Connecticut State Department of Education

DISTRICT PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2016–17



Plymouth School District

Dr. Martin Semmel, Superintendent • 860-314-8005 • http://plymouth.k12.ct.us/

District Information

Grade Range	PK-12
Number of Schools/Programs	5
Enrollment	1,504
Per Pupil Expenditures ¹	\$14,895
Total Expenditures ¹	\$25,246,946

¹Expenditure data reflect the 2015-16 year.



Community Information

<u>CERC Town Profiles</u> provide summary demographic and economic information for Connecticut's municipalities

Related Reports/Publications

CT Reports (CMT/CAPT)

Special Education Annual Performance Reports
SAT®, AP®, PSAT® Report by High School (Class of 2017)
(2017® The College Board)

Contents

Students1
Educators
Instruction and Resources
Performance and Accountability 4
Narratives

Notes

Unless otherwise noted, all data are for 2016-17 and include all grades offered by the district.

In most tables, data are displayed only for the three major race/ethnicity categories. For additional race/ethnicity categories, please visit edsight.ct.gov.

State totals are not displayed as they are not comparable to district totals.

Special Education tables reflect only students for whom the district is fiscally responsible.

* When an asterisk is displayed, data have been suppressed to ensure student confidentiality. N/A is displayed when a category is not applicable for a district or school.

Students

October 1, 2016 Enrollment				
		District	State	
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)	
Female	701	46.6	48.4	
Male	803	53.4	51.6	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	0.3	
Asian	20	1.3	5.1	
Black or African American	*	*	12.9	
Hispanic or Latino	130	8.6	24.0	
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.1	
Two or More Races	29	1.9	2.9	
White	1,302	86.6	54.8	
English Learners	16	1.1	6.8	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	495	32.9	35.9	
Students with Disabilities ¹	241	16.0	14.3	

¹Students in this category are students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) only. This category does not include students with Section 504 Plans.

Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension/Expulsion

	Chronic		Suspe	nsion/
	Absenteeism ²		Expu	lsion ³
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	67	10.1	17	2.4
Male	80	10.3	68	8.4
Black or African American	*	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	17	14.4	7	5.3
White	121	9.6	70	5.4
English Learners	*	*	0	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	86	19.3	52	9.9
Students with Disabilities	55	23.8	25	9.4
District	147	10.2	85	5.7
State		9.9		6.7

Number of students in 2015-16 qualified as truant under state statute: 189

Number of school-based arrests: Fewer than 6

²A student is chronically absent if he/she misses ten percent or greater of the total number of days enrolled in the school year for any reason. Pre-Kindergarten students are excluded from this calculation.

³The count and percentage of students who receive at least one in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension or expulsion.

Educators

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)¹ Staff

	FTE
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	93.0
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	4.0
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	16.0
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	35.6
Administrators, Coordinators and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.0
School Level	6.0
Library/Media	
Specialists (Certified)	0.0
Support Staff	3.0
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers	12.7
Counselors, Social Workers and School Psychologists	10.0
School Nurses	4.0
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services/Support	99.5

¹In the full-time equivalent count, staff members working part-time in the school are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in a school contributes 0.50 to the school's staff count.

Educators by Race/Ethnicity

		District	State
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0	0.1
Asian	0	0.0	1.0
Black or African American	0	0.0	3.6
Hispanic or Latino	2	1.4	3.6
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races	0	0.0	0.1
White	142	98.6	91.4

Classroom Teacher Attendance: 2015-16

	District	State
Average Number of FTE Days Absent Due to Illness or Personal Time	7.7	9.6

Instruction and Resources

11th and 12th Graders Enrolled in College-and-Career-Readiness Courses during High School³

	11th		12th	
	Count	Count Rate (%)		Rate (%)
Black or African American	*	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	6	*	*	*
White	104	90.4	106	88.3
English Learners	0	0.0	*	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	22	73.3	21	75.0
Students with Disabilities	16	72.7	16	72.7
District	112	88.2	112	87.5
State		63.6		77.5

³College-and-Career-Readiness Courses include Advanced Placement®(AP), International Baccalaureate®(IB), Career and Technical Education(CTE), workplace experience and dual enrollment courses.

