

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11****Common Ground High School District**

LIZANNE M. COX, Director

Location: 358 Springside Avenue  
New Haven,  
Connecticut

Telephone:

Website: [www.commongroundct.org](http://www.commongroundct.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](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

---

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: New Haven  
 Town Population in 2000: N/A  
 1990-2000 Population Growth: N/A  
 Number of Public Schools: 1

Per Capita Income in 2000: N/A  
 Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: N/A  
 Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: N/A  
 District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: N/A

---

\*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

---



---

District Reference Group (DRG): N/A

---

**STUDENT ENROLLMENT**

Enrollment on October 1, 2010      163  
 5-Year Enrollment Change      20.7%

**DISTRICT GRADE RANGE**

Grade Range      9 - 12

---

**INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED**

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	86	52.8	N/A	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	6	3.7	N/A	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	3	1.8	N/A	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	20	12.3	N/A	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Homeless	1	0.6	N/A	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	3	4.5	N/A	13.2

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

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	0	0.0
Asian American	1	0.6
Black	55	33.7
Hispanic	72	44.2
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	27	16.6
Two or more races	8	4.9
Total Minority	136	83.4

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 5.3%

**Non-English Home Language:**

9.2% 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 4.

---

### 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.

As a charter school, COMMON GROUND works to be part of the solution to racial, ethnic, and economic isolation in Connecticut. Given the interdistrict nature of our program, students interact with peers coming from a variety of circumstances (approximately 30% of our students live out-of-district). Our students are provided with meaningful experiences with diverse populations through venues such as Green Jobs Corps, our youth employment program, environmental community programs sponsored by our parent organization, The New Haven Ecology Project Inc, and a multitude of community-based youth programs, such as Evolutions at the Peabody Museum, the CT Envirothon, and Elm Shakespeare. Our students also encounter diversity through university and college-based partnerships, junior job shadows, and senior projects, which require off-site interviews and service. Internally, the school program encourages these connections and fosters close and positive interaction among students of all backgrounds. The lack of state funds to provide transportation to students outside of the city remains a significant obstacle in our quest for a more diverse student body. We are hopeful, however, that a \$150,000 technology grant and a \$1.5 billion state facilities grant, both recently received, will enhance our diversification efforts. We have also continued to expand partnerships with Yale, SCSU, and UNH.

---

## 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 <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Grade 3 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Grade 4 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Grade 5 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	
Grade 6 Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	
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 <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Reading Across the Disciplines	40.5	44.7	37.9	
Writing Across the Disciplines	36.8	61.2	11.3	
Mathematics	21.6	49.5	14.3	
Science	18.4	47.0	10.5	

**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
	0.0	N/A	N/A

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		50.0	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	397	510	3.8
	Critical Reading	402	505	4.6
	Writing	396	510	3.1

**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 2010	85.3	81.8	34.4
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.6	2.8	61.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	70.0	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	23.3	9.1

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	13.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	3.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	1.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	0.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	0.00
School Level	1.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	0.50
School Nurses	0.20
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	9.50

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	8.0	N/A	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	58.8	N/A	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	21.3	N/A	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Middle School	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	1,033	N/A	1,010

\*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*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Middle School	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	1.1	N/A	2.2

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

### DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2009-10

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	\$1,012	\$6,325	\$8,456	N/A	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$60	\$377	\$275	N/A	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$26	\$162	\$392	N/A	\$463
Student Support Services	\$160	\$1,003	\$792	N/A	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$402	\$2,512	\$1,891	N/A	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$142	\$885	\$1,459	N/A	\$1,410
Transportation	\$9	N/A	\$824	N/A	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$180	\$1,127	\$330	N/A	\$159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,991</b>	<b>\$12,445</b>	<b>\$15,034</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$13,780</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$0	\$0	\$1,847	N/A	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**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	0.6	73.9	20.9	4.7
Excluding School Construction	0.6	73.9	20.9	4.7

---

**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.

Not applicable

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**


---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible N/A

Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities N/A

---

<b>Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities</b>				
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	<b>State Percent</b>
Autism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Learning Disability	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Intellectual Disability	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Emotional Disturbance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Speech Impairment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Health Impairment*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Disabilities**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

\*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

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Who Graduated in 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma	N/A	N/A
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	3.9

## 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing	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
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	40.5	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	36.8	61.2
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	21.6	49.5
	Science	N/A	N/A	18.4	47.0

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com). To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		0.0

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	N/A	N/A
Private Schools or Other Settings	N/A	N/A

### 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

During its thirteenth year, Common Ground continued to revise and enhance its program. Receipt of a major competitive grant from the State of Connecticut for technology integration and facilities development afforded almost one-to-one computer correspondence for students and helped Common Ground to procure BrainHoney, a learning management system, Epson “Smart” projectors for every classroom, and several other computer applications to support teaching and learning. While maintaining the focus on the school’s environmental mission and curricular standards alignment, teachers also developed expertise in technological applications to foster 21st century learning. Teacher exchanges, made possible through the Fulbright program, and enhanced technology fostered global collaborations with students in France, Hungary and Japan. School Improvement goals for 2010-2011 included improvement at the goal level on summative assessments and further development of a school-wide environmental leadership initiative. Efforts to increase student achievement were multi-pronged. Math, ELA, and Content Area data team all met twice monthly to analyze data and strategize on numeracy and literacy skill development. Benchmark assessment data provided the school-wide leadership team with information needed to adjust instruction. Common Ground continued to utilize the Reader/Writer workshop model developed at Columbia University, including a second-year course in advanced reading strategies to support reading comprehension. Core literacy and numeracy skills programs for students with special needs or skill deficiencies were provided through classes or after school academic enrichment. The mathematics curriculum emphasized deeper conceptual focus to build understanding through applying skills to solving challenging real-world problems. And finally weekly writing assignments, assessed with a school-wide writing rubric, were required in all classes, including math classes. These efforts resulted in a goal-level increases in reading and writing mastery tests and proficiency increases in math and science. An Environmental Leadership Committee implemented a 3-year Environmental Leadership strategic plan. Key components of that plan include the revamping of the Environmental Honors program, the creation of Environmental Leadership standards and the inclusion of Environmental Leadership opportunities in all classes and extracurricular offerings. Parents were involved in school improvement planning in two formats: a parent team met twice per trimester and informed a parent representative to the board of directors, and parent workshops yielded parent input on school improvement, parent needs, and communication.

---