

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12**Manchester School District**

KATHLEEN M. OUELLETTE, Superintendent

Location: 45 North School Street

Telephone: (860) 647-3441

Manchester,
ConnecticutWebsite: boe.townofmanchester.org/

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: Hartford

Town Population in 2000: 54,740

1990-2000 Population Growth: 6%

Number of Public Schools: 12

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$25,989

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 13.8%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.5%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 89.8%

*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): G 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, 2011 6,405
5-Year Enrollment Change -8.7%

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	3,596	56.1	42.1	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	332	5.4	3.8	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	235	3.7	3.9	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	901	14.1	12.6	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	344	68.3	77.0	79.8
Homeless	2	0.0	0.3	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	136	16.0	12.0	13.0

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	31	0.5
Asian American	494	7.7
Black	1,370	21.4
Hispanic	1,499	23.4
Pacific Islander	1	0.0
White	2,742	42.8
Two or more races	268	4.2
Total Minority	3,663	57.2

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 8.5%

Non-English Home Language:

13.2% 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 54.

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.

Our goal is to continue to close the achievement gap. Significant gains in achievement have been made for our students that show a closing of the Achievement Gap in Manchester for the following groups; Black, Hispanic, Special Education and Free/Reduced Lunch students. Additionally, there have been remarkable achievement gains for our black and brown students in the areas of math, reading and writing over time. Evidence has been revealed to show that the implementation of Data Driven Decision Making, cultural relevant lesson planning and the creation of SMART Goals (goals for individual student achievement) has shown to be the reason for our growth. This year, many initiatives were applied to ensure continual equitable student growth. Further focus has been turned to our Bilingual and English Language Learner (ELL) programs. The increase of students with second language continues to be staggering and calls for immediate implementation of additional support for our ELL students. Additional programming supports the reduction of racial isolation. Such programs include creating culturally responsive classrooms and racial balance planning. This is done with a focus to embrace difference and highlight the understanding of diversity. The Manchester School system continues to celebrate diversity evident through the central focus on cultural awareness within the school level. Several opportunities continue to be provided each year for all students to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Below are only a few highlights of some of the many fine programs that our school system offers all of our students. Overall, families are attracted to or schools because of the diversity and exposure to a sound comprehensive education. The Manchester Board of Education is committed to helping our district and community address racial, ethnic and economic isolation.

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	52.8	59.2	21.9
Writing	56.0	62.7	21.9
Mathematics	61.7	66.5	23.8
Grade 4 Reading	64.2	64.1	31.3
Writing	64.6	65.3	31.3
Mathematics	68.5	68.0	31.9
Grade 5 Reading	65.4	67.6	27.7
Writing	56.2	68.1	14.3
Mathematics	66.8	71.6	24.4
Science	56.1	63.9	16.7
Grade 6 Reading	66.7	74.1	21.1
Writing	63.2	67.4	30.1
Mathematics	60.1	69.3	18.7
Grade 7 Reading	67.9	79.8	11.3
Writing	56.1	65.6	16.1
Mathematics	49.7	68.1	12.5
Grade 8 Reading	68.2	76.8	15.7
Writing	58.3	68.3	18.1
Mathematics	50.8	67.2	14.5
Science	44.1	61.9	13.1

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.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to 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	37.4	47.5	25.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	59.4	63.0	32.8
Mathematics	36.1	49.2	23.3
Science	34.1	47.1	26.9

For more detailed 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."

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
	52.8	50.6	53.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		66.7	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	472	505	19.1
	Critical Reading	480	502	25.2
	Writing	478	506	19.8

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 2011	71.2	82.7	13.5
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	4.8	2.6	10.1

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	92.1	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	6.7	9.7

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	452.77
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	68.54
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	72.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	152.32
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	23.67
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	11.60
School Level	25.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	14.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	47.37
School Nurses	19.03
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	371.40

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	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	56.7	79.5	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.6	18.7	18.5
Grade 2	17.8	19.3	19.7
Grade 5	19.3	21.1	21.6
Grade 7	17.6	20.3	20.3
High School	19.8	19.4	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,032	989	993
Middle School	1,017	1,012	1,024
High School	1,003	1,013	1,024