Students with Disabilities Who Spend 79.1 to 100 Percent of Time with Nondisabled Peers⁴

	Count	Rate (%)
Autism	*	*
Emotional Disturbance	12	52.2
Intellectual Disability	0	0
Learning Disability	60	95.2
Other Health Impairment	50	73.5
Other Disabilities	*	*
Speech/Language Impairment	25	96.2
District	161	70.3
State		68.2

⁴Ages 6-21

Students with Disabilities by Primary Disability¹

	Di	State	
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Autism	32	2.0	1.7
Emotional Disturbance	23	1.4	1.0
Intellectual Disability	*	*	0.5
Learning Disability	63	3.9	4.9
Other Health Impairment	68	4.2	2.9
Other Disabilities	*	*	1.1
Speech/Language Impairment	33	2.1	1.8
All Disabilities	245	15.3	13.9

¹Grades K-12

Overall Expenditures: 2015-16

		Per Pupil	
	Total (\$)	District (\$)	State (\$)
Instructional Staff and Services	13,260,404	8,823	9,663
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	753,874	502	321
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	507,756	338	578
Student Support Services	1,743,002	1,160	1,103
Administration and Support Services	2,119,994	1,411	1,861
Plant Operation and Maintenance	1,859,721	1,237	1,637
Transportation	1,804,838	1,035	877
Costs of Students Tuitioned Out	1,811,598	N/A	N/A
Other	1,385,759	922	201
Total	25,246,946	14,895	16,236
Additiona	al Expenditures		
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	1,329,805	885	1,749

³Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources.

Special Education Expenditures: 2015-16

	Distr	State	
	Total (\$)	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Certified Personnel	2,274,295	34.9	34.6
Noncertified Personnel	653,681	10.0	14.6
Purchased Services	363,688	5.6	5.8
Tuition to Other Schools	1,622,186	24.9	21.8
Special Ed. Transportation	609,231	9.4	8.5
Other Expenditures	985,702	15.1	14.7
Total Expenditures	6,508,783	100.0	100.0

Expenditures by Revenue Source:4 2015-16

	Percent of Total (%)				
	Including Excluding				
	School	School			
	Construction	Construction			
Local	51.2	53.0			
State	46.1	44.4			
Federal	2.4	2.3			
Tuition & Other	0.3	0.3			

⁴Revenue 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 Correction).

Performance and Accountability

District Performance Index (DPI)

A District Performance Index (DPI) is the average performance of students in a subject area (i.e., ELA, Mathematics or Science) on the state summative assessments. The DPI ranges from 0-100. A DPI is reported for all students tested in a district and for students in each individual student group. Connecticut's ultimate target for a DPI is 75.

	English Language Arts(ELA)		Mat	h	Science	
	Count	DPI	Count	DPI	Count	DPI
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	12	*	12	*	6	*
Black or African American	8	*	8	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	58	64.3	58	57.6	25	44.5
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Two or More Races	13	*	13	*	9	*
White	685	66.8	685	64.0	318	53.8
English Learners	11	*	11	*	6	*
Non-English Learners	766	66.3	766	63.4	357	53.2
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	247	61.2	247	57.8	108	49.5
Not Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	530	68.4	530	65.9	255	54.4
Students with Disabilities	114	43.8	114	40.3	52	38.1
Students without Disabilities	663	70.0	663	67.3	311	55.4
High Needs	307	58.0	307	54.7	140	46.4
Non-High Needs	470	71.5	470	69.0	223	57.0
District	777	66.1	777	63.3	363	52.9

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Percent At or Above Proficient¹

	NAEP	NAEP 2013	
READING	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	43%	43%	50%
National Public	35%	33%	36%
MATH	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	41%	36%	32%
National Public	39%	32%	25%

¹NAEP is often called the "Nation's Report Card." It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. This table compares Connecticut's performance to that of national public school students. Performance standards for state assessments and NAEP are set independently. Therefore, one should not expect performance results to be the same across Smarter Balanced and NAEP. Instead, NAEP results are meant to complement other state assessment data. To view student subgroup performance on NAEP, click here.

