

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2012-13**Orange School District**

Lynn K. McMullin, Superintendent

Location: 637 Orange Center Road

Telephone: (203) 891-8020

Orange,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.oess.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: New Haven

Town Population in 2000: 13,233

1990-2000 Population Growth: 3.1%

Number of Public Schools: 4

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$36,471

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: N/A

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.3%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 97.5%

*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): 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, 2012 1,243
 5-Year Enrollment Change -9.3%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range PK - 6

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	54	4.3	9.9	36.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	22	1.8	2.0	5.8
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	50	4.0	7.1	3.8
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	114	9.2	10.2	11.9
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	145	94.2	91.6	79.3
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*100.0 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	3	0.2
Asian American	135	10.9
Black	26	2.1
Hispanic	52	4.2
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	1,010	81.3
Two or more races	17	1.4
Total Minority	233	18.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.6%

Open Choice:

12 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:

6.0% 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 20.

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.

The Board of Education continued to welcome Project Choice students in 2013-2014. Through classroom and school reach-out efforts, our principals and teachers continue to demonstrate their commitment to the program. We accepted one additional student for the 2013/2014 school year. The Orange Board of Education has seen a burgeoning ESL program. In 2011-2012, we serviced only 18 ELL students. Through an increase in enrollments from April – August of 2012, we enrolled 25 additional ELL students (18 in kindergarten) who are living in homes where English is not the primary language. This year we exited several students, but continued to grow to 42 students (34 current and 8 kindergarteners in process). We have 26 different languages, including both Chinese dialects, Urdu, Arabic, Korean, Hebrew, Polish, Ukrainian, and others. Our efforts in this area have increased considerably. We have hired a full-time ESL teacher to service the 48 students; we also specially trained 4 paraprofessionals, one per school for a ½ day of servicing. We purchased a new curriculum and an Internet-based program, called Mango. We are planning multiple evening events for our ESL families with the wider school community to increase relationships with these newest members of our school community. Orange continues to provide all students in Grades 1-6 with Spanish instruction. In addition to acquiring oral communication skills, the program enables students to view the Spanish culture through study of its art, music, customs, and traditions. Students also heighten their awareness of the greater world community through various cultural arts programs sponsored by our PTO's. We continue to make efforts to attract and recruit some minority candidates for teaching and administrative assignments, last year adding a Hispanic Spanish teacher to our staff.

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	75.4	56.9	78.8	
Writing	74.2	60.0	70.2	
Mathematics	82.0	61.4	83.2	
Grade 4 Reading	81.1	62.6	82.3	
Writing	81.4	63.0	82.3	
Mathematics	81.9	65.1	77.2	
Grade 5 Reading	82.3	66.9	75.8	
Writing	87.2	65.6	93.8	
Mathematics	86.8	69.2	76.4	
Science	73.9	62.3	52.2	
Grade 6 Reading	96.8	73.3	97.6	
Writing	91.5	65.1	98.2	
Mathematics	93.5	67	97.0	
Grade 7 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Grade 8 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	

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	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	

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
	58.1	51.1	64.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2012		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 2012	N/A	N/A	N/A
2011-12 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	87.73
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	12.14
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	11.84
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	33.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	3.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	2.49
School Level	3.51
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.14
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	4.54
School Nurses	4.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	68.48

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	14.0	14.5	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	78.4	87.3	79.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.4	17.8	18.9
Grade 2	16.6	19.2	19.8
Grade 5	18.6	21.4	21.3
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	722	973	999
Middle School	N/A	N/A	N/A
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*	2.5	2.6	2.7
Middle School	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2011-12

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	\$11,491	\$9,048	\$8,481	\$8,425	\$8,570
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$310	\$244	\$334	\$260	\$257
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$603	\$475	\$424	\$553	\$471
Student Support Services	\$1,558	\$1,227	\$998	\$1,002	\$950
Administration and Support Services	\$1,687	\$1,328	\$1,742	\$1,470	\$1,547
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,465	\$1,153	\$1,277	\$1,432	\$1,459
Transportation	\$1,042	\$418	\$731	\$687	\$765
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$576	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$106	\$175	\$170
Total*	\$18,732	\$14,600	\$14,878	\$14,369	\$14,333
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$577	\$454	\$1,117	\$1,015	\$1,398

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$37,793 Tuition Costs, \$18,929.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$15,111.

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$4,801,240	25.6	20.9	21.8

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	92.6	5.4	1.9	0.0
Excluding School Construction	92.4	5.6	2.0	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.

