STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09

Monroe School District

Telephone: (203) 452-2862

Location: 375 Monroe Turnpike
Monroe,
Connecticut

Website: www.monroeps.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: Fairfield

Per Capita Income in 2000: $34,161

Town Population in 2000: 19,247

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.3%

1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.9%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.4%

Number of Public Schools: 6

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 92.4%

*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, 2008   4,045

5-Year Enrollment Change   -6.1%

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	210	5.2	6.4	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	20	0.5	2.2	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	136	3.4	6.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	404	10.0	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	207	82.5	91.3	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	112	21.1	14.2	19.0

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	**Number**	**Percent**
American Indian	11	0.3
Asian American	131	3.2
Black	87	2.2
Hispanic	157	3.9
White	3,659	90.5
Total Minority	386	9.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 0.9%

Open Choice: 8 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: 2.4% 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 25.

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 district supports school-based efforts that include differentiated curricula to present diverse cultural perspectives involving a variety of topics and concepts. Schools provide opportunities for students to engage in community service projects and special programs, including exchanges with students from regional school districts. Interdistrict grants also provide opportunities for students to work beside students from other districts in various disciplines, including the visual and performing arts. The district also supports opportunities for students to participate in magnet school programs.

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	74.7	54.6	86.2
Writing	87.1	62.5	96.9
Mathematics	87.3	62.8	95.6
Grade 4 Reading	89.2	60.7	98.8
Writing	88.8	64.2	98.2
Mathematics	92.0	63.6	99.4
Grade 5 Reading	84.8	66.0	83.9
Writing	76.5	66.5	60.5
Mathematics	84.9	68.8	84.0
Science	81.8	58.1	84.6
Grade 6 Reading	86.7	68.9	78.5
Writing	73.6	62.2	60.1
Mathematics	88.1	68.8	76.7
Grade 7 Reading	85.1	74.9	64.3
Writing	72.3	62.9	58.6
Mathematics	82.7	66.0	72.6
Grade 8 Reading	75.4	68.4	49.0
Writing	71.6	66.5	43.2
Mathematics	79.9	64.5	65.2
Science	82.1	60.6	78.1

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.

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	70.8	47.4	83.3
Writing Across the Disciplines	75.2	55.0	77.9
Mathematics	74.6	47.8	88.5
Science	79.1	42.8	99.2

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
	37.2	36.2	49.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		91.0	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	523	507	66.7
	Critical Reading	521	503	64.3
	Writing	523	506	65.9

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 2008	99.2	92.1	92.4
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	0.8	6.6	86.9
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.1	2.5	91.2

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	90.5	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	8.0	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	245.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	21.11
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	37.45
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	64.03
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	14.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	3.50
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.65
School Nurses	7.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	114.71

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	14.1	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	76.9	83.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.9	18.4	18.3
Grade 2	19.4	19.4	19.3
Grade 5	23.5	22.0	21.0
Grade 7	22.7	21.6	20.5
High School	22.3	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	993	991	988
Middle School	1,022	1,018	1,016
High School	980	977	1,007

*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*	3.4	3.4	3.3
Middle School	2.0	2.5	2.6
High School	2.5	2.9	2.4

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

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	$28,729	$6,806	$7,521	$7,233	$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	$572	$136	$267	$245	$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	$1,856	$440	$461	$461	$446
Student Support Services	$3,413	$809	$808	$862	$806
Administration and Support Services	$4,643	$1,100	$1,351	$1,342	$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	$5,563	$1,318	$1,382	$1,386	$1,377
Transportation	$2,373	$551	$649	$575	$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	$971	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	$487	$115	$152	$164	$151
Total	$48,609	$11,373	$12,869	$12,531	$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	$3,761	$891	$1,791	$1,180	$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	$7,818,429	16.1	19.2	20.5

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	80.8	15.0	1.8	2.4
Excluding School Construction	80.5	15.0	1.9	2.6

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 district continues to develop standards-based curricula using a digital approach to curriculum mapping that began in 1999. This dynamic approach provides opportunities for teachers to work collaboratively using a common framework to develop and refine each curriculum. The district also developed a curriculum audit model that uses a diverse team of experts to provide the district with feedback about the assets and challenges facing each audited discipline, and a set of recommendations to address those curricular needs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	385
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.6%

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	25	0.6	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	158	3.9	3.5	3.9
Intellectual Disability	18	0.4	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	13	0.3	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	92	2.3	2.1	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	65	1.6	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	14	0.3	0.7	0.9
Total	385	9.6	10.2	11.6

*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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	91.7	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

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	48.2	30.2	82.6	65.7
	Writing	29.8	19.5	78.0	64.1
	Mathematics	45.5	30.7	85.7	65.7
	Science	45.5	23.8	82.0	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	70.8	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	10.0	13.6	75.2	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	74.6	47.8
	Science	27.3	10.6	79.1	42.8

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	30.6
	% With Accommodations	69.4
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	25.0
	% With Accommodations	75.0
% 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	2	0.5
Private Schools or Other Settings	17	4.4

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	290	75.3	75.9	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	76	19.7	17.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	19	4.9	6.9	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

District and school data teams monitor school and individual student progress in all disciplines. Emphasis is placed on reading, mathematics, writing and science. Benchmarking assessments are blended with standardized test results to assess student growth. Assessments also monitor student growth in their ability to use technology for problem solving and to support various school related projects. The district continues to implement its scientifically research-based intervention (SRBI) plan at all grade levels. SRBI began with reading and is extending to mathematics and behavioral intervention strategies. The district extends student learning and provides intervention activities using technology. School scheduling changes provide additional time for students in need of intervention to improve learning. Teachers also receive information through the district data collection system to help them reflect on their teaching practice. The district is focusing on Dr. Robert Marzano's research to provide feedback to students and teachers at the classroom level, and to provide feedback on highly effective instructional practices using a classroom walk-through model, and to identify and teach key academic vocabulary by discipline at each grade level.