

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

MICHAEL T. CICHETTI, Superintendent

Location: 238 Kensington Road  
Berlin,  
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 828-6581

Website: [www.berlin.k12.ct.us](http://www.berlin.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](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Hartford

Town Population in 2000: 18,215

1990-2000 Population Growth: 8.5%

Number of Public Schools: 5

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,744

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 13.0%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 2.0%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 93.1%

\*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): D 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      3,159  
5-Year Enrollment Change      -5.8%

**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	199	6.3	13.4	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	62	2.0	2.3	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.8	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	343	10.9	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	172	95.0	85.6	80.5
Homeless	6	0.2	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	55	10.7	15.5	13.6

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	9	0.3
Asian American	129	4.1
Black	45	1.4
Hispanic	93	2.9
White	2,883	91.3
Total Minority	276	8.7

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 1.0%

**Open Choice:**

31 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:**

7.8% 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 28.

---

### 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 Berlin Public Schools provide a variety of programs and experiences that are designed to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. We are encouraged with the response to these efforts from students, staff, and members of the community. Our participation in the Open CHOICE Program is district-wide and during this year we welcomed 32 students into our five schools. This signals a sincere commitment to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. The Board of Education recognizes that Berlin is not a highly diverse community and that the greater Berlin community also benefits from participation in CHOICE. Each of our schools continues to participate in and provide a number of learning activities designed to promote diversity. Our middle school partnered with an elementary school in Hartford and participated in activities to build a sense of team. When curriculum is revised, careful attention is given to be certain it is reflective of diversity. Administration continues to offer periodic updates, to the Board of Education and community, outlining the activities that are conducted as part of the district's efforts to educate students about understanding differences among people.

---

## 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 <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Grade 3 Reading	66.9	57.0	53.4	
Writing	71.6	58.3	69.9	
Mathematics	72.0	62.4	55.2	
Grade 4 Reading	76.1	59.9	73.0	
Writing	74.6	63.6	56.9	
Mathematics	84.2	67.0	81.1	
Grade 5 Reading	75.9	61.8	64.8	
Writing	82.3	68.2	72.3	
Mathematics	87.7	72.4	77.1	
Science	71.4	59.4	51.2	
Grade 6 Reading	88.1	74.9	71.2	
Writing	89.6	65.9	93.9	
Mathematics	86.1	70.7	71.2	
Grade 7 Reading	90.7	77.4	74.0	
Writing	81.5	61.2	81.8	
Mathematics	87.4	68.5	80.5	
Grade 8 Reading	88.6	73.3	79.0	
Writing	81.7	62.6	82.8	
Mathematics	87.8	67.3	85.4	
Science	78.9	62.8	66.2	

**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 <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Reading Across the Disciplines	61.2	45.9	68.9	
Writing Across the Disciplines	77.2	59.6	73.7	
Mathematics	65.9	48.7	68.2	
Science	52.4	45.3	53.0	

**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	50.7	75.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		75.0	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	527	508	60.5
	Critical Reading	497	503	37.2
	Writing	504	506	41.9

**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	94.2	91.3	43.1
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.4	3.0	47.1

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	88.9	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.3	10.4

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	202.02
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	20.63
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	34.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	43.92
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	9.94
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.60
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	6.00
School Level	13.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	7.40
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	16.80
School Nurses	5.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	124.56

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	13.0	14.4	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	84.6	77.1	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.5	17.2	18.5
Grade 2	18.5	18.9	19.7
Grade 5	21.0	20.9	21.1
Grade 7	19.2	20.3	20.8
High School	19.8	19.6	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	999	985	992
Middle School	1,065	1,025	1,018
High School	1,053	1,000	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*	3.4	3.5	3.2
Middle School	2.0	2.8	2.5
High School	2.4	2.8	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	\$21,429	\$6,661	\$7,819	\$7,408	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,044	\$324	\$274	\$280	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,003	\$312	\$474	\$389	\$459
Student Support Services	\$3,636	\$1,130	\$863	\$800	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$4,510	\$1,402	\$1,405	\$1,309	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,373	\$1,670	\$1,469	\$1,377	\$1,462
Transportation	\$1,970	\$580	\$701	\$641	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,151	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$808	\$251	\$163	\$169	\$162
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$40,923</b>	<b>\$12,603</b>	<b>\$13,458</b>	<b>\$12,685</b>	<b>\$13,386</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$622	\$193	\$1,864	\$1,136	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$8,016,139	19.6	20.9	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	80.3	17.7	1.8	0.3
Excluding School Construction	80.3	17.6	1.8	0.3

