

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

LOUISE S. BERRY, Superintendent

Location: 119 Gorman Road

Telephone: (860) 774-9153

Brooklyn,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.brooklynschools.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: Windham

Town Population in 2000: 7,173

1990-2000 Population Growth: 7.4%

Number of Public Schools: 2

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$20,359

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 21.0%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.7%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 93.8%

*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): E 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 930
5-Year Enrollment Change -9.0%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range PK - 8

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	244	26.2	14.9	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	5	0.6	0.7	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	60	6.6	3.3	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	106	11.4	11.1	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	72	97.3	86.6	79.8
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*85.2 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	3	0.3
Asian American	17	1.8
Black	20	2.2
Hispanic	34	3.7
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	842	90.5
Two or more races	14	1.5
Total Minority	88	9.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.3%

Non-English Home Language:

1.8% 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 8.

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.

Brooklyn is a small town with very little racial diversity. However, its economic diversity is evidenced by the increasing percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price meals. Hence, the issues of economic isolation and fragmented families are of ongoing concern to members of our staff. At the elementary level, we work to address the limitations in the lives of many of our students through a variety of curricular projects to provide opportunities for students to experience other cultures. In addition, students have a number of field trips annually to enrich and broaden their perspective. At the middle school level, the many cultural enrichment activities throughout the year in language arts, social studies and science help to broaden students' understanding of the differences, as well as the similarities of different ethnic groups, to relate to a "larger world", and to expand their interest to issues and activities well beyond Connecticut. The faculty has incorporated diversity into their instructional activities and our technological resources and extensive use of the Internet have helped our students. These activities also help students develop an appreciation of the traditions of other cultures. Our secondary students are tuitioned to a number of high schools in eastern Connecticut under the Board's Freedom of Choice policy and thus have access to a broad range of programs/activities. Brooklyn's high school students also become members of student bodies with much more diversity than is possible in Brooklyn. Within the scope of their experience in our designated high schools, our secondary students have the opportunity to learn about and interact with members of different ethnic, racial and economic backgrounds and cultures.

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	60.7	59.2	41.3
Writing	66.7	62.7	45.6
Mathematics	73.5	66.5	51.3
Grade 4 Reading	68.9	64.1	40.6
Writing	73.4	65.3	49.4
Mathematics	79.3	68.0	56.3
Grade 5 Reading	68.3	67.6	33.7
Writing	69.2	68.1	36.3
Mathematics	71.6	71.6	30.4
Science	66.3	63.9	32.1
Grade 6 Reading	81.9	74.1	52.4
Writing	69.8	67.4	41.0
Mathematics	73.5	69.3	42.8
Grade 7 Reading	84.8	79.8	42.8
Writing	61.5	65.6	26.1
Mathematics	66.7	68.1	31.9
Grade 8 Reading	78.0	76.8	32.1
Writing	73.1	68.3	41.3
Mathematics	69.2	67.2	35.2
Science	70.5	61.9	45.0

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
	36.5	50.6	17.3

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		N/A	N/A	
Average Score	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Critical Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	N/A	N/A	N/A

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	N/A	N/A
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	N/A	N/A

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	59.33
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	8.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	1.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	1.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	1.00
School Level	3.10
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	2.50
School Nurses	0.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	24.00

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	19.0	15.4	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	76.8	81.8	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	12.0	15.5	18.5
Grade 2	17.8	17.0	19.7
Grade 5	20.6	18.5	21.6
Grade 7	20.0	19.1	20.3
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,001	992	993
Middle School	998	1,027	1,024
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*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*	5.7	2.4	2.8
Middle School	2.7	1.9	2.2
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*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	\$7,453	\$7,870	\$8,513	\$8,407	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$165	\$175	\$323	\$300	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$175	\$184	\$407	\$412	\$482
Student Support Services	\$706	\$746	\$919	\$905	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$925	\$976	\$1,700	\$1,532	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,070	\$1,130	\$1,281	\$1,547	\$1,463
Transportation	\$1,072	\$805	\$678	\$768	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$686	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$74	\$78	\$102	\$178	\$165
Total*	\$12,326	\$12,694	\$14,710	\$14,452	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$883	\$933	\$1,866	\$1,107	\$1,331

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$16,558 Tuition Costs, \$4,918.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$12,592.

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$2,920,754	17.6	20.1	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	46.8	42.4	10.8	0.0
Excluding School Construction	49.4	39.2	11.4	0.0

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 Board of Education's policy on the allocation of district resources provides the framework for both expenditures and revenues and translates into financial terms the priorities and educational needs of the district. The Board expects the superintendent to work closely with building level administrators in studying the needs of the school and recommendations are consistent with those needs. Building administrators are expected to confer with their grade level teams to obtain information on needs and priorities. The Board formulates the annual budget through a committee structure and solicits comments and recommendations from parents and community members. Resources are allocated in an equitable manner in an attempt to meet the needs of all students. Limited budget dollars are targeted toward priorities which are established by the Board of Education and the administration. Programmatic issues such as staff/student ratios and class size are reviewed annually or more frequently, if necessary. However, the allocation of funds for education during the past few years has significantly challenged the school administration as well as The Board of Education in their efforts to address all the financial needs of this system. Once the budget is approved by the Taxpayers, and the budget is usually approved at a level lower than originally requested, school administrators make appropriate reductions without changing the per student expenditure ratio.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	135
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	7	0.6	1.1	1.2
Learning Disability	60	5.0	3.6	3.9
Intellectual Disability	3	0.3	0.4	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	13	1.1	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	22	1.8	2.5	2.1
Other Health Impairment*	20	1.7	1.9	2.2
Other Disabilities**	10	0.8	0.8	1.0
Total	135	11.3	11.1	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	N/A	N/A
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	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	25.0	36.0	73.9	70.4
	Writing	16.4	21.5	68.8	66.3
	Mathematics	27.6	31.8	72.2	68.4
	Science	22.2	23.0	68.3	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	12.2
	% With Accommodations	87.8
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	100.0
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		2.4

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	3	2.2
Private Schools or Other Settings	12	8.9

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	90	66.7	74.3	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	30	22.2	18.2	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	15	11.1	7.5	11.7

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The focus on school improvement during 2011-2012 was a continuation of our efforts to use data analysis of CMT results to develop plans to improve the academic performance of all students as well as assisting staff in how to use data in the instructional process and the development of our curriculum. In the area of special education we continue to use our software system to create and modify IEP's which contributes to a consistent and cohesive practice in the development of IEP's. With the guidance of a new Director of Special Education, we have a greatly improved approach to the requirements of the special education process. Our efforts to provide a safe and positive learning environment for all students includes the development of a School Climate Plan, new bullying policies, a heightened concern of all staff members for the needs of students, additional special education programs to meet the needs of students with special needs, a pre-school program for all three and four year old children in our community and additional professional development activities on the Common Core Program and state standards involving this program. Finally our School Curriculum Committee, chaired by the Chair of the Brooklyn Board of Education and members of our staff and the Board of Education, meets frequently to discuss programs, raise questions on instructional practices, explore new courses, review CMT results and discuss the academic needs of the school provides an opportunity for school staff members and community members to exchange ideas and offer recommendations on the academic needs and programs of The Brooklyn School.
