

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11**Berlin School District**

DAVID B. ERWIN, Superintendent

Location: 238 Kensington Road
Berlin,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 828-6581

Website: www.berlin.k12.ct.us

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: Hartford

Town Population in 2000: 18,215

1990-2000 Population Growth: 8.5%

Number of Public Schools: 5

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,744

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 13.0%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 2.0%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 92.7%

*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): D 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 3,116
5-Year Enrollment Change -7.0%

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 | 274 | 8.8 | 13.8 | 34.1 |
| K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English | 66 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 5.6 |
| Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented | 0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 4.0 |
| PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District | 309 | 9.9 | 11.1 | 11.4 |
| Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart | 196 | 93.8 | 85.1 | 80.2 |
| Homeless | 4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week | 49 | 10.7 | 17.2 | 13.2 |

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

| Student Race/Ethnicity | | |
|------------------------|--------|---------|
| Race/Ethnicity | Number | Percent |
| American Indian | 2 | 0.1 |
| Asian American | 112 | 3.6 |
| Black | 34 | 1.1 |
| Hispanic | 188 | 6.0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 |
| White | 2,689 | 86.3 |
| Two or more races | 91 | 2.9 |
| Total Minority | 427 | 13.7 |

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.4%

Open Choice:

44 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:

7.5% 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 28.

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 Berlin Public Schools provide a variety of programs and experiences that are designed to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. We continue to be encouraged with the response to these efforts from students, staff, and members of the community. Our participation in the Open CHOICE Program is district-wide and during this year we had 47 CHOICE students in our five schools. There is a sincere commitment to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. The Board of Education recognizes that Berlin is not a highly diverse community and that the greater Berlin community also benefits from participation in CHOICE. We continue to offer seats in an attempt to bring additional students into our district. Each of our schools continues to participate in and provide a number of learning activities designed to promote diversity. Our middle school interacted with an elementary school in Hartford and students visited the school and participated in numerous activities including Project Adventure. When curriculum is revised, careful attention is given to be certain it is reflective of diversity. Administration continues to offer updates to the Board of Education and community outlining the activities that are conducted as part of the district's efforts to educate students about understanding differences among people.

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 | <p>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.</p> <p>For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p> |
|----------------------------|----------|-------|--|--|
| Grade 3 Reading | 70.5 | 58.4 | 62.5 | |
| Writing | 69.3 | 61.1 | 55.9 | |
| Mathematics | 70.6 | 63.0 | 54.0 | |
| Grade 4 Reading | 76.5 | 62.5 | 66.9 | |
| Writing | 80.8 | 65.5 | 72.6 | |
| Mathematics | 76.0 | 67.0 | 56.1 | |
| Grade 5 Reading | 82.8 | 61.4 | 87.1 | |
| Writing | 82.3 | 66.8 | 73.0 | |
| Mathematics | 88.7 | 72.5 | 76.7 | |
| Science | 82.3 | 59.9 | 81.6 | |
| Grade 6 Reading | 87.6 | 76.0 | 66.1 | |
| Writing | 82.5 | 65.2 | 81.0 | |
| Mathematics | 80.4 | 71.3 | 56.0 | |
| Grade 7 Reading | 91.2 | 77.8 | 77.1 | |
| Writing | 80.5 | 58.9 | 82.9 | |
| Mathematics | 84.0 | 68.4 | 68.6 | |
| Grade 8 Reading | 90.0 | 74.7 | 79.6 | |
| Writing | 76.8 | 64.8 | 53.5 | |
| Mathematics | 82.1 | 66.6 | 66.9 | |
| Science | 84.0 | 63.1 | 75.2 | |

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 | <p>For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|--|--|
| Reading Across the Disciplines | 59.5 | 44.7 | 68.2 | |
| Writing Across the Disciplines | 77.8 | 61.2 | 70.7 | |
| Mathematics | 64.6 | 49.5 | 69.2 | |
| Science | 57.4 | 47.0 | 54.9 | |

