

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

THOMAS N. JAMES, Superintendent
Telephone: (203) 891-8020

Location: 637 Orange Center Road
Orange,
Connecticut

Website: www.oess.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: \$36,471
Town Population in 2000: 13,233	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 7.8%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 3.1%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.3%
Number of Public Schools: 4	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 95.6%

*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 1,316
5-Year Enrollment Change -5.8%

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	38	2.9	6.4	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	6	0.5	2.2	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	54	4.1	6.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	107	8.1	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	162	100.0	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

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	1	0.1
Asian American	147	11.2
Black	37	2.8
Hispanic	44	3.3
White	1,087	82.6
Total Minority	229	17.4

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.5%

Open Choice: 16 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: 3.8% 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 16.

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 Board of Education continues to endorse and embrace the concept of Project Choice. Though classroom and other available space continues to be a concern, we are committed to the program. We have committed to accepting additional students for the 2009/2010 school year. The Orange Board of Education continues to provide all students in grades 1-6 with a comprehensive world language program. The program enables students to view the world through the lenses of our multicultural society. Students, on a regular basis throughout the school year, study the Spanish language, its art, music, customs and traditions, and its rich history. Students also heighten their awareness when some cultural arts programs are presented that incorporate art, music, and culture. We continue to make efforts to attract and recruit minority candidates for open teaching and administrative assignments.

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	70.5	54.6	69.8
Writing	72.9	62.5	61.0
Mathematics	84.5	62.8	88.1
Grade 4 Reading	78.1	60.7	81.0
Writing	76.3	64.2	63.0
Mathematics	85.8	63.6	87.8
Grade 5 Reading	88.8	66.0	93.2
Writing	91.2	66.5	98.8
Mathematics	91.0	68.8	95.1
Science	69.3	58.1	49.4
Grade 6 Reading	88.8	68.9	82.8
Writing	87.7	62.2	94.5
Mathematics	90.4	68.8	87.1
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
	53.1	36.2	89.5

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	95.72
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	16.68
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	13.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	32.55
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	3.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	2.45
School Level	3.51
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	4.49
School Nurses	4.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	69.25

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	13.8	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	91.0	83.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.0	18.4	18.3
Grade 2	16.2	19.4	19.3
Grade 5	16.8	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	964	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*	3.1	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	\$10,687	\$7,789	\$7,411	\$7,233	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$408	\$297	\$332	\$245	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$57	\$42	\$232	\$461	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,215	\$886	\$796	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$1,817	\$1,325	\$1,508	\$1,342	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,592	\$1,161	\$1,249	\$1,386	\$1,377
Transportation	\$861	\$341	\$610	\$575	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$349	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$30	\$22	\$87	\$164	\$151
Total*	\$17,017	\$12,295	\$12,897	\$12,531	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$288	\$210	\$1,185	\$1,180	\$1,759

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$32,801; Tuition Costs, \$15,703.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$12,924.

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$4,001,180	23.5	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	91.8	6.5	1.7	0.0
Excluding School Construction	91.7	6.6	1.7	0.0

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.

Allocation of resources by the district administrative team continues to be a priority. The team focuses their decisions first focusing on the "Strategic Plans" in place at each school, the needs at each building, and the use of an established per pupil allocation procedure. Our talented administrators meet twice monthly to ensure that each program receives the needed resources to ensure high quality programming. We will continue to do our very best to ensure that staff have the resources, time and materials necessary to meet and exceed our standards. The district continues to support the model for allocating resources for instructional materials, equipment, supplies and professional development directly to the buildings for local expenditure decisions. Recognizing that student achievement is directly tied to the teacher to student ratio, the Board of Education continues to maintain its focus on maintaining reasonably low class sizes.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	104
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	8.0%

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	20	1.5	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	35	2.7	3.5	3.9
Intellectual Disability	0	0.0	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	0	0.0	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	31	2.4	2.1	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	11	0.8	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	7	0.5	0.7	0.9
Total	104	8.0	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	42.9	30.2	81.9	65.7
	Writing	30.0	19.5	82.4	64.1
	Mathematics	64.4	30.7	88.0	65.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	69.3	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	7.5
	% With Accommodations	92.5
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.0

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	0	0.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	8	7.7

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	64	61.5	75.9	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	34	32.7	17.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	6	5.8	6.9	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Board of Education continues to be vigilant in its commitment to continuous improvement and is focused on the achievement of all students. Efforts in the 2008/2009 school year focused on the continued implementation of a Professional Learning Community model. Specifically, administrators and teachers applied Marzano's learning theory to the analysis of student work. The result was the effective use of data to drive and modify instruction to best meet the needs of students. The teachers and administrators have attended several professional development sessions to gain knowledge in this area and have received skilled coaching in the classroom several times each year from trained professionals. This effort has resulted in an increased level of differentiated instruction across the grade levels and an increase in student achievement as measured by the CMT. A core group of teachers from different grade levels and departments have received training in the First Steps, Numeracy program. They will serve as trainers/presenters and workshop facilitators for our staff this year. We are very proud that each school continues to achieve Adequate Yearly Progress.
