

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**Berlin School District**

MICHAEL T. CICHETTI, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 828-6581

Location: 238 Kensington Road
Berlin,
Connecticut

Website: www.berlinschools.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	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,744
Town Population in 2000: 18,215	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 13.0%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 8.5%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 2%
Number of Public Schools: 5	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 92.5%

*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): D 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, 2007	3,267
5-Year Enrollment Change	-0.1%

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	201	6.2	10.5	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	76	2.4	2.4	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	1	0.0	4.5	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	416	12.7	10.9	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	171	89.5	84.1	79.2
Homeless	2	0.1	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	125	21.7	22.2	20.2

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	8	0.2
Asian American	124	3.8
Black	37	1.1
Hispanic	83	2.5
White	3,015	92.3
Total Minority	252	7.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.4%

Open Choice: 19 students 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: 7.5% 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 27.

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 Berlin Public Schools provide a variety of programs and experiences that are designed to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. We are encouraged with the response to these efforts from students, staff, and members of our community. Our participation in the Open CHOICE Program has been expanded to all of our elementary schools and to McGee Middle School. We will welcome up to ten additional students for the 2008-09 school year. This initiative is perhaps the most significant accomplishment for our community as it signals a sincere commitment to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. The Board of Education recognizes that Berlin is not a highly diverse community and that the greater Berlin community also benefits from participation in CHOICE.

Each of our district's five schools has increased the number of learning activities designed to promote diversity. Curriculum revision increasingly reflects cultural diversity, particularly in the areas of language arts, social studies, and the arts. Fortunately, the district continues to receive grant funding for multiple sister school projects that link Berlin schools with urban schools in the greater Hartford area. The school administration provides periodic updates to the Board of Education, and subsequently to the community, detailing the activities that are conducted as part of the district's efforts to educate its students about understanding differences among people. It is in the best interests of the community-at-large to build upon the efforts of the school district and incorporate similar efforts for adult members of our community.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % 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.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	68.6	52.0	73.0
Writing	80.2	63.4	77.9
Mathematics	72.8	60.0	66.3
Grade 4 Reading	74.5	55.9	80.4
Writing	80.5	62.9	82.4
Mathematics	77.3	60.3	74.8
Grade 5 Reading	75.0	62.2	63.6
Writing	80.6	64.5	74.7
Mathematics	73.9	65.9	52.5
Science	71.1	54.9	63.6
Grade 6 Reading	82.2	66.3	72.0
Writing	86.7	61.9	95.8
Mathematics	79.8	66.4	67.3
Grade 7 Reading	87.1	71.1	77.4
Writing	81.3	62.0	83.2
Mathematics	82.0	63.0	76.8
Grade 8 Reading	76.9	64.8	58.5
Writing	78.0	63.4	65.4
Mathematics	73.2	60.8	54.1
Science	78.4	58.6	76.1

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 scoreable 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	57.1	45.5	59.2
Writing Across the Disciplines	71.0	57.9	63.1
Mathematics	65.1	50.1	64.6
Science	60.1	46.3	59.2

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
	54.0	36.1	92.0

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		92.8	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	516	504	59.2
	Critical Reading	496	502	37.7
	Writing	503	503	45.4

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, Class of 2007	95.1	92.6	39.2
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	4.4	6.2	35.3
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.1	1.7	48.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	89.4	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	3.8	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	196.70
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	23.69
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	34.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	40.59
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	8.01
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	6.00
School Level	12.50
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	6.30
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	16.80
School Nurses	5.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	122.73

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	13.6	14.1	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	79.1	74.9	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.5	17.4	18.1
Grade 2	18.5	19.1	19.3
Grade 5	21.4	20.6	20.9
Grade 7	20.1	21.0	20.5
High School	20.1	20.2	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	996	987	987
Middle School	1,074	1,023	1,017
High School	1,023	1,001	1,006

*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*	3.6	3.7	3.4
Middle School	3.2	3.0	2.7
High School	3.3	3.1	2.7

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2006-07

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	\$19,627	\$5,995	\$7,153	\$6,689	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$967	\$296	\$262	\$257	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,066	\$326	\$443	\$364	\$429
Student Support Services	\$3,108	\$949	\$764	\$705	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$3,971	\$1,213	\$1,256	\$1,201	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$4,572	\$1,396	\$1,329	\$1,202	\$1,322
Transportation	\$1,666	\$489	\$605	\$552	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$885	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$750	\$229	\$147	\$139	\$145
Total	\$36,612	\$11,115	\$12,203	\$11,370	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,195	\$365	\$1,875	\$1,149	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$6,830,218
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	18.7%

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	81.8	16.3	1.8	0.2
Excluding School Construction	82.8	15.2	1.8	0.2

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.