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 |
|--|----------|-------|---|
| | 62.3 | 51.0 | 73.0 |

| SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010 | | District | State | % of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores |
|---|------------------|----------|-------|--|
| % of Graduates Tested | | 76.8 | 70.6 | |
| Average Score | Mathematics | 531 | 510 | 67.9 |
| | Critical Reading | 503 | 505 | 45.8 |
| | Writing | 504 | 510 | 42.0 |

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 | 90.5 | 81.8 | 63.4 |
| 2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 29.5 |

| Activities of Graduates | District | State |
|--|----------|-------|
| % Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs) | 90.7 | 84.8 |
| % Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services) | 5.9 | 9.1 |

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

| Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff | |
|---|--------|
| General Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 200.64 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants | 6.73 |
| Special Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 34.30 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants | 45.93 |
| Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants | 9.73 |
| Staff Devoted to Adult Education | 1.36 |
| Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs | |
| District Central Office | 6.00 |
| School Level | 12.40 |
| Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists) | 6.60 |
| Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists | 16.80 |
| School Nurses | 5.40 |
| Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support | 125.00 |

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 | 14.0 | 14.6 | 13.9 |
| % with Master's Degree or Above | 82.0 | 79.0 | 79.0 |

| Average Class Size | District | DRG | State |
|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| Grade K | 17.4 | 17.5 | 18.4 |
| Grade 2 | 18.3 | 19.2 | 19.9 |
| Grade 5 | 21.6 | 21.7 | 21.2 |
| Grade 7 | 19.4 | 20.7 | 20.6 |
| High School | 19.4 | 19.8 | 19.3 |

| Hours of Instruction Per Year* | Dist | DRG | State |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Elementary School | 999 | 984 | 992 |
| Middle School | 1,055 | 1,025 | 1,017 |
| High School | 1,053 | 1,004 | 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* | 2.9 | 3.2 | 3.1 |
| Middle School | 1.4 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| High School | 2.2 | 2.6 | 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 | \$22,587 | \$7,150 | \$8,232 | \$7,875 | \$8,237 |
| Instructional Supplies and Equipment | \$926 | \$293 | \$299 | \$267 | \$300 |
| Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services | \$954 | \$302 | \$477 | \$387 | \$463 |
| Student Support Services | \$3,774 | \$1,195 | \$875 | \$828 | \$872 |
| Administration and Support Services | \$4,252 | \$1,346 | \$1,433 | \$1,339 | \$1,459 |
| Plant Operation and Maintenance | \$4,926 | \$1,559 | \$1,421 | \$1,322 | \$1,410 |
| Transportation | \$2,048 | \$632 | \$701 | \$641 | \$692 |
| Costs for Students Tuitioned Out | \$1,462 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other | \$824 | \$261 | \$161 | \$159 | \$159 |
| Total | \$41,752 | \$13,047 | \$13,878 | \$13,136 | \$13,780 |
| Additional Expenditures | | | | | |
| Land, Buildings, and Debt Service | \$411 | \$130 | \$1,622 | \$1,432 | \$1,616 |

| Special Education Expenditures | District Total | Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--|------|-------|
| | | District | DRG | State |
| | \$8,335,383 | 20.0 | 21.7 | 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 | 79.6 | 15.4 | 4.9 | 0.2 |
| Excluding School Construction | 80.2 | 14.7 | 4.9 | 0.2 |

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 has been the practice of the Berlin Board of Education and its central office administration that each school in the district should have comparable resources while recognizing factors such as equipment and specialized supply needs at the secondary school are inherently more costly in nature. The proposed budget for our school district is created by our administrators in the late fall. It is built on the assumption that our three elementary schools would receive a fixed amount for each student enrolled in the school. This would “guarantee” an equitable allocation of resources among our schools. Once that assumption was met, adjustments were then made to determine what additional resources would be allocated to particular schools to adequately address needs particular to a certain school. The same process was then used at our two secondary schools. However, a different per student fixed amount was used because of the significantly higher costs as mentioned above. Once the proposed budget is adopted, appropriate reductions, if necessary, are made “across the board,” and the same per student expenditure ratio described above is maintained as closely as possible.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

| | |
|--|------|
| Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible | 308 |
| Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities | 9.8% |

