

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09****Cheshire School District**

GREG FLORIO, Superintendent

Telephone: (203) 250-2420

Location: 29 Main Street

Cheshire,

Connecticut

Website: [www.cheshire.k12.ct.us/](http://www.cheshire.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: New Haven

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$33,903

Town Population in 2000: 28,543

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 11.2%

1990-2000 Population Growth: 11.1%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 1.2%

Number of Public Schools: 7

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.0%

\*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): 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, 2008

5,006

5-Year Enrollment Change

-3.4%

**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	268	5.4	6.4	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	41	0.8	2.2	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	1,374	27.4	6.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	504	10.1	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	286	95.3	91.3	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	143	16.2	14.2	19.0

\*99.8% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	9	0.2
Asian American	392	7.8
Black	90	1.8
Hispanic	152	3.0
White	4,363	87.2
Total Minority	643	12.8

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 2.6%

**Open Choice:** 13 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:** 5.1% 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 29.

---

### 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.

A major focus in the Cheshire Public Schools during the 2008 – 2009 school year to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation was to implement learning opportunities and experiences that connected our learners with students from other communities. Fourth graders from Norton School partnered with students from Wexler/Grant Community School in New Haven to communicate and collaborate on various projects and learn from each other through the use of video conferencing. Students and staff members at Cheshire High School participated in the Southern Connecticut Conference Dream Team monthly meetings that included specific activities focused on diversity, acceptance and tolerance. At Dodd Middle School, students from each seventh grade team took part in the ACES Prudence Crandall Project. This project engaged middle school students from Hamden, Fair Haven, Cheshire, New Haven, and Wallingford in two days of diversity activities. After the event, students from Dodd repeated the learning activities at school with their peers so that the learning could be extended to all students. In addition, the Cheshire Public Schools continued to participate in the Open Choice program during the 2008 – 2009 school year. The staff at Darcey School participated in a day long professional development activity entitled “A World of Difference.” This workshop was planned to improve cultural competence and sensitivity to the increasingly diverse student population at Darcey School. As a result of this training, changes were made to the kindergarten curriculum. We continued to partner with our parent organizations in each school to plan and implement activities, schoolwide assemblies, field trips and programs that were aligned with our curriculum to foster learning about different cultures, customs, and traditions. Guest speakers, food festivals, and various cultural arts assemblies were among the activities that took place during the 2008 – 2009 school year in our efforts to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation for our students. We plan to continue the process of finding meaningful and productive measures that will help broaden our connections with other districts and plan to build on the activities that were successful this school year to enhance student learning and understanding of differences.

---

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE

**Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % 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.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	73.8	54.6	79.9
Writing	80.8	62.5	83.0
Mathematics	78.3	62.8	71.7
Grade 4 Reading	77.8	60.7	80.4
Writing	79.3	64.2	78.2
Mathematics	84.0	63.6	84.8
Grade 5 Reading	81.8	66.0	73.3
Writing	76.8	66.5	62.3
Mathematics	84.3	68.8	79.6
Science	79.2	58.1	78.4
Grade 6 Reading	91.1	68.9	89.6
Writing	85.1	62.2	89.0
Mathematics	89.6	68.8	82.8
Grade 7 Reading	88.9	74.9	79.0
Writing	81.4	62.9	84.7
Mathematics	86.3	66.0	87.3
Grade 8 Reading	84.5	68.4	75.5
Writing	89.1	66.5	89.7
Mathematics	88.9	64.5	90.3
Science	85.1	60.6	85.2

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 scoreable 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	65.6	47.4	75.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	72.1	55.0	70.2
Mathematics	69.1	47.8	76.3
Science	60.2	42.8	71.8

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
	40.6	36.2	60.0

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		91.8	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	557	507	86.0
	Critical Reading	532	503	76.7
	Writing	535	506	76.0

**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, Class of 2008	98.2	92.1	77.1
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	1.9	6.6	73.0
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.6	2.5	69.3

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	95.1	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.2	11.0

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	299.03
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	38.15
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	45.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	87.40
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	19.70
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.20
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.00
School Level	19.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	4.55
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	22.50
School Nurses	8.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	190.10

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	14.7	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	77.3	83.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.7	18.4	18.3
Grade 2	17.8	19.4	19.3
Grade 5	19.8	22.0	21.0
Grade 7	22.0	21.6	20.5
High School	17.6	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,009	991	988
Middle School	1,021	1,018	1,016
High School	1,001	977	1,007

