STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12

Ansonia School District

CAROL C. MERLONE, Superintendent

Telephone: (203) 736-5095

Location: 42 Grove Street Ansonia, Connecticut

Website: www.ansonia.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: 18,554 1990-2000 Population Growth: 0.8% Number of Public Schools: 4 Per Capita Income in 2000: \$20,504

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 17.9% Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 3.3% District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 89.1%

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

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2011 2,514 5-Year Enrollment Change -7.8% Grade Range PK - 12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	1,519	60.4	53.8	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	77	3.2	12.5	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	273	10.9	11.3	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	123	70.7	75.4	79.8
Homeless	9	0.4	0.3	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	39	13.3	15.9	13.0

^{*}To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity					
Race/Ethnicity Number Percer					
American Indian	19	0.8			
Asian American	16	0.6			
Black	525	20.9			
Hispanic	650	25.9			
Pacific Islander	37	1.5			
White	1,267	50.4			
Two or more races	0	0.0			
Total Minority	1,247	49.6			

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 4.5%

Open Choice:

3 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:

10.5% 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 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 Ansonia Public School District educates a student population that is increasingly diverse. Approximately 56% of students qualify for free and reduced-price lunch. The district has taken significant steps to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. The grade-level structure of our elementary schools is specifically designed to reduce such isolation. Our K-6 elementary schools both serve a representative population of students from across the entire city - rather than being neighborhood-based. Each classroom within these schools receives an enrollment that is reflective of the community's diversity. A significant contribution toward these efforts has been the creation of a Human Relations Club at our high school and middle school. This student-led organization has grown to nearly 100 members between the two buildings. They have sponsored three annual Community Conferences and two Student Conferences. In addition, this group works closely with Ansonia's mayor, who formed a Task Force on Race & Ethnicity. We collaborate with the Boys & Girls Club of the Lower Naugatuck Valley in 2002 when our five-year, 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant was approved. This collaborative provides middle school programming for grades 6-8, including after school tutoring and enrichment/recreational activities three hours each day for the majority of the school year. The district provides literacy and recreational support to the two community-based after school programs in our city. The local Boys and Girls Club partners with us by providing recreational support at the two sites. Many of our K-12 teachers lead programs that bring Ansonia students into other communities and learning experiences, including State Department of Education Inter-district Cooperative Grant Programs and our relationship with Project Opening Doors. We participate in the New Haven Magnet School Program, and 214 of our students attended one of the magnet schools last year.

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 an Area	nd CMT Subject	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal	These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable
Grade 3	Reading	40.3	59.2	8.1	tests who were enrolled in the district at the
	Writing	51.3	62.7	14.4	time of testing,
	Mathematics	49.7	66.5	11.9	regardless of the length
Grade 4	Reading	41.4	64.1	7.5	of time they were enrolled in the district.
	Writing	51.6	65.3	10.6	Results for fewer than
	Mathematics	57.1	68.0	13.8	20 students are not
Grade 5	Reading	61.9	67.6	22.9	presented.
	Writing	71.3	68.1	43.5	
	Mathematics	61.8	71.6	17.3	E 1. I CMT
	Science	47.4	63.9	10.7	For more detailed CMT results, go to
Grade 6	Reading	57.8	74.1	11.4	www.ctreports.
	Writing	65.5	67.4	34.9	
	Mathematics	65.1	69.3	24.7	
Grade 7	Reading	52.9	79.8	3.1	To see the NCLB
	Writing	45.8	65.6	8.7	Report Card for this school, go to
	Mathematics	42.9	68.1	8.1	www.sde.ct.gov and
Grade 8	Reading	61.1	76.8	10.1	click on "No Child Left
	Writing	50.0	68.3	11.3	Behind."
	Mathematics	48.0	67.2	12.6	
	Science	38.5	61.9	11.3	

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
Reading Across the Disciplines	26.8	47.5	14.3
Writing Across the Disciplines	34.7	63.0	7.5
Mathematics	21.6	49.2	12.0
Science	28.8	47.1	16.4

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		% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	38.1	50.6	19.4

SAT® I: Reasonin Class of 2011	g Test	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tes	sted	59.6	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	437	505	9.2
	Critical Reading	455	502	11.5
	Writing	463	506	14.5