| 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 | 39 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Learning Disability | 88 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 3.9 |
| Intellectual Disability | 2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Emotional Disturbance | 17 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Speech Impairment | 84 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Other Health Impairment* | 64 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| Other Disabilities** | 14 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Total | 308 | 9.8 | 11.3 | 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 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma | 64.5 | 62.5 |
| 2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21 | N/A | 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 | 39.8 | 33.0 | 83.5 | 68.6 |
| | Writing | 24.3 | 19.3 | 78.9 | 63.7 |
| | Mathematics | 31.9 | 33.4 | 80.6 | 68.2 |
| | Science | 34.0 | 21.2 | 83.1 | 61.5 |
| CAPT | Reading Across the Disciplines | N/A | N/A | 59.5 | 44.7 |
| | Writing Across the Disciplines | 42.1 | 17.3 | 77.8 | 61.2 |
| | Mathematics | 6.2 | 15.8 | 64.6 | 49.5 |
| | Science | 10.5 | 13.1 | 57.4 | 47.0 |

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 | 18.0 |
| | % With Accommodations | 82.0 |
| CAPT | % Without Accommodations | 10.5 |
| | % With Accommodations | 89.5 |
| % Assessed Using Skills Checklist | | 4.1 |

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 | 2 | 0.6 |
| Private Schools or Other Settings | 24 | 7.8 |

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 | 213 | 69.2 | 77.0 | 74.1 |
| 40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time | 66 | 21.4 | 13.9 | 14.9 |
| 0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time | 29 | 9.4 | 9.1 | 11.0 |

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Berlin Public School District is committed to a continuous improvement process. Within this process, district goals are supported by measurable building goals, which are supported by a team professional growth plan. This cycle forms the framework for continuous student achievement through focused instructional improvement. Teachers' and administrators' capacity is developed through focused, ongoing, job-embedded professional development related to the district and school goal. District administration presents an annual report to the Board of Education on student performance focusing on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) and the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT). The 2011 CMT results reflected exceptionally high participation rates (99.9%) and continued strong performance in both math and reading. The CAPT participation rate was 98.8% for mathematics and 99.2% for reading with 97.3% scoring at or above proficient for mathematics and 100.0% scoring at or above proficient in reading. The districts' overall performance continues to improve in many content areas, grade levels and amongst subgroups. The staff is committed to continually evaluating individual student performance looking at longitudinal trends and inconsistency in student performance over time. A system-wide effort to evaluate students' performance takes place throughout the school year. The analysis includes work with individual schools and grade levels within each school. Individual schools have instituted various PLCs and instructional support programs to assist in the analysis of student performance data and to help teachers use data to inform instruction. The decisions on instructional and resource allocations are made collaboratively utilizing a Scientific Research Based Intervention model. Administrators have identified grade-level benchmark assessments and regular monitoring systems for the purpose of ongoing identification and intervention for students in need of additional instruction and resources. Efforts underway to improve student learning include:

- Alignment of teacher, department, school and district goals using student performance data to identify areas in need of improvement
- Use of the Continuous Improvement Model to guide all schools in the development of focused, data-driven action plans and performance indicators
- Assessment of all students - special education and general education - using established, universal screens, benchmark assessments and common formative assessments
- Instructional support staff for math and reading at all levels with specific implementation protocols
- Implementation and coordination of a true co-teaching model at the secondary level
- Increased opportunities for instruction through after-school programs at all levels
- Established comprehensive summer reading programs at all schools
- Regular monitoring of students who receive support services to evaluate instruction and to make adjustments as necessary
- Implementation of Scientific Research Based Intervention (SRBI) model
- Coordinated professional development focused on effective instructional strategies
- Vertical teams for math, science, language arts, social studies and technology literacy comprised of general and special education teachers to ensure consistency and continuity of instruction in grades K-12
- Use of Performance Tracker Data System district-wide and MMS Electronic Gradebook/ Parent Portal at the secondary level
- Implementation of the instructional rounds process as a data gathering tool focused on school improvement
- Continuous curriculum cycle focused on creating a common, viable, standards-based curriculum for all students
