

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

KATHLEEN M. OUELLETTE, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 647-3441

Location: 45 North School Street
Manchester,
Connecticut

Website: boe.townofmanchester.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: Hartford	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$25,989
Town Population in 2000: 54,740	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 13.8%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 6.0%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.5%
Number of Public Schools: 13	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 88.5%

*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): G 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 6,863
5-Year Enrollment Change -10.3%

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	2,957	43.1	33.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	295	4.4	3.3	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	202	2.9	3.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	913	13.3	12.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	354	65.8	77.0	79.7
Homeless	3	0.0	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	236	24.0	21.3	19.0

*0.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	37	0.5
Asian American	467	6.8
Black	1,554	22.6
Hispanic	1,424	20.7
White	3,381	49.3
Total Minority	3,482	50.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 7.6%

Non-English Home Language: 4.4% 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 34.

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 main goal of our district is to close the achievement gap. Significant strides have been made over the last few years to increase the achievement gains of our black and brown student in the area of reading and writing. Evidence has been revealed to show that the implementation of Data Driven Decision Making, cultural relevant lesson planning, and SMART Goals (goals for individual student achievement) has shown upward of 15-18% gains at several grade levels; in both math and reading. This year, the implementation of SRBI (Scientifically Researched Based Intervention) will prove to strengthen existing efforts to close the gap. Such initiatives are applied to ensure continual equitable student growth.

Further focus has been turned to our Bilingual and ELL (English Language Learner) programs. The increase of students with second language is staggering and calls for immediate implementation of additional support for our ELL students. Additional programming supports the reduction of racial isolation. Such programs include Courageous Conversations, and Beyond Diversity. Academic experiences in Manchester are provided with a culturally responsive approach. This is done with a focus to embrace differences and center on an understanding of diversity. The school system celebrates its diversity as evident through the central focus on cultural awareness at the school level. Our ethnic student enrollment increased in the school year 2007-2008 to 50.7%. Several opportunities continue to be provided each year for all students to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Below are only a few highlights of some of the many fine programs that our school system offers all of our students. A review of our racial balance plan was completed this year to ensure that Manchester maintains compliance. Overall, families are attracted to our schools because of the diversity and exposure to a comprehensive education. The Manchester Board of Education continues to be committed to helping our district and community address racial, ethnic and economic isolation.

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	49.5	54.6	27.0
Writing	62.6	62.5	38.4
Mathematics	63.8	62.8	38.4
Grade 4 Reading	58.8	60.7	31.3
Writing	63.8	64.2	35.2
Mathematics	56.6	63.6	22.0
Grade 5 Reading	58.1	66.0	21.7
Writing	60.8	66.5	25.9
Mathematics	65.6	68.8	29.0
Science	52.3	58.1	22.8
Grade 6 Reading	58.9	68.9	16.6
Writing	52.3	62.2	20.2
Mathematics	56.1	68.8	14.7
Grade 7 Reading	66.4	74.9	18.5
Writing	51.4	62.9	15.9
Mathematics	50.3	66.0	14.0
Grade 8 Reading	54.8	68.4	16.1
Writing	55.1	66.5	20.0
Mathematics	38.9	64.5	9.0
Science	43.9	60.6	15.5

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	41.4	47.4	32.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	51.5	55.0	32.8
Mathematics	31.0	47.8	16.8
Science	31.4	42.8	20.6

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
	27.5	36.2	22.6

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		61.6	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	477	507	24.0
	Critical Reading	479	503	21.7
	Writing	481	506	24.8

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	93.6	92.1	42.7
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	4.7	6.6	47.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.7	2.5	32.8

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	92.5	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	7.1	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	459.83
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	62.74
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	67.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	126.46
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	22.85
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	12.60
School Level	27.90
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	17.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	41.80
School Nurses	20.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	329.13

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	13.9	14.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	59.4	77.2	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.9	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	18.9	18.3	19.3
Grade 5	19.8	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	17.7	19.7	20.5
High School	20.9	19.5	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,032	981	988
Middle School	1,033	1,001	1,016
High School	995	1,005	1,007

