

**Stafford Board of Education Response to Questions**  
**from the Board of Finance**  
**March 21, 2012**

**Question #1**

**What is the percentage of special needs students in the budget and what is the total cost for special needs yearly?**

According to the State report entitled, "Analysis of Special Education as a Percentage of Total Current Expenditures (TCE)", the source of which is the 2010-2011 End of Year School Report ED001, Stafford's Special Education Expenditures of the TCE is reported as 21.74%. This is a comprehensive total of Special Education costs imbedded throughout the district's budget. The average for all reporting districts, according to this same report, is 21.69%.

**Question #2**

**Provide a list of all the grants received by the school system, what they are for and the amount.**

Attached please find a listing of grants for FY 2011-2012. While the grants are awarded per fiscal year, districts are allowed to carryover unused funding through June of the subsequent year. We have provided information for Title I, Title II, IDEA 611B and IDEA 619B, as applicable, relative to the grant year award (e.g. Year one of two; Year two of two).

**Question #3**

**Provide a copy of the projected revenue for the Board of Education.**

Attached please find the most recent 2011-2012 Education Revenue Update from the State of CT. The State does not provide Projected Education Revenues their first estimate of state aid to municipalities for 2012-2013 will be provided by the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) in September 2012.

**Question #4**

**Please detail the grants that were received last year that the school system is not getting this year.**

Grants awarded for last year are included in the response to Question #2. As indicated in the aforementioned table, the school district did not receive any Education Job Fund grant monies for this school year.

Please see the attached Grant Detail Report which lists all grants received by Stafford Public Schools for the time period of July 2009 through June 2012. The chart identifies the grant award period, grant name and amount, the amounts expended by each fiscal year and any funds available for carryover into the next fiscal year. The "Total" at the bottom of the page reflects the grant funds expended by fiscal year, with an "Adjusted Total" that removes the State Stabilization funding that was used to offset budgeted salaries, as required by the grants.

**Question #5**

**Please give a detailed list of where the funds were taken from to pay for the snow removal from the schools roofs and the amounts from each account.**

Attached is a detailed list of the accounts from which funds that were available as a result of the budget freeze that was instituted on March 10, 2011. These funds were used to offset the costs incurred for the snow removal from the school roofs.

**Question #6**

**Regarding the \$500,000 stimulus money that was received last year, please explain where this money was spent and how you plan to adjust the budget without this funding this year.**

According to the Connecticut State Department of Education's website, "Education Job Fund (Ed Jobs) Program," *the Education Jobs Fund requires that school districts use the funds to pay the salaries and benefits of teachers, school administrators, and other essential staff.* The revised allocation posted on November 16, 2011, indicated a grant award totaling \$582,038. These funds were made available in August 2010 with the stipulation that they be expended before September 2012.

We did not spend any of the grant award in FY 2010-2011, retaining the total funds to offset salary increases in FY 2011-2012. There was a Supplemental Jobs fund Authorization, as referenced above, in November 2011 in the amount of \$8,474. The loss of the stimulus money has been included in the Board of Education's Approved Itemized Estimate of the Cost of the Maintenance of Stafford Public Schools.

**Question #7**

**Several members of the Board [of Finance] asked why the Board of Education does not provide more detail on their budget. It is not clear what each line items represents and how the figures were derived.**

Attached are supplemental tables, which provide further detail and backup for the Board of Education's Itemized Estimate of the Cost of Maintenance of Stafford Public Schools.

**Question #8**

**Provide a copy of what the departments provided to Administration to create the budget.**

Attached please find the requests, which were submitted in November 2011, from Curriculum/Technology, Pupil Services, Athletics, Building Services, Stafford High School, Stafford Middle School, Stafford Elementary School, Staffordville School, and West Stafford School. Please note that these are the initial proposals that do not reflect the revisions that may have been made through the Board of Education budget process.

**Question #9**

**Regarding "Total Certified", how was this figure calculated and what is the increase?**

The table indicates proposed salaries (based on contractual obligations) and variances in dollar amounts for each of the following categories: Administrators, Certified Staff (e.g. Teachers), and Certified Related Salaries (e.g. coaches, substitutes, & tutors).

The reduction in the Administrators' salary line is attributed to two factors, as follows: the bargaining unit agreed to a 0% general wage increase and no step advancement for FY 12-13 and; two of three recently hired building administrators are currently at Step 1 (entry level) of the salary schedule. They replaced administrators that were at the top of the salary schedule.

The teachers' contract calls for a 1.75% raise in general wages, as well as step advancement for those teachers not on the highest step of the salary schedule.

**Question #10**

**In this figure, how many of these are new positions and what are they?**

There are no new positions in the Board of Education Itemized Estimate of the Cost of Maintenance of Stafford Public Schools.

**Question #11**

**Please provide student enrollment figures for the last five (5) years and the projected enrollment for 2012-2013.**

Below is a chart that details the district's enrollment as of October 1, since 2007, as well as the increase / decrease in enrollment at each grade configuration as compared to the previous year.

We do not have an accurate projection for the 12-13 school year at this time because we are awaiting pre-kindergarten / Head Start registration information and possible retention data. Additionally, the State no longer provides enrollment projection data to districts. However, to date, we are able to report that 65 children have been registered for preschool, and we expect a minimum of four children to transition from the Birth to Three System.