*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*	2.2	3.4	2.8
Middle School	2.3	2.4	2.2
High School	1.8	2.1	2.1

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2010-11

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	\$60,704	\$8,917	\$8,464	\$8,467	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$2,295	\$337	\$267	\$222	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$3,921	\$576	\$487	\$406	\$482
Student Support Services	\$6,676	\$981	\$901	\$999	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$10,491	\$1,541	\$1,468	\$1,417	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$10,813	\$1,588	\$1,471	\$1,459	\$1,463
Transportation	\$4,083	\$532	\$735	\$732	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$5,725	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,360	\$200	\$165	\$166	\$165
Total	\$106,069	\$14,307	\$14,238	\$14,111	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$4,843	\$711	\$1,290	\$1,057	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$23,894,109	22.5	22.7	21.7

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	62.3	25.9	10.3	1.5
Excluding School Construction	61.2	26.5	10.8	1.6

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 Manchester Board of Education ensures that all of our schools are well funded to achieve success for all. This point is represented by providing each school an allocation from the Town for instructional materials based on an equitable per pupil allotment. The annual Town budget process ensures that every school submits a budget requesting materials and staffing for educational improvement. Additionally, the district reviews requests to ensure the distribution of resources in an equitable fashion so that each school receives the necessary staff, materials and monies. Furthermore, Title Grants and other awards are secured to help provide supplementary funding to improve student achievement especially in schools that have a population of low income students. The method to determine the distribution of funding is established by free and reduced lunch counts. Those schools that have a larger percentage of free and reduced lunch population receive a larger amount of state funded allocations and district focus to address these needs. District funds are awarded to support professional development and remedial programming for students. Parameters are taken into consideration, established by equity and specific to class size, free and reduced lunch statistics, staffing for achievement success and literacy development need to enable a quality education.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	980
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.7%

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	85	1.2	1.3	1.2
Learning Disability	313	4.4	3.9	3.9
Intellectual Disability	21	0.3	0.5	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	130	1.8	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	206	2.9	2.3	2.1
Other Health Impairment*	150	2.1	2.5	2.2
Other Disabilities**	75	1.1	1.2	1.0
Total	980	13.7	12.9	11.7

*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 2010-11 with a Standard Diploma	49.4	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	5.6	5.1

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	32.5	36.0	63.9	70.4
	Writing	13.4	21.5	58.8	66.3
	Mathematics	26.2	31.8	59.8	68.4
	Science	12.1	23.0	50.7	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	9.8	14.5	37.4	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	12.8	18.2	59.4	63.0
	Mathematics	9.5	15.4	36.1	49.2
	Science	6.4	13.6	34.1	47.1

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	41.0
	% With Accommodations	59.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	35.4
	% With Accommodations	64.6
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.5

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	59	6.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	77	7.9

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	659	67.2	68.0	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	133	13.6	16.4	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	188	19.2	15.6	11.7

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Data is used in all aspects of our planning stage in an effort to design the most meaningful activities for the students of our learning community. Our goals were formulated from data to improve achievement in numeracy, literacy and parent involvement. Every year the district improvement plan provides an umbrella to which our schools coordinate their school improvement plans. The district improvement plan is derived from our system's strategic plan. School Improvement Plans are generated so that each building and all staff are consistent with the District's mission. The school improvement plans focus specifically on improving student achievement in the following areas: low socio-economic status, low achievement, special education and all ethnic groups, emphasizing the Achievement Gap. Enrichment programming is offered to challenge all students in the classroom equitably. Our vision is based on everyone reaching their fullest potential. Our programs and plans reflect this vision. Because the Manchester school district received the status of making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2010-2011, the district was given a year of no requirements from the Federal Government. The Manchester District made "Safe Harbor" twice in three years. Evidence at all levels showed student academic growth on the CMT and CAPT assessment tools. Some of the aforementioned techniques were used by District staff to raise scores. Additionally, strategies to help all students learn more effectively are as follows: differentiated instruction, training in data driven decision making, proficiency development, cultural pedagogy, math initiatives, reading programs and Leveled Literacy support. The staff in the Manchester Public School district is committed to working as a team to close the achievement gap and is dedicated to providing a challenging education, so that all students are prepared in college and career readiness for the 21st Century.
