student engagement. Data team work, common formative assessments to guide instruction, differentiation and technology integration will continue to be major areas of focus in all district schools.