Grade Level	2007	2008	Increase/ Decrease 2007 vs. 08	2009	Increase/ Decrease 08 vs. 09	2010	Increase/ Decrease 09 vs. 10	2011	Increase/ Decrease 10 vs. 11
PreK	138	135	-3	136	-1	137	+1	137	0
K-1	243	248	+5	236	-12	241	+5	265	+24
2-5	526	549	+23	524	-25	503	-21	498	-5
6-8	477	427	-50	411	-16	417	+6	408	-9
9-12	521	559	+38	548	-11	565	+17	523	-42
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1905</b>	<b>1918</b>	<b>+13</b>	<b>1855</b>	<b>-65</b>	<b>1863</b>	<b>+8</b>	<b>1831</b>	<b>-32</b>

**Question #12**

**The board discussed what the Board of Education's budget was for the FY 2011-2012 and with the \$573,000 Education Jobs grant and the increase in the ECS funding of approximately \$120,000 what would be the lowest amount by which they could reduce their budget. If there is a decline in enrollment, what would the savings be per student?**

According to a recent conversation with Kevin Chambers, SDE, Bureau of Grants Management, the Town may reduce our proposed itemized estimate by \$1,422,583 to be in compliance with our Minimum Budget Requirement (MBR), resulting in a figure of \$24,830,913.

Our enrollment reflects a decrease of 33 students (This figure has increased by one student as compared to the chart above due to a recent adjustment made to our 10/1/11 student count.). Based on current State statute, should the Town choose to reduce our budget by \$3,000 per student, this would possibly result in an additional reduction of \$99,000. Therefore, the actual MBR for 2012-2013 would be \$24,731,913, a reduction in the proposed itemized estimate of \$1,521,573. (A copy of a memorandum from the Department of Education dated July 29, 2011, regarding the 2011-2012 MBR Determination is attached for your information. Please note that this memo refers to the 11-12 budget, not the 12-13 budget; however, the determination process should remain the same for 12-13.)

Mr. Chambers also verified that the proposed increase to the Education Cost Sharing (ECS) Entitlement grant is \$120,738. It has not been approved at this time and the Governor has indicated that the Town may use this money for tax relief.

**Question #13**

**Workers Compensation –Why does the bottom statement say 15% increase and the variance shows a 22% increase?**

According to the Expense Detail by Account for 2011-2012 Workers' Compensation line, which is attached, Penny, Hanley and Howley recommended we budget for a 15% increase over this year's actual costs. The figure quoted by our broker for budgetary purposes in the current 2011-2012 budget was under-estimated and there was an audit adjustment of an additional \$7,040.

**Question #14**

**Social Security - The salaries' lines are showing an increase, why is the Social Security line then going down?**

The Certified and Administrative staff do not pay Social Security. There has been a wage reduction in the Non-Certified Salaries as a result of staffing changes with new employees being hired at a lesser rate in open positions. This calculation is driven by actual salaries at the time of the budget process. This is why there is a lower request in the Social Security line.

**Question #15**

**Capital Improvements: Why does the gym floor at the High School have to be refinished when it was just done during the high School renovation project?**

Hillyard Industries, Inc. conducted an analysis of the peelings from SHS's gymnasium floor and provided a written report dated March 8, 2011, to the district. According to the analysis, the peeling is occurring four layers deep into the coating and averaging 3.7 mils thick.

The exact cause of the peeling is unknown, but the Director of Athletics and Recreation, the current Principal of Stafford High School, the Head Custodian, the district Maintenance Worker and our previous Director of Building Services met with the flooring representatives and implemented a plan to ensure safety until it can be refinished this summer. This preliminary work, completed in November 2011, was intended to preserve the floor and allow usage of the high school gymnasium floor for both school- and town-sponsored activities.

**Question #16**

**Repairs/Maintenance –District:**

- Explain in more detail what the 82,075 increase is for and what the cost breakdown is.**
- The actual amount expended in 2010-2011.**

Attached is the request summary and corresponding detail for the Department of Building Services. The detail reflects data sorted by each of the five schools, the Pinney Administration Building, and the district, in general. The chairman of the BOF has been provided with a 27-page final report of total expenditures for the FY 2010-2011 by account.

**Question #17**

**Transportation:**

- Give detail about each reimbursable vs. non-reimbursable.**
- What is the reimbursable rate?**

Reimbursable transportation is the portion of our transportation costs for the district's regular education students. This category includes Vo-Ag, Vo-Tech, In-district buses, monitors, Head Start, summer school and regular education fuel. In addition, the reimbursable transportation category also includes the aforementioned items and private contracts for transportation (e.g. Coordinated Transportation Systems) which may transport one or two students to out-of-district programs. Non-reimbursable transportation refers to the district's athletic programs and field trips and is not eligible in the Public Transportation revenue calculation. Public Transportation revenue goes to the Town. This reimbursement is determined by our ED001 filing and is calculated by the State through this filing process.

Below please find a copy of the detailed backup for our transportation request for FY 2012-2013.

STAFFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION			
2012-2013 BUDGET			
TRANSPORTATION			
ITEM	2011-2012	2012-2013	VARIANCE
510	APPROVED	PROPOSED	
REGULAR ED			
VO-AG – 1	47,138	47,880	742
VO-TECH – 2	94,276	95,760	1,484
IN DISTRICT - 24	1,117,506	1,149,120	31,614
MONITORS	95,240	45,000	-50,240
HEAD START - 1.5	70,707	71,820	1,113
SUMMER SCHOOL	23,314	25,536	2,222
REGULAR ED FUEL (\$3.0618/GALLON)	134,591	159,774	25,184
SPECIAL ED & PUPIL SERVICES			
IN DISTRICT-7	379,911	393,789	13,878
MONITORS	90,842	60,000	-30,842
OUTSIDE CONTRACTS-3	27,300	60,000	32,700
SUMMER SCHOOL	50,000	50,000	0
SPECIAL ED & PUPIL SERVICES FUEL	33,057	39,243	6,185
REIMBURSABLE	2,163,883	2,197,922	34,039
581			
ATHLETICS	9,658	18,142	8,484
FIELD TRIPS	11,819	10,920	-899
NON-REIMBURSABLE	21,477	29,062	7,585
TOTAL	2,185,360	2,226,984	41,624

According to the State Data Reference, “2010-2011 End of Year School Report ED001,” Public Transportation Expenditures totaled \$1,589,589 or 5.99% of our Total Current Expenditures.

