

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11****Regional School District 12**

BRUCE STORM, Superintendent

Location: 11a School Street  
Washington Depot,  
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 868-6100

Website: [www.region-12.org](http://www.region-12.org)

This regional school district serves Bridgewater, Roxbury, Washington

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: Litchfield

Town Population in 2000: 7,556

1990-2000 Population Growth: 2.3%

Number of Public Schools: 5

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$44,020

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 7.8%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 0.3%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 90.7%

\*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): C 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, 2010      930  
5-Year Enrollment Change      -18.3%

**DISTRICT GRADE RANGE**

Grade Range      K - 12

**INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED**

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	63	6.8	7.6	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	2	0.2	0.7	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	116	12.5	10.7	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	44	95.7	85.4	80.2
Homeless	1	0.1	0.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	9	6.1	12.6	13.2

### SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	0	0.0
Asian American	5	0.5
Black	8	0.9
Hispanic	32	3.4
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	874	94.0
Two or more races	11	1.2
Total Minority	56	6.0

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.6%**

**Non-English Home Language:**

0.8% 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 3.

---

### 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.

Located in the northwest corner of the state, Region 12 remains relatively isolated from urban life, in general, and the rich and varied cultures to be found there. This and the fact that there is little diversity among the district's students and staff, requires the Region to offer a range of opportunities for teachers and students to increase their awareness of diversity, to encourage greater sensitivity to differences, and to participate in unique experiences to expand cultural awareness. Our individual school reports provide the most detail, but some highlights include involvement in programs that encourage sharing with students in other parts of the state and across the world ("Flat Stanley"), exposure to cultures through programs like "Customs Around the World," after school programs in the arts (provided by ASAP, a community-based arts program) that broaden cultural sensitivity through the arts, poetry competitions with students in other districts and around the world, and various courses that promote cultural and gender awareness among students. All schools engage in character education programs that help to insure a community of caring, while promoting mutual respect for all.

---

## 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
Grade 3 Reading	76.9	58.4	83.1
Writing	84.6	61.1	95.7
Mathematics	88.5	63.0	97.5
Grade 4 Reading	82.7	62.5	83.4
Writing	87.5	65.5	92.1
Mathematics	89.6	67.0	90.2
Grade 5 Reading	75.8	61.4	65.6
Writing	84.6	66.8	82.2
Mathematics	88.9	72.5	79.1
Science	76.9	59.9	68.1
Grade 6 Reading	89.5	76.0	72.6
Writing	78.3	65.2	64.9
Mathematics	89.5	71.3	79.2
Grade 7 Reading	91.9	77.8	81.5
Writing	64.8	58.9	50.0
Mathematics	85.1	68.4	75.6
Grade 8 Reading	88.3	74.7	72.0
Writing	83.5	64.8	72.6
Mathematics	82.9	66.6	68.8
Science	79.7	63.1	63.1

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.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."

**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	57.1	44.7	62.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	63.6	61.2	43.6
Mathematics	67.1	49.5	73.7
Science	61.4	47.0	66.2

For more detailed 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."

**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
	76.9	51.0	98.4

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		78.4	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	526	510	63.4
	Critical Reading	525	505	66.4
	Writing	529	510	67.2

**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	82.2	81.8	26.7
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.0	2.8	100.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	91.9	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	8.1	9.1

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	78.02
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	13.99
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	13.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	24.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.50
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	6.26
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	6.51
School Nurses	4.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	66.96

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	17.0	14.7	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	86.7	81.3	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.3	17.6	18.4
Grade 2	15.8	19.1	19.9
Grade 5	16.3	20.7	21.2
Grade 7	15.6	19.6	20.6
High School	22.7	19.2	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	990	988	992
Middle School	1,040	1,026	1,017
High School	987	1,012	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*	2.0	3.0	3.1
Middle School	1.7	2.3	2.4
High School	1.9	2.4	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	\$10,902	\$11,262	\$8,232	\$7,683	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$599	\$618	\$299	\$267	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$832	\$860	\$477	\$388	\$463
Student Support Services	\$1,571	\$1,623	\$875	\$893	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$2,062	\$2,130	\$1,433	\$1,410	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,034	\$2,101	\$1,421	\$1,346	\$1,410
Transportation	\$1,385	\$1,389	\$701	\$664	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$535	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$399	\$412	\$161	\$171	\$159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$20,319</b>	<b>\$20,734</b>	<b>\$13,878</b>	<b>\$13,335</b>	<b>\$13,780</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$383	\$396	\$1,622	\$1,101	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$4,291,137	21.1	21.2	21.5

**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	91.5	3.3	3.2	2.1
Excluding School Construction	91.5	3.2	3.2	2.1

---

**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.

Like many other school districts in CT and elsewhere, the Region's budget development process consumes administration and teacher time throughout the fall months. This process allows for each principal and program leader to develop and propose a budget request for the following fiscal year, including requests for materials, supplies and equipment. Personnel funding is handled centrally and is largely controlled by a policy that seeks to insure class sizes that are reasonable at the specific grade levels and which are equitable across the system. Special education costs are dictated by the requirements of the many PPT's that define program needs, ranging from in-class monitoring to costly out-of-district placements. The most recent budget request (FY12) brought forward for voter approval a 2.3% increase over the prior year's budget. The voters endorsed this request at the first referendum. As in the prior year' budget, to achieve a 2.3% increase, additional positions had to be eliminated across the district among both certified and non-certified staff. In spite of these reductions, learning opportunities remain at present equitable and reasonably comprehensive among all the schools.

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**


---



---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	124
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.8%

---

<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	10	1.1	1.1	1.1
Learning Disability	43	4.8	3.8	3.9
Intellectual Disability	5	0.6	0.4	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	4	0.4	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	27	3.0	1.9	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	26	2.9	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	9	1.0	0.7	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>11.6</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	69.2	62.5
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	45.5	33.0	84.8	68.6
	Writing	27.1	19.3	80.0	63.7
	Mathematics	52.8	33.4	87.1	68.2
	Science	38.9	21.2	78.5	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	33.3	14.1	57.1	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	43.8	17.3	63.6	61.2
	Mathematics	38.5	15.8	67.1	49.5
	Science	18.8	13.1	61.4	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	3.7
	% With Accommodations	96.3
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	38.9
	% With Accommodations	61.1
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		2.8

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	15	12.1

### 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	75	60.5	77.4	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	38	30.6	15.5	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	11	8.9	7.1	11.0

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

On a Region-wide basis, goals for improvement include: insuring curriculum congruence with the CT CCSS and making necessary adjustments; pressing ahead with increasing the use of data to inform instruction and expanding the portfolio and use of common formative assessments; continuing the implementation of the “mini-observation” technique and associated adjustments in the teacher evaluation process to incorporate the use of student performance data as part of the assessment; and accomplishing the foundational work having to do with long-range planning (commencing in the 2011-2012 school year. At the building level, focuses for improvement are derived from careful analysis of CMT and CAPT scores, as well as through the use of various formative assessments that allow for the adjustment of instruction to insure the success of all learners. Further, work done over the last few years in the areas of differentiated instruction and Understanding by Design now finds its application under the broader umbrella of measured performance. Clear curricular outcomes and an array of instructional strategies will contribute significantly to the instructional adjustments called for by the periodic assessments of the learning students managed to achieve. The Region also continues to work toward the required implementation of Scientific, Research-Based Intervention (SRBI). Lastly, at each level the administration and staff formulate annual “success plans” that describe targeted areas for improvement and the criteria that will be used to measure degrees of success. These plans are detailed for the Board of Education each spring.

---