

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

COLLEEN PALMER, Superintendent

Location: 375 Monroe Turnpike

Telephone: (203) 452-2862

Monroe,  
ConnecticutWebsite: [www.monroeeps.org](http://www.monroeeps.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](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Fairfield

Town Population in 2000: 19,247

1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.9%

Number of Public Schools: 6

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$34,161

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 9.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 1.4%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.9%

\*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): 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, 2010      3,745  
5-Year Enrollment Change      -13.9%

**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	280	7.5	8.4	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	26	0.7	2.0	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	171	4.6	6.4	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	357	9.5	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	187	94.0	91.3	80.2
Homeless	1	0.0	0.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	84	13.5	12.1	13.2

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

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	14	0.4
Asian American	124	3.3
Black	65	1.7
Hispanic	215	5.7
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	3,275	87.4
Two or more races	52	1.4
Total Minority	470	12.6

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 1.3%

**Non-English Home Language:**

2.6% 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 24.

---

### 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 district supports school-based efforts that include differentiated curricula to present diverse cultural perspectives involving a variety of topics and concepts. In the development of curriculum units of study and lesson plans, teachers are challenged to consider multi-cultural perspectives that go beyond the demographics of the community. The multi-cultural perspective in its broader sense includes race, ethnicity, religious perspective, economics, and gender. Schools provide opportunities for students to engage in community service projects and special programs, including exchanges with students from other districts within the region. The district supports participation in the Bridgeport Six-to-Six Magnet School. Masuk High School students have the choice to participate in the Regional Center for the Arts (RCA), the Aquaculture School program in Bridgeport, and the Trumbull Agriscience and Biotechnology Center. The district also transports students to the Henry Abbott Technical High School in Danbury. Interdistrict grants coordinated by Cooperative Educational Services (CES), the district's local Regional Education Service Center (RESC), provide opportunities for students to work with students from other districts in various disciplines. Additionally, grants have supported exchanges involving theatre, music and the visual arts. The schools also engage in programs designed to build further understandings of differences while emphasizing those human qualities that unite us in the common understanding of what it means to live in peace and cooperation. Ours schools have extensive, grade level appropriate community service programs. School-wide activities at the elementary level transition to middle school's community service club referred to as the Student Activists. The high school has a very active Interact Club that follows the local Rotary Club in its design and commitment to service.

---

## 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 <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Grade 3 Reading	84.7	58.4	96.9	
Writing	81.8	61.1	87.0	
Mathematics	88.0	63.0	96.3	
Grade 4 Reading	90.4	62.5	95.7	
Writing	86.1	65.5	87.8	
Mathematics	91.1	67.0	93.9	
Grade 5 Reading	77.1	61.4	70.6	
Writing	82.9	66.8	75.5	
Mathematics	87.8	72.5	73.0	
Science	88.3	59.9	96.3	
Grade 6 Reading	91.3	76.0	80.4	
Writing	79.9	65.2	73.2	
Mathematics	92.1	71.3	90.5	
Grade 7 Reading	94.0	77.8	86.6	
Writing	79.9	58.9	81.0	
Mathematics	86.6	68.4	79.5	
Grade 8 Reading	91.6	74.7	85.4	
Writing	86.1	64.8	80.3	
Mathematics	87.6	66.6	81.5	
Science	83.6	63.1	73.9	

**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 <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Reading Across the Disciplines	57.4	44.7	64.4	
Writing Across the Disciplines	79.9	61.2	76.7	
Mathematics	72.4	49.5	84.2	
Science	70.2	47.0	83.5	

**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
	52.9	51.0	49.7

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		83.9	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	517	510	55.7
	Critical Reading	518	505	61.1
	Writing	519	510	56.5

**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	96.0	81.8	97.7
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)	96.0	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.0	9.1

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	213.55
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	23.39
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	35.85
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	68.44
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	5.90
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.00
School Level	14.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.60
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.45
School Nurses	7.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	170.80