Please refer to the report that was included in our response to question #3 from the CSDE Finance and Internal Operations, “2011-12 Revenues for Selected State Grants”. This report includes information from our Education Cost Sharing (ECS) grant, Transportation Grant, Excess Cost Grant, Adult Education Grant, and Health Services Grant.

A question was raised regarding the transportation fees that students pay for participation in high school and middle school sports. Please see the attached copy of the athletic budget detail. Also, please note that the gate fees reduce the budget request for “Officials” and that the high school and middle school transportation fees reduce the budget request for “Transportation”.

### **Question #18**

#### **Tuition-Number of students this represents and what it includes.**

The attached table indicates the number and corresponding tuition rates for students projected to attend special education out-of-district placements, magnet schools and vocational-agricultural schools. The anticipated excess cost monies (estimated at 70%) has been deducted from the total [i.e. \$798,000-(\$119,922 + \$209,749) = \$648,329].

Of those students listed on the table we provided, the eight special education students listed in the first section (Out of District Tuition) are included in Stafford’s October 1, 2011, student count. The remaining 33 students listed on the table are reported by the school district that they attend, and therefore, are not included in Stafford’s October 1, 2011, enrollment. A revised backup page has been attached for your information.

**Question #19**

**Instructional Supplies-Explain the increase and give detail of what is included in this figure.**

Below is a table indicating the detail on the Instructional Supply lines.

<b>STAFFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION</b>			
<b>2012-2013 BUDGET</b>			
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES</b>			
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>VARIANCE</b>
<b>611</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>	
<b>HIGH SCHOOL</b>	45,144	56,446	11,302
<b>MIDDLE SCHOOL</b>	51,806	51,061	-745
<b>STAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</b>	56,790	56,662	-128
<b>WEST STAFFORD SCHOOL</b>	14,813	20,897	6,084
<b>STAFFORDVILLE SCHOOL</b>	16,126	16,403	277
<b>PUPIL SERVICES</b>	22,000	48,800	26,800
<b>CENTRAL OFFICE</b>	22,340	22,340	0
<b>AUDIO VISUAL</b>	2,500	1,250	-1,250
<b>STUDENT DATA WAREHOUSING</b>	7,000	8,000	1,000
<b>ATHLETICS</b>	12,457	12,957	500
<b>CURRICULUM</b>			
<b>SCHOOL CLIMATE</b>	2,500	2,500	0
<b>SCIENCE</b>	11,500	12,500	1,000
<b>Scientific Research Based Intervention</b>	15,000	1,500	-13,500
<b>CURRICULUM UPGRADE TECH ED</b>	0	12,000	12,000
<b>LIBRARIAN</b>	1,250	1,250	0
<b>SUMMER SCHOOL</b>	2,500	3,500	1,000
<b>TECHNOLOGY</b>	39,650	49,550	9,900
<b>LANGUAGE ARTS</b>	4,000	8,000	4,000
<b>TESTING/SCORING</b>	20,000	20,000	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>347,376</b>	<b>405,616</b>	<b>58,240</b>

**Question #20**

**Explain in detail what the request is for the Video Lab.**

When the high school was renovated, a TV studio was incorporated so that a video editing course could be added to the program of studies. While there is a very nice studio room and the course is listed in our program of studies, the high school does not have the hardware to offer such a course. In addition, Stafford High School does not currently create or provide video announcements or video presentations. With the purchase of the necessary equipment for a video lab, Administration hopes to have student-produced video announcements/Student News on a daily basis while also enabling SHS students to complete and digitally store video presentations. Doing so would also allow the high school to publicize events and notices more effectively while increasing school spirit and promoting a positive school climate. Furthermore, using the current V-Brick system, SHS should be able to digitally record oral presentations and teacher-directed lessons for use in the classroom, which aligns with the school's initiative to increase the development of 21<sup>st</sup> century skills.

A member of the Board of Finance raised a question regarding the student parking fees that are charged at the high school. In previous school years, the parking fees were used to offset the cost of supplies at the high school. In 2011 – 2012, \$6,200 was collected from students for parking fees. Of that amount, \$2,192.29 was expended on supplies for the technology department, which had been cut from the budget last year. The remaining \$4,007.71, in addition to the anticipated \$6,200 for 2012 – 2013, will be used to offset the projected cost of the video lab in the amount of \$9,536, in anticipation of a potential reduction to the BOE's proposed 2012-2013 budget. In future budget years, this revenue will be reflected in our budget in the same manner as the athletic transportation fees (please see response for Question #17 above).

### **Questions #21 and #22**

**Technology- give a detailed breakdown of what the increase is for  
IT Licensing Fees- explain the increase; what is it for?**

Below please find a detailed list of the accounts in the technology budget, along with a breakdown of the items included in the 730 account (technology equipment). In addition, attached to this document is a spreadsheet that further details each item and the associated cost contained in each technology account (including account 810- Licensing and Fees).

STAFFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION				
2012-2013 BUDGET				
TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM BUDGET				
ACCOUNT	ITEM	2011-2012	2012-2013	VARIANCE
NUMBER		APPROVED	PROPOSED	
430	REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE	78,010	84,350	6,340
530	COMMUNICATIONS	18,000	18,759	759
610	SUPPLIES	39,650	49,550	9,900
730	EQUIPMENT (detailed below)	86,500	135,546	49,046
810	LICENSING FEES	16,043	27,393	11,350
	TOTAL	238,203	315,598	77,395

TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT- ACCOUNT 730			
	2011-2012	2012-2013	VARIANCE
ITEM	APPROVED	PROPOSED	
WORKSTATIONS – 100	60,000	80,300	20,300
MOBILE LAPTOP CART - 1	2,000	23,800	21,800
FILE SERVER	9,000	9,000	0
MISC HARDWARE	2,500	2,500	0
DESKJET PRINTERS	1,500	0	-1,500
LASERJET PRINTERS	1,500	1,500	0
MIMIO XI	2,500	3,200	700
LCD COMPUTER PROJECTORS	6,500	6,500	0
SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY	0	0	0
LCD BRACKETS	1,000	1,000	0
REWIRE SVS	0	5,946	5,946
SWITCHES	0	1,800	1,800
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>86,500</b>	<b>135,546</b>	<b>49,046</b>

**Question #23**

**Provide a copy of the Board of Education's inventory with as much detail as to what, how many and where each item is located.**

When the district asked for further clarification regarding this question, Beth directed us to refer to our GASB 34 inventory, which should state what and where each item is located along with the cost less depreciation. Mr. Muska has been provided with a copy of the following reports: Fixed Asset Listing by Asset Id (13 pages), Stafford Public Schools Software Inventory (3 pages), Computer Inventory- Stafford High School (6 pages) and Computer Inventory- PreK - 8 (11 pages).

**Question #24**

**How often are the computers on the laptop carts used?**

Stafford High School has two laptop carts, one of which is included in the technology budget in account #730 for replacement. The 2011- 2012 usage is detailed below:

**Cart A**

Sept – March 16<sup>th</sup>: 176 period checkouts

Sept – March 16<sup>th</sup>: 91 days with at least one checkout

Cart A is stationed in the Library. It has an antiquated wireless system, which deters usage due to the fact that it requires the use of 10 – 15 minutes of instructional time to prepare for usage. This is the cart that is included in the budget for replacement.

**Cart B**

Sept – March 16<sup>th</sup>: 118 period checkouts

Sept- March 16<sup>th</sup>: 62 days with at least one check out

Cart B is stationed in a classroom where students access the laptops every day. The “checkout” data is based on checkouts from that room. Therefore, CART B is utilized everyday and almost every period.

Stafford Middle School has two laptop carts. Both carts are used on average for six out of seven periods per day. In addition, the laptops are used on Tuesdays and Thursdays for extra help and student research projects, and on Wednesdays for the Newspaper Club. Both carts are already fully booked from March 26 (the conclusion of Connecticut Mastery Testing) through the end of the school year.

Stafford Elementary School has three laptop carts. The carts are used on average 40% of the time that they are available.

### **Question #25**

#### **What is the dropout rate for Stafford?**

The following information was shared at the Dropout Prevention Committee meeting on January 30, 2012. We thought it may be helpful to provide this information to you as it may facilitate your understanding of graduation rate (on time), students from the respective cohorts still in school (working to meet graduation requirements) and the actual percentage of students who dropped out of school.

Beginning with the graduating class of 2010, a new formula was used to compute graduation rates. Only students who graduate from high school within four years are considered as “graduated on time”. Students completing graduation requirements within four years elsewhere (i.e. Adult Education, GED programs, Job Corps, etc.) are NOT included in the “graduated on time.”

Category	2010	2011
Number of Students in Cohort	125	134
Graduation Rate (On Time)	76.8%	77.6%
Still in School	12.8%	10.5%
Drop Outs	9.6%	11.9%

There were seven students that did not report for the 2011 – 2012 school year. Two students have withdrawn since the beginning of the 2011 -2012 school year to attend night school.

### **Question #26**

#### **What are the average class sizes per school and the cost per student? Explain how the cost is calculated.**

	PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
SVS	14	15	23											
WSS	17.5	18	21											
SES				19	20	20.5	21.5							
SMS								15.4	22.6	20.3				
SHS											*	*	*	*

\*SHS data is best interpreted by average class size by department as described below:

Department	Average Class Size
English	16
Foreign Language	16
Science	18
Girls Physical Education	29
Boys Physical Education	21
Health	14
Music	21
Math	16
Art	17
Technology Education	14
Technology/Business	19.5
Social Studies	19

Note: Because in some cases only a few students meet the prerequisite requirements for specific courses (e.g. Advanced Placement, Early College Experience, French 5, etc.), these classes have a lower enrollment than do general curricular courses (e.g. World Cultures). Second, enrollment in most Technology classes is limited by the number of available work stations. And lastly, classes for students with special needs are not included in the aforementioned calculations as the figures would skew averages due to the nature of some of the classes and mandated Planning and Placement Team (PPT) recommendations.

The high school's average class size, as reported in the Strategic School Profile for 2010 – 2011, in comparison to the State and District Reference Group (DRG), is as follows:

**District- 16.9**

**DRG- 17.8**

**State- 19.3**

A copy of the Strategic School Profile for 2010 – 2011 has been included for your information. An explanation of District Reference Groups (DRGs) and a list of the DRGs in Connecticut are also attached for your review.

