

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

SALVATORE PASCARELLA, Superintendent

Location: 63 Beaver Brook Road

Telephone: (203) 797-4701

Danbury,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.danbury.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.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Fairfield

Town Population in 2000: 74,848

1990-2000 Population Growth: 14.1%

Number of Public Schools: 17

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$24,500

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 23.2%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 11.6%

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

*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): H 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 10,488
5-Year Enrollment Change 8.0%

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	5,199	49.6	53.8	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	1,946	18.8	12.5	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	350	3.3	4.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	1,113	10.6	11.3	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	649	74.2	75.4	79.8
Homeless	21	0.2	0.3	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	221	16.3	15.9	13.0

*51.4 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	10	0.1
Asian American	800	7.6
Black	934	8.9
Hispanic	3,960	37.8
Pacific Islander	3	0.0
White	4,632	44.2
Two or more races	149	1.4
Total Minority	5,856	55.8

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 11.2%

Non-English Home Language:

39.6% 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 50.

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.

Danbury Public Schools is perhaps one of the best racial, ethnic and economically balanced districts in the state. The community celebrates its diversity and works hard to ensure its schools are meeting the needs of all students. We have an ESL Reception Center that welcome our non-English speaking students and helps their parents adjust to our schools' culture. We also work closely with community groups such as the Hispanic Center, the Hord Foundation, the Latino Scholarship Fund, the Danbury School and Business Collaborative, Danbury Children First and other groups to assist parents and students in mastering the transition to Danbury Public Schools. The Academy of International Studies Magnet School opened in 2006. This K-5 school serves students from the Greater Danbury Area. It mirrors the diversity of Danbury Public Schools. The theme of the school incorporates learning the Spanish language and while also maintaining an international focus. In addition, our school works closely with the surrounding communities on a host of student exchange programs. The District continues to work at improving its percentage of minority employees. Focus has been given to participating in state-based career job fairs as a potential source of minority teaching candidates. We have had significant success in our efforts to diversify our workforce.

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 www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Grade 3 Reading	46.3	59.2	13.1	
Writing	53.6	62.7	18.8	
Mathematics	63.5	66.5	27.5	
Grade 4 Reading	60.9	64.1	25.6	
Writing	57.4	65.3	15.6	
Mathematics	67.8	68.0	30.6	
Grade 5 Reading	59.1	67.6	18.7	
Writing	60.2	68.1	23.8	
Mathematics	71.9	71.6	31.0	
Science	50.8	63.9	13.1	
Grade 6 Reading	67.5	74.1	22.9	
Writing	55.0	67.4	16.3	
Mathematics	64.6	69.3	24.1	
Grade 7 Reading	73.9	79.8	21.4	
Writing	54.7	65.6	13.7	
Mathematics	56.6	68.1	17.5	
Grade 8 Reading	73.1	76.8	23.3	
Writing	66.4	68.3	30.6	
Mathematics	55.8	67.2	20.1	
Science	52.2	61.9	20.0	

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 www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Reading Across the Disciplines	30.9	47.5	17.3	
Writing Across the Disciplines	48.3	63.0	18.7	
Mathematics	29.2	49.2	17.3	
Science	26.9	47.1	15.7	

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		73.3	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	475	505	22.1
	Critical Reading	479	502	22.9
	Writing	489	506	27.5

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	77.2	82.7	18.8
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.4	2.6	15.2

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	76.8	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	6.9	9.7

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	586.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	50.20
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	90.60
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	207.80
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	29.60
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	38.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	22.70
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	49.60
School Nurses	20.60
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	342.85

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	12.0	13.7	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	79.6	80.9	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.4	19.6	18.5
Grade 2	19.9	20.1	19.7
Grade 5	22.9	21.9	21.6
Grade 7	22.3	20.0	20.3
High School	24.6	21.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	966	973	993
Middle School	982	992	1,024
High School	998	1,007	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*	3.7	3.6	2.8
Middle School	3.0	3.0	2.2
High School	6.0	2.7	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	\$85,004	\$8,218	\$8,464	\$8,722	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$3,447	\$333	\$267	\$237	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$3,661	\$354	\$487	\$428	\$482
Student Support Services	\$6,629	\$641	\$901	\$879	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$10,597	\$1,024	\$1,468	\$1,509	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$9,038	\$874	\$1,471	\$1,393	\$1,463
Transportation	\$6,829	\$588	\$735	\$641	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,900	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$855	\$83	\$165	\$93	\$165
Total	\$128,960	\$12,095	\$14,238	\$13,972	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,405	\$329	\$1,290	\$1,004	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$24,116,997	18.7	21.3	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	70.0	21.0	8.4	0.6
Excluding School Construction	69.7	21.1	8.6	0.6