Through a restructuring of the Central Office and an increased collaboration among our district-level Leadership Team, we are better able to ensure equitable, high-quality programming across the district. We are working with staff to standardize the curriculum and our in-house assessments, data analysis, and interventions. Three district-wide goals were established to further emphasize fidelity to district programs. We brought in two additional Internet-based SRBI tools as both universal screening tools and intervention tools; one for math and one for reading. These products continue our commitment to a planned 'suite of interventions' that will ensure equitable access to support services across the district. All paras were trained in late August as reading and math interventionists, and work with children accordingly. Some Special Education teachers were reassigned for more meaningful and equitable servicing of students. Our administrators meet twice monthly to ensure policy, services, resources, curriculum, etc. are implemented district-wide. Our three math consultants and three LA consultants meet regularly to ensure curriculum across the district. All schools have equal access to Lexia, Dreambox, STAR, and SMI. Our new TEVAL Plan, through the goal-setting process, further defined equitable instruction, in that all teachers must use STAR and the Math curriculum benchmarks in their goal-setting. This year each school is receiving identical embedded professional development in the new LA Common Core. This year all students have access to netbooks and iPads, including kindergarteners.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	112
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.1%

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	13	1.1	1.4	1.3
Learning Disability	41	3.3	3.2	4.0
Intellectual Disability	1	0.1	0.3	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Speech Impairment	36	2.9	1.7	2.0
Other Health Impairment*	19	1.5	2.4	2.4
Other Disabilities**	2	0.2	0.7	1.0
Total	112	9.1	10.3	12.1

*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 2011-12 with a Standard Diploma	N/A	N/A
2011-12 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.2

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	41.2	34.5	84.0	69.2
	Writing	34.8	19.9	83.6	64.4
	Mathematics	45.5	29.0	86.1	65.5
	Science	39.1	21.3	73.9	61.3
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	25.6
	% With Accommodations	74.4
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		15.9

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	7	6.3

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	75	67.0	75.7	72.0
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	33	29.5	16.4	16.4
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	4	3.6	7.9	11.6

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Board of Education continues to be vigilant in its commitment to continuous improvement and is focused on the achievement of all students. This year, 2013-2014, is the first year of our Board of Ed approved long-range Strategic Plan, called "Together We Can." A large group of school and community volunteers worked all last year to write the plan which was BOE approved in Spring 2013. The new Plan has been well-publicized and is available on-line. Each principal is using the plan's goal-setting model to present his/her goals for the school year: one (1) goal – three (3) reasons – five (5) action steps. The first building-level presentation took place in October with Peck Place School. The Board of Education successfully bonded for \$8.1 million in significant improvements, including three new roofs, two new boilers, one parking lot improvement, and school security improvements for all four schools, in the wake of Sandy Hook. The security plan is being implemented in two phases, and phase 1 is complete. It includes hiring security monitors, locking all doors and using ID badges for entry of staff at front and at recess doors, and the installation of a panic button system. Phase 2 will include interior doors locks, Shatterguard on glass, video surveillance, and the installation of sally-port entrances. Three additional district-wide goals are representative of concentrated efforts to improve and standardize instruction. The first is the implementation of new LA Common Core instructional model, Grades K – 6. To further support this implementation, the district has hired Nancy Boyles to lead embedded, classroom workshop PD at each school. Second, we wrote and are fully implementing a new EVAL Plan for both teachers and principals. To accomplish this, we negotiated with the Orange Teachers League for four meetings per month, which are used for school-level professional development. However, the principals meet regularly to plan that PD together. Our third goal is the implementation of PBIS. Two buildings were trained last year and are fully implementing this year, 2013-2014. Our third school is training this year and fully implementing next year in 2014-2015. The District has also implemented PowerSchool this year, and has purchased additional netbooks and iPads in carts for student use. Changes in technology since January of 2013 include: 1.the implementation of PowerSchool; 2. A new fiber-optic Internet connection; 3.changing our email service over to the cloud; 4. implementing the ID badge system; and 5. using School Gate Guardian software for visitor recognition at the door. Orange continues to be data-team driven. Our efforts to improve SRBI and our tiered interventions have already begun to blur the lines between Special Education and regular education in that our paraprofessionals can service all students with the same need in the same group. Through Internet-based programs such as Lexia, interventionists can use the reporting features to identify, for example, all the students needing additional instruction in short vowel sounds and work with them in one grade-level group. Our new math curriculum is differentiated, (One of the reasons we selected it), thereby increasing teachers' knowledge of and experience with implementing classroom differentiation. The District has formed two, long-standing district-wide committees to work on key improvement plans for next year: a Healthy Lifestyles Committee and a Homework Committee. Both committees are represented by teachers from all four schools, Administrators, and Community members. The Board's Policy Committee revised and reviewed the 1000, 2000, 3000, 7000, and 9000 series of policies and those policies are available in an on-line manual through CAFE's service. This year the plan is to review the 4000, 5000, and 6000 policies. Orange continues to quickly identify attendance issues and to personally work with families on a case-by-case basis to improve attendance. When necessary, we have sought the support of outside services, such as the Department of Children and Families. We are also undertaking a new enrollment projection study.