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	69.1	82.7	10.5
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)	77.3	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	17.0	9.7

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	142.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	42.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	22.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	47.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	5.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs District Central Office School Level	6.00 8.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	13.60
School Nurses	4.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	94.50

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	9.0	13.7	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	78.7	80.9	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.6	19.6	18.5
Grade 2	20.9	20.1	19.7
Grade 5	22.6	21.9	21.6
Grade 7	19.7	20.0	20.3
High School	19.3	21.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,015	973	993
Middle School	941	992	1,024
High School	1,000	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*	3.5	3.6	2.8
Middle School	2.3	3.0	2.2
High School	2.2	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	\$17,156	\$6,563	\$8,464	\$8,722	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,031	\$395	\$267	\$237	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$742	\$284	\$487	\$428	\$482
Student Support Services	\$1,597	\$611	\$901	\$879	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$3,136	\$1,200	\$1,468	\$1,509	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,808	\$1,074	\$1,471	\$1,393	\$1,463
Transportation	\$1,647	\$562	\$735	\$641	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,654	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$754	\$288	\$165	\$93	\$165
Total	\$31,525	\$10,992	\$14,238	\$13,972	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,044	\$1,164	\$1,290	\$1,004	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$7,385,805	23.4	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	32.4	53.2	13.9	0.5
Excluding School Construction	32.9	51.4	15.2	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.

It is the policy of the Ansonia Board of Education that each school in the district receives comparable resources, taking into account a variety of data related to student achievement, District and School Improvement Plans, financial limitations and differing needs among schools and grade levels. A four-step process is used to ensure equity: First, each building administrator works with her/his staff to assess grade-level curricular needs and develop a proposed annual budget aligned to their School Improvement Plan. Then, each administrator meets with the Superintendent to explain and justify this proposed building budget. Once the Superintendent has all submissions compiled, she applies her own review and adjustment process to balance the distribution of funding among buildings and initiatives checking that all budget requests are aligned to the goals of School and District Improvement Plans. Competing requests are evaluated and prioritized on the basis of which will add the highest value to help the district achieve its student achievement goals. Once finished, the Superintendent's budget is presented to the Board of Education for final approval.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible 298
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities 11.1%

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	35	1.3	1.0	1.2	
Learning Disability	77	2.9	3.9	3.9	
Intellectual Disability	25	0.9	0.5	0.4	
Emotional Disturbance	24	0.9	0.9	1.0	
Speech Impairment	43	1.6	2.1	2.1	
Other Health Impairment*	73	2.7	2.0	2.2	
Other Disabilities**	21	0.8	1.2	1.0	
Total	298	11.1	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	40.9	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	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	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	15.8	36.0	52.8	70.4
	Writing	10.8	21.5	56.3	66.3
	Mathematics	11.0	31.8	54.3	68.4
	Science	5.6	23.0	43.2	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	26.8	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	34.7	63.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	21.6	49.2
	Science	6.2	13.6	28.8	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	CMT % Without Accommodations 37.6				
	% With Accommodations	62.4			
CAPT % Without Accommodations		18.2			
% With Accommodations 81.8					
% Assessed U	16.1				

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	1	0.3		
Private Schools or Other Settings	35	11.7		

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	241	80.9	70.0	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	18	6.0	14.9	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	39	13.1	15.1	11.7

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the district revised its three-year District Improvement Plan to address the 2012-2015 timeframe. The staff was trained in research-based Effective Teaching Strategies, differentiated instruction, Common Core State Standards, and Kim Marshall's rubrics for teacher observation. Workshops were offered to all staff to promote the use of digital technology to enhance teaching and learning. Classroom walkthroughs are conducted daily to monitor the effective implementation of these strategies and principals provide constructive feedback to teachers. Structures and processes for Scientific Research-based Intervention (SRBI) were planned and implemented including: hiring and training intervention teachers, training collaborative intervention teams in each building, scheduling tier 2 and 3 intervention blocks and the implementation of electronic tools such as Lexia and Study Island. Additional AP courses have been introduced at the high school. Enrichment classes are in place at Ansonia Middle School. The district seeks to involve parents and community members in educational initiatives through: participation in the district and school data teams, committees and a variety of activities. Community forums are hosted at each building to elicit support for school district initiatives and to address questions regarding student progress, district improvement plans and budgetary needs.