

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2006-07**Brooklyn School District****LOUISE S BERRY, Superintendent**

Telephone: (860) 774-9153



 This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c).

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Windham	Public School Enrollment as a Percent of Town Population: 12.5%
2000 Population: 7,173	Public School Enrollment as % of Total Student Population: 96.1%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 7.4%	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000: 21.0%
2000 Per Capita Income: \$20,359	Adult Education Enrollment in 2005-06 School Year: 21
Number of Public Schools: 2	Number of Adults Receiving Diplomas in 2005-06 School Yr.: 18
Number of Nonpublic Schools: 2	

 District Reference Group (DRG): E DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment.

DISTRICT NEED

Current and Past District Need	Year	District	DRG	State
% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2006-07	18.3	10.0	27.3
	2002-03	17.4	N/A	25.4
% of K-12 Students with Non-English Home Language	2006-07	1.3	1.4	12.8
	2001-02	0.2	N/A	12.8
% of Elementary and Middle School Students Above Entry Gr. Who Attended Same School Previous Yr.	2006-07	94.5	94.7	88.6
	2001-02	90.5	N/A	86.9
% of Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School, or Headstart	2006-07	87.5	82.6	79.3
	2001-02	80.2	N/A	75.1
% of Juniors and Seniors Working More Than 16 Hours Per Week	2006-07	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2001-02	N/A	N/A	N/A

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY

Enrollment	
Grade Range	PK- 8
Total Enrollment	1,022
5-Year Enrollment Change	10.2%
Projected 2011 Enrollment	
Elementary	1,210
Middle School	0
High School	0
Prekindergarten, Other	114

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	1	0.1
Asian American	12	1.2
Black	5	0.5
Hispanic	13	1.3
White	991	97.0
Total Minority 2006-07	31	3.0
Total Minority 2001-02	31	3.3

EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Below is the description submitted by this school district of how it provides educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

Brooklyn is a small town with very little racial diversity. However, its economic diversity is evidenced by the 18% of students eligible for free/reduced price meals. Hence the issue of economic isolation and fragmented families is an ongoing concern to members of our staff. At the elementary level, we work to address the limitations in the lives of many of our students through a variety of curricular projects to provide opportunities for students to experience other cultures and field trips to enrich and broaden their perspective.

At the middle school level, the many cultural enrichment activities throughout the year in language arts, social studies and science help to broaden students' understanding of the differences and the similarities of different ethnic groups and also help to develop an appreciation of the traditions of other cultures. The faculty has incorporated diversity into their instructional activities and our field trip program provides opportunities for students to interact with students from other schools. Examples of this are: music festivals at the University of Connecticut; the Legacy Exploration Program at UCONN; and trips to Plimoth Plantation in Plymouth, MA and the Hyde Cultural Center in Woodstock, CT.

Our secondary students are tuitioned to a number of high schools in eastern Connecticut under the Board's Freedom of Choice policy and thus have access to a broad range of programs/activities and become members of student bodies with much more diversity than is possible in Brooklyn. Within the scope of their experience in our designated high schools, our secondary students have the opportunity to learn about, interact with and respect members of different ethnic, racial and economic backgrounds and cultures.

DISTRICT RESOURCES

Staff Count (Full-Time Equivalent)



# of Certified Staff	
Teachers	66.6
Administrators	4.5
Department Chairs	0.0
Library/Media Staff	1.4
Other Professionals	6.0
% Minority 2006-07	1.2
% Minority 2001-02	0.0
# Non-Certified Instructional	32.0

Average Class Size		District	DRG	State
Grade K	2006-07	17.2	15.0	18.2
	2001-02	14.3	N/A	18.3
Grade 2	2006-07	20.6	17.3	19.5
	2001-02	17.0	N/A	19.6
Grade 5	2006-07	19.6	19.9	21.2
	2001-02	21.4	N/A	21.5
Grade 7	2006-07	20.2	20.1	20.8
	2001-02	17.4	N/A	21.9
High School	2006-07	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2001-02	N/A	N/A	N/A

Professional Staff Experience and Training	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Connecticut and Other Locations	17.8	15.3	14.4
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.9	79.9	78.9

DISTRICT RESOURCES, continued

Total Hours of Instruction Per Yr.*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary	978	985	987
Middle School	1,001	1,011	1,016
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*State law requires at least 900 hours for gr. 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours for half-day kindergarten.

Resource Ratios	District	DRG	State
Students Per Academic Computer	5.2	2.8	3.2
Students Per Teacher	15.3	13.1	13.5
Teachers Per Administrator	14.8	13.2	13.9

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.

The Board of Education's policy on the allocation of district resources provides the framework for both expenditures and revenues and translates into financial terms the priorities and education needs of the district. The Board expects the superintendent to work closely with building level administrators in studying the needs of the schools and make recommendations consistent with those needs. Building administrators are expected to confer with their staff and their parent advisory committees to obtain information on needs and priorities.