It has been the practice of the Berlin Board of Education and its central office administration that each school in the district should have comparable resources while recognizing factors such as equipment and specialized supply needs at the secondary school are inherently more costly in nature. The proposed budget for our school district is created by our administrators in the late fall. It is built on the assumption that our three elementary schools would receive a fixed amount for each student enrolled in the school. This would “guarantee” an equitable allocation of resources among our schools. Once that assumption was met, adjustments were then made to determine what additional resources would be allocated to particular schools to adequately address needs particular to a certain school. The same process was then used at our two secondary schools. However, a different per student fixed amount was used because of the significantly higher costs as mentioned above.

Once the proposed budget is adopted, appropriate reductions, if necessary, are made “across the board,” and the same per student expenditure ratio described above is maintained as closely as possible.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	403
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.4%

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	22	0.7	0.8	0.7
Learning Disability	117	3.6	3.3	4.0
Intellectual Disability	8	0.2	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	27	0.8	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	116	3.6	2.5	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	94	2.9	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	19	0.6	0.8	0.9
Total	403	12.4	10.9	11.5

*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 2006-07 with a Standard Diploma	85.7	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	2.3	2.8

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	29.7	20.4	77.5	62.1
	Writing	28.3	19.3	81.1	63.0
	Mathematics	30.8	22.6	76.6	62.7
	Science	29.4	22.2	75.0	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	8.3	11.4	57.1	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	18.2	16.3	71.0	57.9
	Mathematics	8.7	14.7	65.1	50.1
	Science	16.7	14.4	60.1	46.3

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	63.5
	% With Accommodations	36.5
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	4.5
	% With Accommodations	95.5
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.0

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	1	0.2
Private Schools or Other Settings	14	3.5

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	288	71.5	73.4	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	86	21.3	16.6	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	29	7.2	10.0	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

District administration and staff present to the Board of Education an annual report on student performance on the Connecticut Mastery Tests (CMT), the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) and the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT). The 2007 CMT results reflected exceptionally high participation rates at 99.9% and strong performance in both math and reading (90% at/above proficient in math and 88% at/above proficient in reading). CAPT participation rate was 98.8%, with 89% of our students scoring at/above proficient in math and 89% at/above proficient in reading.

While pleased with the district's overall performance, the staff recognizes the need to evaluate performance levels of specific subgroups and individual students. Our analysis includes work with individual schools and grade levels within the school. Individual schools have instituted instructional support programs to assist in the analysis of student performance data and to help teachers use data to inform instruction and to coach teachers in instructional strategies and best practices.

In addition to the use of data teams at all levels, there has been increased coordination between our special education and general education teachers. We recognize the specific learning needs that some students have and we are committed to planning and implementing instruction so that all students can meet grade level expectations. Implementation of the Response to Intervention model will support identification of assessment tools and regular monitoring of student performance.

Efforts underway to improve student learning include:

- Alignment of teacher, department, school and district goals using student performance data to identify areas in need of improvement
 - Use of the Continuous Improvement Model to guide all schools in the development of focused data-driven action plans and performance indicators
 - Assessment of all students - special education and general education - using DRA and common formative assessments
 - Additional instructional staff for math and reading support at all levels
 - Regular monitoring of students who receive support services to evaluate instruction and to make adjustments as necessary
 - Implementation of Response to Intervention model with support from consultants and resource teachers
 - Coordinated professional development focusing on instructional strategies and reading in the content area for all levels
 - Vertical teams for both math and language arts comprised of general and special education teachers to ensure consistency and continuity of instruction in grades K-12
-

