

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**Woodbridge School District**

GAETON F. STELLA, Superintendent
Telephone: (203) 387-6631

Location: 4 Meeting House Lane
Woodbridge,
Connecticut

Website: www.woodbridgesd.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	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$49,049
Town Population in 2000: 8,983	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 7.0%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.4%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.5%
Number of Public Schools: 2	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 86.2%

*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 755
5-Year Enrollment Change -16.6%

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	27	3.6	6.4	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	14	1.9	2.2	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	34	4.5	6.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	71	9.4	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	91	91.0	91.3	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*97.1% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	6	0.8
Asian American	79	10.5
Black	19	2.5
Hispanic	31	4.1
White	620	82.1
Total Minority	135	17.9

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 3.8%

Open Choice: 11 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: 9.7% 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 18.

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.

Beecher Road School is the only elementary school in Woodbridge for students in Grades PK-6 and has an enrollment of approximately 760 students. Woodbridge supports and participates in the Open Choice program. Through this program, 11 students are enrolled from New Haven in Grades K through 6. Additionally, Beecher Road School continues to participate with the Wintergreen Inter-district Magnet School. These partnerships allow Beecher Road School students opportunities to have direct contact with students of different racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

Woodbridge has a long-standing tradition of integrating multicultural themes into its curriculum. A Writer's Workshop approach in all K-6 classrooms provides students with the added opportunity to share their personal identities and backgrounds with others through writing. Spanish is taught in Grades K-6 through a proficiency model that promotes language acquisition and cross-cultural understandings.

Responsive Classroom initiatives promote a more respectful and tolerant school culture---one that supports inter-cultural communication, tolerance of others and an appreciation of all forms of diversity. Using the internet as a vehicle of communication, students are involved in a number of instructional activities intended to broaden their perspective about world societies and multiculturalism.

During the 2008/09 school year, sixth grade classes engaged in an international project with students in Hong Kong. Grade six students participated in Global Knowledge Communities, a project designed to help students knowledge build with students in other countries, utilizing skills accumulated across the curriculum including scientific inquiry and writing in content areas, and using technological tools for gathering and analyzing data, and effective presentation. The project helps to broaden student's global perspective by incorporating the following components: (1) multi-cultural understanding; (2) writing for cross-cultural understanding; and, (3) and the use of the Arts to promote multi-cultural understanding. In the 2008/09 school year, sister-school relationships were established with two elementary schools in the Shandong Province of China. A staff exchange occurred and digital forms of communication have been established with both staff and students. These new relationships provide future opportunities for inter-cultural communication.

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	71.4	54.6	71.7
Writing	80.6	62.5	82.4
Mathematics	80.6	62.8	79.2
Grade 4 Reading	85.5	60.7	95.1
Writing	89.7	64.2	99.4
Mathematics	82.6	63.6	82.3
Grade 5 Reading	86.6	66.0	90.7
Writing	84.2	66.5	87.0
Mathematics	87.5	68.8	88.3
Science	78.3	58.1	75.3
Grade 6 Reading	92.6	68.9	93.3
Writing	88.1	62.2	95.7
Mathematics	94.3	68.8	96.3
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

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	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

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
	38.6	36.2	52.6

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		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, Class of 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007-08 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 District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	57.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	15.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	10.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	12.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	2.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	2.50
School Nurses	3.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	29.70

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	15.3	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	94.1	83.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.6	18.4	18.3
Grade 2	17.0	19.4	19.3
Grade 5	20.2	22.0	21.0
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	996	991	988
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*	2.7	3.4	3.3
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, 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	Elementary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$7,348	\$9,349	\$7,411	\$7,233	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$345	\$439	\$332	\$245	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$76	\$97	\$232	\$461	\$446
Student Support Services	\$139	\$177	\$796	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$1,540	\$1,959	\$1,508	\$1,342	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,162	\$1,479	\$1,249	\$1,386	\$1,377
Transportation	\$526	\$311	\$610	\$575	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$529	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$26	\$33	\$87	\$164	\$151
Total*	\$11,692	\$14,615	\$12,897	\$12,531	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$727	\$925	\$1,185	\$1,180	\$1,759

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$22,853; Tuition Costs, \$11,386.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$14,142.