### **Overview of Cost per Student Calculation from the SDE Website**

#### **Net Current Expenditures 2010-11**

Net current expenditures (NCE) are calculated as defined in Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) Section 10-261(a)(3). NCE includes all current public elementary and secondary expenditures from all sources, excluding reimbursable regular education transportation, tuition revenue, capital expenditures for land, buildings and equipment, and debt service. The information for determining NCE is provided from the End of Year School Report (ED001).

#### **Average Daily Membership 2010-11**

Pursuant to C.G.S. Section 10-261(a)(2), average daily membership (ADM) is calculated from the October 2010 Public School Information System (PSIS) and the 2010-11 ED001. ADM represents resident students educated in and out of district, adjusted for school sessions in excess of the 180-day/900-hour minimum, tuition-free summer school and participation in Open Choice. Prekindergarten students are counted on a full-time equivalency basis.

**Net current expenditures per pupil (NCEP) represents NCE divided by ADM.**

Please see the attached copies of the 2010 – 2011 and 2009-2010 Net Current Expenditures per Pupil Reports, as requested. Please note that the last page of each report contains comparison data for the State and each DRG.

## Grant Detail

Backup for Question #4

Award Period	Grant Name	Award Amount	Expended 2009-2010	Expended 2010-2011	Anticipated Expenditures 2011-2012	Carry Over 2012-2013
2010-2011	SCHOOL READINESS	107,000		107,000		0
2011-2012	SCHOOL READINESS	107,000			107,000	0
2010-2011	FAMILY RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM	97,000		97,000		0
2011-2012	FAMILY RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM	92,435			92,435	0
2010-2011	AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM	133,500		133,500		0
2011-2012	AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM	119,071			119,071	0
2009-2011	TITLE I IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS	167,256	159,848	7,408		0
2010-2012	TITLE I IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS	163,353		149,313	14,040	0
2011-2013	TITLE I IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS	156,740			108,000	48,740
2010-2011	CARL D PERKINS	27,691		27,691		0
2010-2011	CARL D PERKINS	17,515		17,515		0
2011-2012	CARL D PERKINS	15,593			15,593	0
2008-2010	TITLE II, D, E2T2	65,000	65,000			0
2009-2011	TITLE II-PART A TEACHERS	64,015	37,284	26,731		0
2010-2012	TITLE II-PART A TEACHERS	64,827		50,018	14,809	0
2011-2013	TITLE II-PART A TEACHERS	57,519			20,519	37,000
2010-2012	TITLE IV - SAFE & DRUG FREE SCHOOLS	4,909	1,404	3,505		0
2009-2011	IDEA-PART B, SECTION 611	384,189	384,189			0
2010-2012	IDEA-PART B, SECTION 611	383,788		383,788		0
2011-2013	IDEA-PART B, SECTION 611	379,632			379,632	0
2009-2011	IDEA, PART B, SECTION 619	14,004	14,004			0
2010-2012	IDEA, PART B, SECTION 619	14,005		14,005		0
2011-2013	IDEA, PART B, SECTION 619	14,014			14,014	0
2010-2012	EDUCATION JOBS FUND	582,038			582,038	0
2009-2011	ARRA IDEA PART B, SECTION 611	398,777	279,616	119,161		0
2009-2011	ARRA - IDEA, PART B, SECTION 619	15,795	15,795			0
2010-2011	ARRA STABILIZATION - ED GRANTS	1,399,461		1,399,461		0
2009-2011	ARRA - EDUCATIONAL TECH	2,055	2,055			0
	<b>Total</b>		<b>959,195</b>	<b>2,536,096</b>	<b>1,467,151</b>	<b>85,740</b>
	<b>Less One-time ARRA and Ed Jobs Fund</b>			<b>-1,399,461</b>	<b>-582,038</b>	
	<b>Adjusted Total</b>		<b>959,195</b>	<b>1,136,635</b>	<b>885,113</b>	



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



TO: Superintendents of Schools  
School Business Managers  
Town Finance Officers

FROM: Brian Mahoney, Chief Financial Officer *BM*  
Division of Finance and Internal Operations

DATE: July 29, 2011

SUBJECT: 2011-12 Minimum Budget Requirement and Related Reporting Requirements

This is to clarify both the 2011-12 Minimum Budget Requirement (MBR) and the reporting requirements necessary for the State Department of Education (SDE) to compute the MBR and monitor compliance.

**MBR Determination**

**A. Base MBR**

Pursuant to Section 1 of Public Act 11-234, the 2011-12 MBR shall equal the 2010-11 budgeted appropriation(s) to the board of education plus any applicable reductions concerning the 2010-11 federal State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (SFSF) that supported the Education Cost Sharing (ECS) grant.

**B. Reductions to MBR**

Under certain circumstances, legislation provides for potential reductions to the MBR:

1. If your district's October 2010 resident student count is less than the October 2009 count, your MBR is reduced by \$3,000 for each such reduced count. However, the maximum reduction under this provision cannot exceed one-half of one percent of the 2011-12 base MBR.
2. If your district does not operate a high school and is not a member of a regional school district and your October 2010 designated high school students have decreased from the prior year, your MBR is reduced by the 2010-11 tuition rate for each such reduced count. However, the maximum reduction under this provision is one-half of one percent of the 2011-12 base MBR.