\*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*	3.3	3.4	3.3
Middle School	3.1	2.5	2.6
High School	3.2	2.9	2.4

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

## DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

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	\$33,633	\$6,566	\$7,521	\$7,233	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,071	\$209	\$267	\$245	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,065	\$403	\$461	\$461	\$446
Student Support Services	\$3,701	\$723	\$808	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$5,389	\$1,052	\$1,351	\$1,342	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,947	\$1,161	\$1,382	\$1,386	\$1,377
Transportation	\$3,233	\$601	\$649	\$575	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,415	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$988	\$193	\$152	\$164	\$151
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$57,442</b>	<b>\$11,241</b>	<b>\$12,869</b>	<b>\$12,531</b>	<b>\$12,805</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,055	\$596	\$1,791	\$1,180	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$12916187	22.5	19.2	20.5

**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	79.5	17.6	2.1	0.8
Excluding School Construction	79.8	17.1	2.2	0.8

---

**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.

Included in the Cheshire Board of Education Policy Manual is a statement that each student in the school district shall be supplied with the appropriate level of material and resources to assure adequate opportunities to achieve academic success. Each year the Cheshire Board of Education takes a "zero based" approach to budgeting. Each school submits requests for supplies, materials, textbooks and equipment based on needs for the coming year. Those requests are reviewed by Central Office staff and the Board of Education to determine the level of funding for the next school year. As curriculum is approached on a districtwide basis, monies to support curriculum must be allocated equitably. Supplies are allocated based on curriculum needs and enrollment and a per pupil average at each grade level. In some years schools will receive a greater amount of money based on specific needs and unique items. For example, a large purchase of equipment required to open a new classroom at one school would make one school's budget greater in a given year than a school without the need to open a new classroom due to enrollment changes. Students with special needs are evaluated on an individual basis and decisions to purchase the appropriate materials, supplies and equipment to meet their individual education programs are made based on that information.

---

### SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	499
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.0%

---

<b>Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities</b>				
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	<b>State Percent</b>
Autism	42	0.8	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	147	3.0	3.5	3.9
Intellectual Disability	21	0.4	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	34	0.7	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	92	1.9	2.1	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	123	2.5	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	40	0.8	0.7	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.2</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

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Who Graduated in 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	90.9	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

## 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	49.4	30.2	83.4	65.7
	Writing	32.2	19.5	82.1	64.1
	Mathematics	45.1	30.7	85.4	65.7
	Science	47.4	23.8	82.2	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	25.0	14.1	65.6	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	13.2	13.6	72.1	55.0
	Mathematics	22.6	15.4	69.1	47.8
	Science	21.1	10.6	60.2	42.8

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	16.7
	% With Accommodations	83.3
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	17.0
	% With Accommodations	83.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		11.4

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	31	6.2

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	366	73.3	75.9	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	85	17.0	17.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	48	9.6	6.9	11.2

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Cheshire Public Schools Strategic Planning Initiative provides a framework for school and district improvement plans and outlines action plan steps to improve the teaching and learning process. Our Strategic Plan emphasizes: 1) differentiating teaching and learning activities to support and challenge students with different learning styles and varying needs and interests; 2) fostering an understanding of the Cheshire Public Schools' performance standards; and 3) using student assessment data to guide instructional decisions. An important component to school and district improvement is our Cheshire Strategic Planning Initiative Council. Our council is made up of teachers, staff members, parents, community members, and administrators that meet monthly to review and discuss progress related to school and district initiatives.

During the 2008 – 2009 school year, we created a district plan for implementing SRBI or Scientific Research-based Interventions to help low performing students meet standards. We plan to devote a portion of three professional development days to provide time for content area teachers to meet and discuss student needs aligned with universal assessment results as outlined in our SRBI plan. We continue to place emphasis on important 21st century skills as outlined in our performance standard expectations to help our students acquire the skills needed to be successful in a dynamic and diverse world. In addition, we have put in to place two technology applications to help us in our quest to accomplish our goals by using data more efficiently through Pearson's INFORM and PowerSchool. These applications will allow teachers to review, analyze, and share student assessment data and use this information linked with their daily observations of student learning and teaching experience to guide interventions and instructional strategies to meet individual student needs. PowerSchool will also enhance our ability to communicate our goals with parents at the high school and middle school levels so that we work in concert with them as partners to help all students achieve their fullest potential. To summarize, we plan to use what we know about effective teaching and learning to support enhanced instruction through the more timely use of data and collaborative practices.

---