Physical Fitness Tests: Students Reaching Health Standard²

	Percent of Students by Grade ³ (%)				All Teste	ed Grades
	4	6	8	10	Count	Rate (%)
Sit & Reach	86.5	89.0	83.8	96.2	428	88.8
Curl Up	71.2	94.0	94.6	92.5	428	87.9
Push Up	54.1	84.0	83.8	82.1	428	75.7
Mile Run/PACER	55.9	91.0	88.3	72.6	428	76.6
All Tests - District	38.7	76.0	74.8	68.9	428	64.3
All Tests - State	52.8	51.4	51.4	50.6		51.6

²The Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment (CPFA) is administered to all students in Grades 4, 6, 8 and 10. The health-related fitness scores gathered through the CPFA should be used to educate and motivate children and their families to increase physical activity and develop lifetime fitness habits.

³Only students assessed in all four areas are included in this calculation.

Cohort Graduation: Four-Year¹

	2015-16		
	Cohort Count ²	Rate (%)	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	
English Learners	*	*	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	45	84.4	
Students with Disabilities	21	61.9	
District	106	87.7	
State		87.4	

¹The four-year cohort graduation rate represents the percentage of first-time 9th graders who earn a standard high school diploma within four years.

11th and 12th Graders Meeting Benchmark on at Least One College Readiness Exam⁵

	Participation ⁶	Meeting E	Benchmark
	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	96.4	45	40.2
Male	95.1	49	34.3
Black or African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
White	95.3	88	37.4
English Learners	*	0	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	94.8	8	13.8
Students with Disabilities	75.0	*	*
District	95.7	94	36.9
State	96.1		43.5

³College readiness exams and benchmark scores are as follows:

- SAT® meets benchmark score on SAT, Revised SAT or Connecticut School Day SAT
- ACT® meets benchmark score on 3 of 4 exams (benchmark score varies by subject)
- $\bullet~\mbox{AP}^{\circledast}$ 3 or higher on any one \mbox{AP}^{\circledast} exam
- IB® 4 or higher on any one IB® exam
- Smarter Balanced Level 3 or higher on both ELA and math

⁴Participation Rate equals the number of test-takers in 11th and 12th grade divided by the number of students enrolled in those grades, as a percent. Sources:

SAT® and AP® statistics derived from data provided by the College Board.

Copyright © 2017 The College Board. www.collegeboard.org

ACT® statistics derived from data provided by ACT, Inc.

Copyright © 2017 ACT, Inc. www.act.org

IB® statistics derived from data provided by the International Baccalaureate Organization.

Copyright © International Baccalaureate Organization 2017

College Entrance and Persistence

	Class of 2016	Class of 2015
	Entrance ⁷	Persistence ⁸
	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Female	73.5	81.0
Male	53.1	81.8
Black or African American	53.1	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*
White	65.2	*
English Learners	*	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	48.8	63.6
Students with Disabilities	*	*
District	63.3	81.3
State	72.0	88.5

⁵College entrance refers to the percent of high school graduates from the year who enrolled in college any time during the first year after high school.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse

 $^{^2}$ Cohort count includes all students in the cohort as of the end of the 2015-16 school year.

⁶College persistence refers to the percent of students who enrolled in college the first year after high school and returned for a second year (Freshman to Sophomore persistence).

Next Generation Accountability Results

Connecticut's Next Generation Accountability System is a broad set of 12 indicators that help tell the story of how well a district/school is preparing its students for success in college, careers, and life. It moves beyond test scores and graduation rates to provide a more holistic, multifactor perspective of district and school performance.