## 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.

It has been the practice of the Berlin Board of Education and its central office administration that each school in the district should have comparable resources while recognizing factors such as equipment and specialized supply needs at the secondary school are inherently more costly in nature. The proposed budget for our school district is created by our administrators in the late fall. It is built on the assumption that our three elementary schools would receive a fixed amount for each student enrolled in the school. This would “guarantee” an equitable allocation of resources among our schools. Once that assumption was met, adjustments were then made to determine what additional resources would be allocated to particular schools to adequately address needs particular to a certain school. The same process was then used at our two secondary schools. However, a different per student fixed amount was used because of the significantly higher costs as mentioned above. Once the proposed budget is adopted, appropriate reductions, if necessary, are made “across the board,” and the same per student expenditure ratio described above is maintained as closely as possible.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	333
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	39	1.2	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	96	3.1	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	5	0.2	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	17	0.5	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	86	2.7	2.4	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	77	2.5	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	13	0.4	0.9	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>11.4</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	88.9	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	1.5	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	37.5	31.6	81.1	67.5
	Writing	29.9	19.6	80.3	63.3
	Mathematics	36.8	32.9	84.2	68.1
	Science	27.8	23.7	75.3	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	4.0	13.8	61.2	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	13.8	16.8	77.2	59.6
	Mathematics	20.8	16.7	65.9	48.7
	Science	12.9	13.0	52.4	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	37.5
	% With Accommodations	62.5
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		2.7

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	0.6
Private Schools or Other Settings	22	6.6

### 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	233	70.0	76.7	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	68	20.4	13.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	32	9.6	9.5	11.3

---

## SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

**Student Performance and Accomplishments:** The district administration and staff present to the Board of Education an annual report on student performance on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) and the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT). The 2010 CMT results reflected exceptionally high participation rates at 99.9% and strong performance in both math and reading (99% at/above proficient in math and 93.4% at/above proficient in reading). The CAPT participation rate was 98.3% with 95.1% of our students scoring at/above proficient in math and 90% at/above proficient in reading. The district's overall performance has improved as compared to last year, while the staff is committed to the need to continually evaluate performance levels of specific subgroups and individual students. A system-wide effort to evaluate students' performance is taking place throughout the school year. Our analysis includes work with individual schools and grade levels within the school. Individual schools have instituted instructional support programs to assist in the analysis of student performance data and to help teachers use data to inform instruction and to coach teachers in instructional strategies and best practices. In addition to the use of data teams at all levels, there has been increased collaboration between our special education and general education teachers and the delineation of responsibilities. We recognize the specific learning needs that some students have and are committed to planning and implementing instruction so that all students can meet grade-level expectations. As part of the district's implementation of the Scientific Research Based Intervention model, administrators have identified grade-level benchmark assessments and regular monitoring systems for the purpose of ongoing identification and intervention for students in need of additional instruction and resources. Ongoing Efforts to improve student learning include:

- Alignment of teacher, department, school and district goals using student performance data to identify areas in need of improvement
- Use of the Continuous Improvement Model to guide all schools in the development of focused data-driven action plans and performance indicators
- Assessment of all students (special and general education) using established universal screens, benchmark assessments and common formative assessments
- Instructional support staff for math and reading at all levels with specific implementation protocols
- Increased opportunities for instruction through after school and summer programs
- Established summer reading programs at all schools
- Regular monitoring of students who receive support services to evaluate instruction and to make adjustments as necessary
- Implementation of Scientific Research Based Intervention (SRBI) model
- Coordinated professional development focused on instructional strategies and reading in the content area for professional and paraprofessional staff at all levels
- Vertical teams for math, science, language arts, social studies and technology literacy comprised of general and special education teachers to ensure consistency and continuity of instruction in grades K-12
- Implementation of Performance Tracker Data System district-wide and MMS Electronic Gradebook/Parent Portal at the secondary level

---