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 Board of Education ensures that each school within the school district receives a base level of support for personnel and instructional supplies. Student enrollment and class size determine the level of funding for personnel. Support levels for instructional supplies are also based on a per pupil allocation. The Central Office then determines what additional personnel and instructional supplies are required for schools with specific programs and needs in addition to the base level funding. Additional allocations are budgeted for these adjustments. The criteria for determining budgets are the student enrollment and program needs. Budgets for the maintenance of our facilities and the purchase of equipment are evaluated at Central Office. The District, being a Priority School District, also receives a significant amount of funding for a specifically targeted population and program. These funds and other funds are allocated in keeping with the goals and objectives of the grant.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	1,086
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	101	1.0	1.0	1.2
Learning Disability	447	4.4	3.9	3.9
Intellectual Disability	41	0.4	0.5	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	61	0.6	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	155	1.5	2.1	2.1
Other Health Impairment*	170	1.7	2.0	2.2
Other Disabilities**	111	1.1	1.2	1.0
Total	1,086	10.6	11.6	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	57.9	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	3.5	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	34.7	36.0	62.7	70.4
	Writing	15.6	21.5	57.7	66.3
	Mathematics	33.1	31.8	63.6	68.4
	Science	13.2	23.0	51.5	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	6.5	14.5	30.9	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	3.6	18.2	48.3	63.0
	Mathematics	4.8	15.4	29.2	49.2
	Science	7.0	13.6	26.9	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	35.8
	% With Accommodations	64.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	40.3
	% With Accommodations	59.7
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		11.1

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	55	5.1

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	790	72.7	70.0	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	210	19.3	14.9	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	86	7.9	15.1	11.7

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The District continues to implement its District Enhancement Plan with very good results. Notable gains have been achieved; however, the achievement gap continues remains our major area of focus. This past year, our district demonstrated exceptional growth in all grades tested and in all areas tested. We believe that this growth is directly attributable to our efforts to unify all instructional leadership efforts within the district. The significant effort that has been made to address the issue of student participation rates for the CAPT assessment is achieving its intended purpose. We are now consistently meeting the participation rate. While student performance in reading, writing, mathematics and science reflects mixed results, we believe that the recent addition of a new principal, the implementation of the position of Associate Principal for Instruction and the introduction of Department Heads will lead to greater academic gains and more continuity of effort. Truancy prevention and intervention strategies within DPS has included many components. To address truancy, the SRBI process is well underway in all schools, monitoring attendance of all students and providing immediate interventions when attendance becomes an issue. Pupil personnel staff, including social workers, school psychologists and school counselors are often the front line staff to address these needs. Parents are contacted on a regular basis when students are not in attendance. Meetings are held to determine the root cause of attendance issues. Incentive programs are present in all schools rewarding students for excellent and perfect attendance. In addition, a continued collaboration with community resources and agencies have assisted school personnel in addressing truancy issues. Enlisting bilingual staff to help reduce the communication barrier have also been integrated into all schools. A continual reaching out to parents is a common practice in all schools. Special initiatives have helped to promote communication and engage parents in their child's education. Family University offered in the spring was an attempt to reach parents in a variety of different ways through a series of workshops. The incorporation of school-wide positive behavioral supports is also a strategy that will help to improve attendance and reduce truancy behaviors. Most recently, the exploration of utilizing a juvenile review board in middle schools and high school could serve as an excellent intervention to address the needs of truant students and keep them out of the juvenile justice system. This initiative will involve the collaboration of community agencies, school personnel, police and courts for students that experience habitual truant behaviors. The use of our alternative programs within our district often help to engage students more through smaller classes, more individualized attention and a more personalized learning approach. Identifying at risk students at an earlier age has proven to be an effective approach in changing truant behavior.