**When reviewing whether the MBR reduction options are applicable, please note the following:**

1. If your district falls under both of the above reduction options, the MBR is reduced up to one percent.
2. The reduction options do not apply to the following districts:
  - a. those that are in the third year or more of being identified as in need of improvement under Section 10-223e of the Connecticut General Statutes;
  - b. those that are in safe harbor;
  - c. those identified as in need of improvement and have a Title I poverty rate of at least 10 percent; and

	#	Coaches	Officials	Uniforms	Equip	Supplies	Transportation	Totals
Athletic Trainer	1	7,500				1,000		8,500
Football	3	10,045	2,769		500	550	2,688	16,552
JV Football		0	925				698	1,623
Boys Soccer	1	3,593	1,459			545	1,338	6,935
JV Boys Soccer	1	1,864	714					2,578
Girls Soccer	1	3,593	1,459			545	1,338	6,935
JV Girls Soccer	1	1,864	714					2,578
Field Hockey	1	3,593	1,388			761	1,699	7,441
JV Field Hockey	1	1,864	925					2,789
X-Country B/G	2	5,390	708				1,355	7,453
FB Cheerleading	1	1,621	208				412	2,241
Basketball	1	4,590	1,894			500	2,427	9,411
JV Basketball	1	3,068	1,231					4,299
Freshman BB	1	1,963	864				1,051	3,878
Girls Basketball	1	4,590	1,894			500	2,427	9,411
JV Girls Basketball	1	3,068	1,231					4,299
Wrestling	1	3,268	1,641			500	1,856	7,265
Asst. Wrestling	1	1,666						1,666
Indoor Track B/G	2	4,902					2,427	7,329
Asst. Indoor Track	1	1,864						1,864
BB Cheerleading	1	1,621						1,621
Baseball	1	3,593	1,800		600	1,107	1,085	8,185
JV Baseball	1	1,864	1,158				1,085	4,107
Softball	1	3,593	1,659			500	1,085	6,837
JV Softball	1	1,864	1,113				1,085	4,062
Track Boys/Girls	2	5,390	5,115		4,130	2,200	1,085	17,920
Asst. Track	2	3,728						3,728
Golf	1	3,172	2,542			600	1,456	7,770
Scrim. & Tourn.			892				2,266	3,158
Awards						1,800		1,800
Reconditioning					3200			3,200
Gate		Gate Fees (10,000)				HS Transportation Fees (12,721)		(22,721)
Support Staff			20,002					20,002
Unified Sports						500	2,000	2,500
Total		94,731	44,305	0	5,230	11,608	18,142	177,216
Boys Soccer	1	1,864	932				1,182	3,978
Girls Soccer	1	1,864	932				1,182	3,978
Field Hockey	1	1,864	354			783	1,182	4,183
X-Country B/G	1	1,864	410				1,182	3,456
Boys Basketball	1	2,006	1,079				1,182	4,267
Girls Basketball	1	2,006	1,079				1,182	4,267
Basketball Superv.	1		902					902
Timer-Basketball	1		498					498
						MS Transportation Fees (9,456)		(9,456)
Spring								-
Baseball	1	1,864	647		780	566	1,182	5,039
Softball	1	1,864	647				1,182	3,693
MS total		15,196	7,480	0	780	1,349	0	24,805
HS total		7,500	10,002	0	5,230	11,608	18,142	52,482
		87,231	34,303		3,200			124,734
Grand Total		109,927	51,785	0	9,210	12,957	18,142	202,021

fee/gate

fee

Budget Request

Gate

Total

Budget Request

202,021

Number of Students			
	<b>Special Education Out of District Tuition</b>		
3	Tuition Private Day Placement A	\$56,500.00	\$169,500.00
1	Tuition Private Day Placement B	\$95,500.00	\$95,500.00
1	Tuition Private Day Placement C	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00
1	Tuition Private Day Placement D	\$65,000.00	\$65,000.00
1	Tuition Private Residential Placement A	\$85,000.00	\$85,000.00
1	Tuition Private Residential Placement B	\$53,000.00	\$53,000.00
<u>8</u>	Excess Cost 70%		(\$119,922.00)
1	Tuition Public Day Placement E	\$170,000.00	\$170,000.00
1	Tuition Public Day Placement F	\$140,000.00	\$140,000.00
1	Tuition Public Day Placement G	\$95,000.00	\$95,000.00
1	Tuition Public Day Placement H	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00
	Excess Cost 70%		(\$209,749.00)
			<b>\$648,329.00</b>
	<b>Magnet School</b>		
1	ACT	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00
1	Montessori	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
1	PSA	\$6,000.00	\$5,000.00
1	Public Magnet - CREC Univ of Hartford	\$3,327.00	\$3,327.00
2	Public Magnet - CREC Montessori	\$2,928.00	\$5,856.00
1	GHAA	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00
1	Two Rivers	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00
4	PSA	\$3,200.00	\$12,800.00
7	Public Magnet - EASTCONN ACT	\$4,950.00	\$34,650.00
1	Great Path	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00
	ACT transportation	\$19,000.00	\$19,000.00
			<b>\$107,233.00</b>
	<b>Vocational Agriculture</b>		
9	Rockville Vo-Ag	\$7,992.00	\$71,928.00

33

Included  
in Stafford's  
10/1/11 Student  
CountNot  
included  
in Stafford's  
10/1/11  
Student  
count

# CONNECTICUT VOICES FOR CHILDREN



## District Reference Groups (DRGs) Formerly Educational Reference Groups (ERGs)

June 2006

Since 1996, the Connecticut State Department of Education has divided school districts into nine groups called Educational Reference Groups.<sup>i</sup> These nine groups are determined according to socio-economic status and other factors. The nine groups, labeled A through I, were recently reclassified District Reference Groups (DRGs) using updated data but the *same formula*.<sup>ii</sup>