Indi	cator	Index/Rate	Target	Points Earned	Max Points	% Points Earned	State Average Index/Rate
ELA Performance Index	All Students	66.1	75	44.1	50	88.2	67.1
ELA Performance index	High Needs Students	58.0	75	38.7	50	77.3	55.9
Math Performance Index	All Students	63.3	75	42.2	50	84.4	62.2
Math Performance muex	High Needs Students	54.7	75	36.4	50	72.9	50.5
Science Performance	All Students	52.9	75	35.3	50	70.6	55.3
Science Performance	High Needs Students	46.4	75	31.0	50	61.9	45.2
ELA Academic Growth	All Students	52.0%	100%	52.0	100	52.0	55.4%
ELA ACAGEMIC GIOWIN	High Needs Students	46.4%	100%	46.4	100	46.4	49.8%
Math Academic Growth	All Students	61.2%	100%	61.2	100	61.2	61.7%
Math Academic Growth	High Needs Students	58.1%	100%	58.1	100	58.1	53.7%
Chronic Absenteeism	All Students	10.2%	<=5%	39.6	50	79.1	9.9%
Chronic Absenteeism	High Needs Students	18.2%	<=5%	23.5	50	47.1	15.8%
Dranauation for CCD	% Taking Courses	87.8%	75%	50.0	50	100.0	70.7%
Preparation for CCR	% Passing Exams	36.9%	75%	24.6	50	49.2	43.5%
On-track to High School G	raduation	88.6%	94%	47.1	50	94.2	87.8%
4-year Graduation All Stud	dents (2016 Cohort)	87.7%	94%	93.3	100	93.3	87.4%
6-year Graduation - High Needs Students (2014		80.0%	94%	85.1	100	85.1	82.0%
Postsecondary Entrance (0	Class of 2016)	63.3%	75%	84.4	100	84.4	72.0%
Physical Fitness (estimated	d part rate) and (fitness	95.5% 64.3%	75%	42.8	50	85.7	92.0% 51.6%
Arts Access		47.4%	60%	39.5	50	78.9	50.5%
Accountability Index				975.2	1350	72.2	

Gap Indicators	Non-High Needs Rate ¹	High Needs Rate	Size of Gap	State Gap Mean +1 Stdev ²	Is Gap an Outlier?2
Achievement Gap Size Outlier?					N
ELA Performance Index Gap	71.5	58.0	13.5	16.7	
Math Performance Index Gap	69.0	54.7	14.3	18.7	
Science Performance Index Gap	57.0	46.4	10.6	16.6	
Graduation Rate Gap	94.0%	80.0%	14.0%	12.0%	Υ

¹ If the Non-High Needs Rate exceeds the ultimate target (75 for Performance Index and 94% for graduation rate), the ultimate target is used for gap calculations.

²If the size of the gap exceeds the state mean gap plus one standard deviation, the gap is an outlier.

Sul	oject/Subgroup	Participation Rate (%) ³	
ELA	All Students	99.1	³ Minimum
ELA	High Needs Students	98.8	participation standard is 95%.
Math	All Students	99.1	
IVIALII	High Needs Students	98.8	
Science	All Students	99.2	
Science	High Needs Students	98.6	

Connecticut's State Identified Measurable Goal for Children with Disabilities (SIMR)

Increase the reading performance of all 3rd grade students with disabilities statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index.

Grade 3 ELA Performance Index for Students with Disabilities:

District: * State: 50.2

Supporting Resources

Two-page FAQ

Detailed Presentation

Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement: comprehensive documentation and supports