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$2,502,331	21.4	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	92.7	5.4	1.8	0.1
Excluding School Construction	93.1	4.8	2.0	0.1

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 Woodbridge School District is committed to the equitable allocation of resources and has one educational facility. Beecher Road School, which is divided into a Primary House, Grades PK to 2, including a Multi-Age program, and an Intermediate House, Grades 3-6. The Board of Education built its annual budget in the following manner. An educational mission was developed, based on a carefully crafted, board approved Strategic Plan. Using a zero based approach, a budget was then created to support that educational mission. As part of the process of building the budget, Principals and the Special Services Director worked with their teams to develop budget requests that supported defined educational objectives. The Superintendent and the Business Manager review their proposals to ensure that budget requests: (a) met district goals; (b) served to further the district's strategic plan; (c) supported continuous improvement; (d) aligned with enrollment projections and class size guidelines; and, (e) assured equity in resource allocation. The Board of Education reviewed the Superintendent's proposed budget at the sub-committee and full board levels. Parents and community members had an opportunity to comment on the budget proposal during public comments at BOE meetings, and/or at special district or building based informational meetings. In December, the BOE approved a budget and forwarded it to the Town of Woodbridge for January submission and review. A formal, televised presentation of the budget was made to the Boards of Selectmen and Finance in February. The Boards of Finance and Selectmen approved the final general and capital budgets in May.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	72
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.7%

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	7	0.9	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	21	2.8	3.5	3.9
Intellectual Disability	0	0.0	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	2	0.3	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	24	3.2	2.1	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	13	1.7	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	5	0.7	0.7	0.9
Total	72	9.7	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	N/A	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	50.0	30.2	84.2	65.7
	Writing	33.3	19.5	85.3	64.1
	Mathematics	54.5	30.7	86.7	65.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	78.3	59.4
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	12.2
	% With Accommodations	87.8
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		6.5

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	1.4
Private Schools or Other Settings	5	6.9

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	49	68.1	75.9	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	21	29.2	17.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	2	2.8	6.9	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

A major initiative was launched to update curriculum in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics and science. Likewise, work continued on developing a cohesive set of assessments in the core curriculum areas, grades K-6. As an example, the DRA was administered as a diagnostic tool to determine the literacy levels of every child and to inform instruction. Likewise, writing prompts were given in Grades K-6 to provide information about strengths and needs of students and to inform instruction. The use of teacher made assessments also have played an important part in the development of a school wide assessment design. The implementation of curriculum based on new state standards, the administration of a cohesive assessment design in grades K-6 and the development of professional learning teams for teachers have resulted in improved student achievement.

Major efforts have been made to strengthen literacy skills of students. As an example, in order to help develop a generation of life time writers and learners, Writer's Workshop has been implemented on grade levels, K-6. Reader's Workshop was introduced in the 2008/09 school year.

Beecher Road School continues to focus on improving student performance on the Connecticut Mastery Test. Teachers and administrators analyze areas of strength and weakness on the Connecticut Mastery Test at each grade level and develop an annual action plan to improve student performance. In the 2008/09 school year, students showed many indicators of success. The sixth grade scored among the highest districts in the State. The most important indicator of success was that every grade level of students that took the CMT demonstrated improvement over time in the core areas of Mathematics, Reading and Writing. A formal presentation of CMT results is given to the School Board and Community in September of each year. The district's CMT improvement plan is presented to the School Board and Community in October of each year. Both presentations can be found on the district's web site.

The cohort of special education students at Beecher Road School did make AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) on the annual CMT tests. This area continues to be addressed in a child centered, developmentally appropriate action plan. A software system has been implemented to manage the creation and modification of Individualized Education Programs for students with disabilities. The result is a more consistent and cohesive approach to the development of IEPs.

Throughout the year, teachers, working in professional learning teams, focused on 4 main questions: (1) what do we want students to learn; (2) how do we know they are learning; (3) what do we do if a student is not learning; (4) how do we work with students if are ready to advance to another level. Added objectives included the use of assessments to inform instruction and the alignment of professional development with student needs as determined by data analysis. The emphasis was on promoting differentiated instruction and accelerated learning opportunities.

During the past several years, the School focused on continuous improvement of the language arts program. In support of delivery of the curriculum, initiatives included: Implementation of balanced literacy programs including the Writer's and Reader's Workshops.

Based on the belief that parent understanding of curriculum improves the home-school partnership, the district has developed a Parent's Guide to the Curriculum that has been distributed to parents, community members, administrators, teachers, and staff members.