The Board formulates the annual budget through a committee structure and solicits comments and recommendations from parents and community members. The Board members present their budget to the Board of Finance prior to presenting it to the community at a public hearing. In developing the 2006-07 school budget, members of the Board and the Administration set the following staff and program priorities: maintain current programs and services; expand the concept of inclusion in the regular classroom; emphasize the use of technology consistent with Brooklyn's Long Range Technology Plan; maintain a curriculum consistent with the performance standards listed in Connecticut's K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; maintain class size to provide for individual attention when necessary; and continue the comprehensive pre-school program for students ages three and four in order to provide an opportunity for every preschool child to have a solid foundation for their educational career.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

SAT[®] I: Reasoning Test	Class of 2001	Class of 2006			
		District	State	Of All Districts in State	
	District			Lowest %	Highest %
% of Graduates Tested	N/A	N/A	N/A	23.8	100.0
Mathematics: Average Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	284	604
Mathematics: % Scoring 600 or More	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	55.6
Critical Reading: Average Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	346	595
Critical Reading: % Scoring 600 or More	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	48.5
Writing: Average Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	337	595
Writing: % Scoring 600 or More	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	48.8



Physical Fitness	District	State	Of All Districts in State	
			Lowest %	Highest %
% Passing All Four Tests	37.2	36.1	0.0	85.0

STUDENT PERFORMANCE, continued

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 All Districts in State		
			Lowest %	Highest %	
Grade 3	Reading	50.5	52.3	13.1	86.4
	Writing	67.0	60.8	20.0	88.9
	Mathematics	57.4	59.4	15.0	91.3
Grade 4	Reading	64.2	57.0	14.1	91.3
	Writing	71.9	65.1	20.0	90.2
	Mathematics	69.8	62.3	17.9	100.0
Grade 5	Reading	60.0	61.4	19.5	92.3
	Writing	57.0	64.6	25.0	95.5
	Mathematics	53.0	66.0	23.5	93.3
Grade 6	Reading	68.5	64.3	16.7	96.3
	Writing	60.4	63.0	20.8	93.6
	Mathematics	60.9	63.9	10.2	92.8
Grade 7	Reading	72.2	65.9	3.8	96.8
	Writing	72.2	60.4	0.0	95.0
	Mathematics	62.6	60.3	7.7	92.0
Grade 8	Reading	62.0	66.6	4.8	94.0
	Writing	71.3	64.0	0.0	94.6
	Mathematics	64.0	60.8	4.5	95.7

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 district, 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.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	Of All Districts in State	
			Lowest %	Highest %
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




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 CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this district, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

STUDENT PERFORMANCE, continued

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	Of All Districts in State	
			Lowest %	Highest %
Graduation Rate for Class of 2006	N/A	N/A	66.7	100.0
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2006	N/A	N/A	0.0	72.5
2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate for Gr. 9 through 12	N/A	N/A	0.0	19.2
2000-01 Annual Dropout Rate for Gr. 9 through 12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Activities of Graduates	Class of	# in District	District %	State %
 Pursuing Higher Education	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2001	N/A	N/A	N/A
Employed or in Military	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2001	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unemployed	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2001	N/A	N/A	N/A

SPECIAL EDUCATION**DISTRICT OVERVIEW**

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	135
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent of Students with Disabilities	9.5%
Total PK-12 Special Education Expenditures, 2005-06	\$2,491,553
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education, 2005-06	17.8%
Enrollment in District PK-12 Special Education Programs	107
Full-Time Equivalent Count of District PK-12 Special Education Instructional Staff	
Teachers and Instructors	6.0
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	18.5



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	5	0.4	0.6	0.6
Learning Disability	60	4.2	3.8	4.0
Intellectual Disability	4	0.3	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	12	0.8	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	30	2.1	3.0	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	19	1.3	1.8	1.9
Other Disabilities**	5	0.4	0.7	0.9
Total	135	9.5	10.9	11.2

*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

SPECIAL EDUCATION, continued

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, Percentage of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal.

The following results include students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	Students with Disabilities		All Students	
	District	State	District	State
Grade 3 Reading	N/A	N/A	50.5	52.3
Writing	N/A	N/A	67.0	60.8
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	57.4	59.4
Grade 4 Reading	N/A	N/A	64.2	57.0
Writing	N/A	N/A	71.9	65.1
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	69.8	62.3
Grade 5 Reading	N/A	N/A	60.0	61.4
Writing	N/A	N/A	57.0	64.6
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	53.0	66.0
Grade 6 Reading	N/A	N/A	68.5	64.3
Writing	N/A	N/A	60.4	63.0
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	60.9	63.9
Grade 7 Reading	N/A	N/A	72.2	65.9
Writing	N/A	N/A	72.2	60.4
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	62.6	60.3
Grade 8 Reading	N/A	N/A	62.0	66.6
Writing	N/A	N/A	71.3	64.0
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	64.0	60.8

For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, Percentage of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal:

The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The following results include students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities.

CAPT Subject Area	Students with Disabilities		All Students	
	District	State	District	State
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 CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

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.