Narratives

School District Improvement Plans and Parental Outreach Activities

The 2016-2017 school year saw significant improvements in the district. Our work in 2015-2016 in regards to Readers Workshop, Fundations and GoMath became embedded in the scope and sequence and pacing guides of our work. During the 2015-2016 school year the team identified Fundations as our word study program and all staff were trained and implemented the program from PK-2 during the 2016-2017 school year. Our work on the middle school schedule during the 2015-2016 school year led to a number of positive changes that were implemented during the 2016-2017 school year. Our students received needed support through the SRBI process or through our co-teaching model and our literacy and math specialists were able to provide more students with tier 2 and tier 3 support. The District Data Team that we developed during the 2015-2016 school year met ten times throughout the 2016-2017 school year to analyze data and discuss potential improvements in our instructional system to allow for greater student outcomes. We had two parents and a BOE member as consistent and active participants on our District Data Team. We identified a series of goals, directly connected to the BOE goals, to focus on throughout the year. We identified indicators of success and it was expected that all school improvement teams would develop school improvement plans directly tied to these district goals. One of the major elements studied by the District Data Team was student attendance. Our school social workers and school level attendance teams discussed the actions they were taking to reduce chronic absenteeism at the district data team level. Our focus on this key indicator led to a significant reduction in attendance issues over the course of the 2016-2017 school year. .During the 2016-2017 school year, we took some additional proactive steps to improve our Special Education programs. Our Director of Special Education worked very closely with all special education teachers and related staff to ensure that student goals were written as "Smart" goals and that each goal had a clear evaluation process. Our Apple program provides structured, intensive support for students with intense needs such as autism, intellectual disabilities, multiple disabilities or other health impairments. In several cases, students in the Apple Program are partially mainstreamed so that student's services are personalized and tailored to individual needs. We also take advantage of a co-teaching model at both the high school and middle school that provides appropriate support so that all students engage with a rigorous curriculum. .In terms of communication, each principal continued to send out weekly email blasts to all o parents. A monthly update to all parents in the district was provided by the Superintendent of Schools. These frequent communications in conjunction with long established parent meetings provided significant opportunities for the schools to provide support to parents working at home with their children. Monthly parent meetings with the Superintendent of Schools continued and appropriately attended by parents throughout the school year as well. These meetings and emails provided substantial opportunities for parent feedback on important topics. Additionally, our Facebook page is a favorite of our parents and is constantly updated by my administrative team. .

Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic and Economic Isolation

Plymouth Public Schools engage in many activities designed to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Through intra-district collaborative programs or community based efforts, the students that attend Plymouth schools are nurtured and cared for despite Plymouth being a community of moderate means and with 32% of its students on free and reduced lunch. Embedded in the curriculum for all elementary levels are many opportunities that expose students to our diverse world. For instance, students in grade three, four and five explore various authors of different ethnicity and spend time researching and presenting information on various influential figures of different races and cultures and their contributions to the world. Social Studies, Civics, World Language, and Language Arts teachers at the middle school level introduce students to a variety of cultures and traditions through the utilization of multicultural literature as a component of our students' literacy experience. The 8th grade curriculum contains a unit of study on Prejudice and how it affects Human Rights.

The Leo Club at Terryville High School continues to engage in a significant number of civic opportunities. We send more than 100 students to magnet schools in Waterbury, such as Maloney, Rotella and the Performing Arts Magnet School. Our School-to-Career program is heavily involved in community work; our students also participate in the Day of Caring for the United Way, Youth Government Day, and the Diversity club. Our Kids-in-the-Middle program also works on civic and philanthropic activities, this middle school program partners with the United Way in Bristol, Burlington, and Plainville.

During the school year students travelled to Canada, France, Spain and England in an effort to gain exposure to other cultures. Our students continued to participate in the 4-H robotics program where they engaged with students from Bristol, Litchfield, and other local communities. The Plymouth Public Schools is committed to helping our students develop understandings and greater acceptance for diverse cultures. In order to prepare our students for a global economy and the 21st century experience, we strive to engage our students in as many authentic and real-life opportunities as possible.

Equitable Allocation of Resources among District Schools

The Plymouth Public Schools is committed to allocating resources in an equitable manner. The Board of Education goals drive the district and school improvement plans. These plans drive the budget development process and ensure that student needs are the driving force in the process. Each cost center is required to use a zero-based budgeting process to develop and then defend their budget. The district leadership team reviews data from the schools to identify inequitable funding situations and uses the budget development process to realign resources. The District Data Team was instrumental in identifying budget priorities. Through an analysis of student outcomes, we were able to identify students and schools with additional needs and to identify opportunities to flexibly use our current resources.