*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	3.9	3.3
Middle School	3.9	2.8	2.6
High School	3.2	2.6	2.4

*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	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$55,274	\$8,093	\$7,521	\$7,445	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$2,095	\$307	\$267	\$227	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,830	\$414	\$461	\$396	\$446
Student Support Services	\$6,190	\$906	\$808	\$887	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$10,250	\$1,501	\$1,351	\$1,294	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$10,727	\$1,571	\$1,382	\$1,360	\$1,377
Transportation	\$3,788	\$504	\$649	\$667	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$6,619	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,320	\$193	\$152	\$166	\$151
Total	\$99,093	\$13,547	\$12,869	\$12,779	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$10,491	\$1,536	\$1,791	\$2,153	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$24459976	24.7	22.1	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	58.1	36.7	4.1	1.1
Excluding School Construction	61.9	32.3	4.6	1.2

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.

Parameters are taken into consideration established by equity and specific to class size, free and reduce lunch statistics, staffing for achievement success, and literacy support to enable a quality education. Furthermore, the district applies for funding toward each school's improvement planning initiatives under the sanction of Title Grants. Grants are secured to help provide supplementary funding to improve student achievement, especially in schools that have a population of low income students. The method to determine the distribution of funding is established by free and reduced lunch counts. Those schools that have a larger percentage of free and reduced lunch population receive a larger amount of state funded allocations and district focus to address these needs. These funds are awarded to support professional development and remedial programming for students.

For local funding support, the Manchester Board of Education's annual town budget process ensures that every school submits a budget requesting materials and staffing for educational improvement. Additionally, the district practice reviews requests to ensure the distribution of resources in an equitable fashion so that each school receives the necessary staff, materials, and monies. However, all of our schools are at the forefront to ensure success for all. This point is represented by providing each school an allocation from the town for instructional materials based on per pupil allotment.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	975
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.4%

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	53	0.7	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	293	4.0	3.8	3.9
Intellectual Disability	31	0.4	0.5	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	105	1.4	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	231	3.2	2.6	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	168	2.3	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	94	1.3	1.1	0.9
Total	975	13.4	12.3	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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	94.1	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	18.5	30.2	57.6	65.7
	Writing	12.4	19.5	57.9	64.1
	Mathematics	18.8	30.7	55.7	65.7
	Science	18.8	23.8	48.5	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	9.5	14.1	41.4	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	4.2	13.6	51.5	55.0
	Mathematics	2.4	15.4	31.0	47.8
	Science	0.0	10.6	31.4	42.8

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	23.5
	% With Accommodations	76.5
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	46.9
	% With Accommodations	53.1
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		11.4

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	21	2.2
Private Schools or Other Settings	115	11.8

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	695	71.3	70.2	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	122	12.5	14.6	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	158	16.2	15.2	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Because the school district of Manchester received the status of making AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress), the system was given a year of no requirements from the Federal Government. Evidence at all levels showed student academic growth on the CMT and CAPT assessment tools. From this growth, Manchester was invited to be part of only seven other districts to develop the District Improvement Plan by participating in the DSAC (State instituted program to identify area of need) Model. Our goals will be formulated from this data to improve achievement in numeracy, literacy and parent involvement. School Improvement Plans will be generated from the District Plan so that each building and all staff is consistent with the mission to move the District forward. Each school in Manchester has a school improvement plan that focuses specifically on improving student achievement for our students in the following areas; low socio-economic status, special education, and minority, as well as supporting enrichment to challenge all students. Some of the techniques that the district staff has implemented to help all students learn are as follows: differentiated instruction, training in data driven decision making, proficiency development, Courageous Conversations, math initiatives, University of Connecticut Reading program, parent involvement in literacy programs, Positive Behavioral Support (PBS), SRBI and Early Intervention Programs (EIP). The Manchester school district is committed to working as a team to close the achievement gap and provide a challenging education for all students.