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools		
CMT	% Without Accommodations	7.4
	% With Accommodations	92.6
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		4.2

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2005-06 with a Standard Diploma	50.0	73.5
2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	12.5	3.8

DISTRICT REVENUES/EXPENDITURES 2005-06

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	\$5,724	\$5,702	\$6,897	\$6,357	\$6,888
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$129	\$129	\$271	\$275	\$249
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$148	\$148	\$214	\$354	\$402
Student Support Services	\$764	\$761	\$709	\$761	\$719
Administration and Support Services	\$868	\$865	\$1,249	\$1,188	\$1,197
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$885	\$881	\$1,037	\$1,167	\$1,199
Transportation	\$933	\$634	\$545	\$576	\$558
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$680	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$55	\$54	\$42	\$127	\$132
Total*	\$10,186	\$9,996	\$11,647	\$11,146	\$11,558
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,263	\$1,258	\$1,081	\$1,542	\$1,834
Adult Education	\$46	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$13,988; Tuition Costs, \$4,482.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$10,006.

Revenue Sources, % 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
With School Construction	50.1	46.3	3.5	0.0
Without School Construction	49.8	46.3	3.9	0.0

Selected Regular Education Expenditures, Amount Per Pupil and Percent Change from Prior Year. Selected regular education expenditures exclude costs of special education and land, building, and debt service.

Expenditures by Grade Level	District		DRG		State	
	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change
Elementary and Middle						
Total	\$7,928	4.2	\$8,842	5.6	\$9,520	5.1
Salaries and Benefits	\$6,558	4.3	\$7,079	4.3	\$7,850	5.3
Supplies	\$427	29.8	\$556	11.6	\$547	6.6
Equipment	\$31	-62.2	\$129	27.7	\$124	-6.8
High School*						
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Salaries and Benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Supplies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Equipment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*High school expenditures are not reported for districts without secondary schools.

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

As a result of our scores on the 2006 CMTs, we began the 2006-2007 school year with a school-wide goal to increase the academic achievement of all students, specifically in reading. We provided professional development activities with reading specialists to address our instructional practices, we trained staff members in the use of data to analyze student progress, we asked team /grade level staff members to use their planning meetings to review student performance and plan appropriate instructional activities and we asked our remedial reading teachers to spend time in the regular classrooms modeling instructional practices. Finally, we increased the time for collaboration between our remedial/developmental reading teachers and our classroom teachers in order to address the needs of struggling readers. Although student performance has improved, we plan to continue these activities and will add a reading coordinator during the next school year to work with all classroom teachers in grades K through 5 to help provide both the vertical and horizontal alignment of instruction and the coordination necessary to guide reading instruction in a comprehensive manner.

In the area of special education, our focus has been on inclusion of all special needs students in the regular classroom program when possible thus increasing the time with non-disabled peers. As a result of this emphasis, time with non-disabled peers has increased significantly since the 2005-2006 school year for students with special needs. This has been accomplished by an increase in the use of trained paraprofessionals working with individuals or small groups of students in the regular classroom under the supervision of the classroom teacher and the special education instructor.

Other areas of emphasis during the 2006-2007 school year have been professional development for staff and workshops for parents. Examples of the programs provided at parent workshops are: Models of Service Delivery in Brooklyn; Inclusion- Vision and Goals; and Understanding the IEP Form.

Parents and community members were involved in the review of and planning for the improvement of school programs through the following activities

- The Brooklyn Collaborative-- staff parents members of students in our early childhood programs who meet monthly to explore ways to broaden the interest in and support for the education of young children. This group has been in existence for more than five years and has been a valuable asset to the school system through its active support of our pre-school programs.
- PTO- parents and staff members who not only work to provide programs and services to classrooms and students but also are engaged in many discussions on issues affecting the school and its programs. With attendance at every Board of Education meeting and a monthly report to board members, this organization continues to be a dynamic voice in assessment of current programs and influential in the development of new programs.
- Allergy/Wellness Policy Committee—the assistant principal of the middle/elementary school was instrumental in establishing a team of parents to develop the allergy/wellness policy which has become school policy.
- Cooperative High School Planning Committee—a committee involving parents, community members, superintendents of schools and elected officials have been meeting since the fall of 2005 to explore a partnership for high school education between Brooklyn and Region 11. Through the development of a cooperative agreement between the parties, Brooklyn committee members have explored their own school system and their goals and plans for education in this community for students from. Pre-K through grade 12.

To view Strategic School Profiles on the internet, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Connecticut Education Data and Research. Additional education data are also available at this site.

For the school district website, see www.brooklynschools.org

Filename: DIST011.DOC
Directory: J:\Cloud\SSP Internet 2006-07
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\cloudr\Application
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: 19-00
Subject:
Author: csde
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 11/28/2007 3:44 PM
Change Number: 1
Last Saved On: 11/28/2007 3:44 PM
Last Saved By: csde
Total Editing Time: 0 Minutes
Last Printed On: 11/30/2007 8:50 AM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 9
Number of Words: 3,429 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 18,590 (approx.)