Seven data indicators are used to classify similar districts into a DRG: three indicators of socioeconomic status (median family income<sup>1</sup>, parental education<sup>1</sup> and parental occupation<sup>1</sup>), three indicators of need (percentage of children living in families with a single parent<sup>1</sup>, the percentage of public school children eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals<sup>2</sup> and percentage of children whose families speak a language other than English at home<sup>2</sup>) and enrollment (the number of students attending schools in that district<sup>2</sup>).<sup>iii</sup>

The most affluent and low-need districts, as measured by these indicators, are grouped in DRG A while the poorest and highest need districts – including Connecticut's five biggest cities – are grouped in DRG I. Following this new re-classification, many of the 169 school districts are in the DRG that corresponds to their former ERG classification (where DRGs A, B, C through I correspond respectively to ERGs A, B, C through I). Twenty-seven districts were reclassified into less affluent, higher need DRGs than their former ERGs, and 23 were reclassified into more affluent, lower need DRGs than their former ERGs.<sup>iv</sup>

The composition of some reference groups changed little as a result of this new classification. DRG I comprises the seven districts that made up ERG I and includes no districts previously classified in other ERGs. Seventeen of the nineteen districts formerly in ERG B are now classified in DRG B. Nine of the twelve districts previously classified in ERG A are now classified in DRG A.

The composition of groups F and G changed most dramatically after the June 2006 re-classification. Only three districts that had been classified in ERG G remain in DRG G and only five former ERG F districts remain in DRG F. The table above indicates the number of districts in each (former) ERG, in each DRG and the number re-classified into the same reference group it was in before. The table on the reverse of this fact sheet indicates each district's previous and new classification.

Reference Group	# of Districts in former ERG	# of Districts in current DRG	# of Districts in common
A	12	9	9
B	19	21	17
C	38	30	26
D	21	24	16
E	25	34	22
F	16	17	5
G	15	15	3
H	13	9	9
I	7	7	7

<sup>i</sup> Since the late 1970s, the Department has used Census and other data to classify districts, first in six groups and later seven.

<sup>ii</sup> Educational Reference Groups were designated using 1990 Census data while the new District Reference Groups were determined using 2000 Census data as well as updated enrollment data and a new indicator of poverty.

<sup>iii</sup> The socioeconomic status and need data describe the resident population of the school district, which may not be the same population the district serves.

<sup>iv</sup> It is important to note that districts are categorized relative to other districts using a statistical model, not according to absolute measures of socioeconomic status, need or enrollment, and that changes in DRG designation may reflect this relative status rather than a change in the data indicators.

1. Based on National Center for Educational Statistics census data from 2000 Census. 2. Based on Public School Information System.

## Appendix A

## District Reference Groups (DRG)

Group A				
035 DARIEN	090 NEW CANAAN	118 RIDGEFIELD	158 WESTPORT	209 DISTRICT NO. 9
046 EASTON	117 REDDING	157 WESTON	161 WILTON	
Group B				
004 AVON	054 GLASTONBURY	076 MADISON	107 ORANGE	155 WEST HARTFORD
018 BROOKFIELD	056 GRANBY	085 MONROE	128 SIMSBURY	167 WOODBRIDGE
025 CHESHIRE	057 GREENWICH	091 NEW FAIRFIELD	132 SOUTH WINDSOR	205 DISTRICT NO. 5
051 FAIRFIELD	060 GUILFORD	097 NEWTOWN	144 TRUMBULL	215 DISTRICT NO. 15
052 FARMINGTON				
Group C				
001 ANDOVER	031 CORNWALL	092 NEW HARTFORD	139 SUFFIELD	212 DISTRICT NO. 12
005 BARKHAMSTED	048 ELLINGTON	108 OXFORD	142 TOLLAND	213 DISTRICT NO. 13
008 BETHANY	050 ESSEX	112 POMFRET	204 DISTRICT NO. 4	214 DISTRICT NO. 14
012 BOLTON	067 HEBRON	121 SALEM	207 DISTRICT NO. 7	217 DISTRICT NO. 17
023 CANTON	078 MANSFIELD	127 SHERMAN	208 DISTRICT NO. 8	218 DISTRICT NO. 18
030 COLUMBIA	079 MARLBOROUGH	129 SOMERS	210 DISTRICT NO. 10	219 DISTRICT NO. 19
Group D				
007 BERLIN	033 CROMWELL	084 MILFORD	119 ROCKY HILL	152 WATERFORD
009 BETHEL	040 EAST GRANBY	094 NEWINGTON	126 SHELTON	153 WATERTOWN
014 BRANFORD	042 EAST HAMPTON	096 NEW MILFORD	131 SOUTHTON	159 WETHERSFIELD
027 CLINTON	045 EAST LYME	101 NORTH HAVEN	137 STONINGTON	164 WINDSOR
028 COLCHESTER	072 LEDYARD	106 OLD SAYBROOK	148 WALLINGFORD	
Group E				
003 ASHFORD	032 COVENTRY	068 KENT	113 PORTLAND	154 WESTBROOK
013 BOZRAH	036 DEEP RIVER	071 LEBANON	114 PRESTON	160 WILLINGTON
019 BROOKLYN	039 EASTFORD	073 LISBON	122 SALISBURY	169 WOODSTOCK
021 CANAAN	041 EAST HADDAM	074 LITCHFIELD	123 SCOTLAND	201 DISTRICT NO. 1
024 CHAPLIN	053 FRANKLIN	098 NORFOLK	125 SHARON	206 DISTRICT NO. 6
026 CHESTER	063 HAMPTON	099 NORTH BRANFORD	140 THOMASTON	216 DISTRICT NO. 16
029 COLEBROOK	065 HARTLAND	102 NORTH STONINGTON	145 UNION	903 WOODSTOCK ACADEMY
Group F				
022 CANTERBURY	086 MONTVILLE	111 PLYMOUTH	134 STAFFORD	147 VOLUNTOWN
047 EAST WINDSOR	100 NORTH CANAAN	124 SEYMOUR	136 STERLING	165 WINDSOR LOCKS
049 ENFIELD	110 PLAINVILLE	133 SPRAGUE	141 THOMPSON	166 WOLCOTT
058 GRISWOLD				211 DISTRICT NO. 11
Group G				
011 BLOOMFIELD	062 HAMDEN	083 MIDDLETOWN	116 PUTNAM	146 VERNON
017 BRISTOL	069 KILLINGLY	088 NAUGATUCK	138 STRATFORD	162 WINCHESTER
044 EAST HAVEN	077 MANCHESTER	109 PLAINFIELD	143 TORRINGTON	901 NORWICH FREE ACAD.
059 GROTON				902 GILBERT SCHOOL
Group H				
002 ANSONIA	037 DERBY	080 MERIDEN	104 NORWICH	156 WEST HAVEN
034 DANBURY	043 EAST HARTFORD	103 NORWALK	135 STAMFORD	
Group I				
015 BRIDGEPORT	089 NEW BRITAIN	093 NEW HAVEN	095 NEW LONDON	151 WATERBURY
064 HARTFORD				163 WINDHAM