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	16.0	14.4	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	83.8	86.1	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	20.1	17.5	18.4
Grade 2	21.0	19.8	19.9
Grade 5	25.2	22.1	21.2
Grade 7	22.6	21.3	20.6
High School	20.8	20.2	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,004	992	992
Middle School	1,019	1,019	1,017
High School	980	987	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*	3.1	3.1	3.1
Middle School	1.8	2.3	2.4
High School	1.7	2.5	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	\$32,190	\$8,267	\$8,232	\$7,924	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$598	\$154	\$299	\$277	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,819	\$467	\$477	\$512	\$463
Student Support Services	\$3,796	\$975	\$875	\$936	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$4,925	\$1,265	\$1,433	\$1,373	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,709	\$1,466	\$1,421	\$1,384	\$1,410
Transportation	\$2,313	\$570	\$701	\$623	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,096	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$424	\$109	\$161	\$162	\$159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$52,870</b>	<b>\$13,392</b>	<b>\$13,878</b>	<b>\$13,518</b>	<b>\$13,780</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,254	\$836	\$1,622	\$1,178	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$9,249,037	17.5	20.5	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	82.6	12.7	3.8	1.0
Excluding School Construction	82.9	12.1	4.0	1.0

---

**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.

It is the practice of the district to provide its schools with equitable resources, both in staffing levels and in instructional materials. The district recognizes that comprehensive middle and high school programs are inherently more costly than elementary school programs. The proposed budget is developed with input from the school administrators. In meetings with the superintendent and finance director, each principal reviews their staffing needs to meet class size guidelines. They also present requests to fund needs that are unique to their schools. The district has three elementary schools and the vetting process is designed to insure comparable class size, special program offerings, intervention, enrichment and special education services, and equity in the distribution of funds for technology and instructional supplies.

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**


---



---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	337
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.0%

---

<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	28	0.7	1.2	1.1
Learning Disability	131	3.5	3.3	3.9
Intellectual Disability	17	0.5	0.3	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	13	0.3	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	55	1.5	1.8	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	75	2.0	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	18	0.5	0.7	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>10.0</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	85.7	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	46.2	33.0	88.2	68.6
	Writing	28.6	19.3	82.8	63.7
	Mathematics	48.2	33.4	88.8	68.2
	Science	28.9	21.2	85.8	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	37.0	14.1	57.4	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	48.3	17.3	79.9	61.2
	Mathematics	32.0	15.8	72.4	49.5
	Science	23.3	13.1	70.2	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	13.2
	% With Accommodations	86.8
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.6

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	18	5.3

### 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	264	78.3	78.0	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	57	16.9	14.9	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	16	4.7	7.1	11.0

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The district continues to build the capacity of all school and district data teams to transform multiple sources of data into actionable information. Data teams working with a consultant developed value tables designed to help teachers and administrators measure growth across the five levels of the CMT by cohort and by classroom. Additionally, teachers made predictions about the performance of their students prior to the state testing, to compare their prediction to actual results. Using the district analytical software (INFORM) and the state reporting website (ctreports.com), professional development activities are linked to the improvement goals for each school and the district. Monroe educators receive training in research-based strategies, including the effective use of student performance data, teaching strategies that yield desired results, and developing every student's background knowledge to help them learn new skills and concepts. Training also includes gathering information using the classroom walk-through with an emphasis on improved student engagement and strategies to increase the application of higher order thinking skills. Each school has developed intervention strategies and staff members have been trained in the use of scientifically research-based interventions to support individual students. Continuous monitoring is provided through the district's use of benchmarking assessments and work continues to validate those assessments as reliable predictors of future success. Intervention has been extended to include enrichment activities that support a flexible grouping model to assist those students that are more independent learners as well as those that require more direction to achieve at a higher level. The district increased reading support staff at the elementary and middle schools. The high school added support for students needing reading support to meet the demands of comprehensive high school curricula.

---