134 - 00

DRAFT

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

THERESE G. FISHMAN, Superintendent

Location: 263 East Street Route 19  
Stafford Springs,  
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 684-5172

Website: [www.stafford.ctschool.net](http://www.stafford.ctschool.net)


---

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: Tolland

Town Population in 2000: 11,307

1990-2000 Population Growth: 1.9%

Number of Public Schools: 5

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$22,017

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 18.4%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 0.6%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.4%

---

\*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): F 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      1,854  
5-Year Enrollment Change      -6.7%

---

**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	509	27.5	27.3	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	16	0.9	1.9	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	14	0.8	2.9	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	163	8.8	11.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	108	87.1	73.3	80.2
Homeless	9	0.5	0.2	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	28	16.0	13.4	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	2	0.1
Asian American	28	1.5
Black	14	0.8
Hispanic	88	4.7
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	1,653	89.2
Two or more races	69	3.7
Total Minority	201	10.8

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.7%

**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 12.

---

#### 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.

Although there are fewer Interdistrict Cooperative Grants available, Stafford continues to seek out and participate in inter-district programs, such as Imagination Connection, Minds in Motion, and Legacy Explorations, to increase contact with diverse student populations. Within our economically-diverse community, we have worked to reduce isolation in significant ways. All Stafford students from second grade to twelfth grade interact while learning at district wide schools. Over the last five years there have been opportunities for younger students and families of different neighborhoods to work together in intradistrict school sponsored programs. Stafford offers every student the option of attending Preschool through local support and School Readiness Grant funding. Events sponsored by the district's Family Resource Center bring the community of young families throughout the town together. The Discovery Grant from the Graustein Memorial Fund continues to be a significant factor in facilitating conversations about valuing diversity, promoting tolerance and appreciating multicultural perspectives. Last year a Community Plan for Children Birth to Eight was developed in concert with State and local officials and families. Over the past five years, initiatives at all schools have been instrumental in focusing students and staff on specific diversity themes. Thoughtful replacement of texts and curriculum revision have been instrumental in redefining and enlarging the multicultural experience of students. We continue to explore opportunities to honor multicultural voices by expanding literature titles in school libraries. Field trips to local, regional, and international destinations broaden students' perspectives and experiences. As well, with the use of grant and local PTO funds, our students were exposed to additional multicultural experiences such as an African storyteller, a pen pal program, and puppeteer from the Connecticut Commission on Culture. The increasing capability to access Internet-supported activities also helps our students to understand other cultures. During 2010-11 we expanded our participation in distance learning projects with schools in other regions of the United States, Canada, and Europe. The district's commitment to the Responsive Classroom model has added depth to students' capacity to interact with each other and develop positive character traits in grades PK- 5. Additionally, the district has made great strides in promoting and implementing inclusion practices via a continuum of collaborative services and models so all children can have access to high quality learning experiences together. We plan to continue to expand our partnerships with diverse communities through increased participation in Interdistrict Cooperative Grants and partnerships with Priority School Districts during the next school year. Future efforts will also look to technology and beyond the school day programming to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation, thereby reflecting the district's theme of "It takes a whole village to raise a child".

---

## 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	66.4	58.4	51.3	
Writing	59.8	61.1	33.5	
Mathematics	65.6	63.0	42.2	
Grade 4 Reading	57.6	62.5	22.7	
Writing	58.5	65.5	18.3	
Mathematics	56.0	67.0	14.6	
Grade 5 Reading	64.0	61.4	38.7	
Writing	62.8	66.8	26.4	
Mathematics	77.5	72.5	43.6	
Science	68.1	59.9	46.0	
Grade 6 Reading	81.0	76.0	42.9	
Writing	63.4	65.2	33.9	
Mathematics	76.5	71.3	46.4	
Grade 7 Reading	86.6	77.8	54.8	
Writing	81.2	58.9	86.1	
Mathematics	82.4	68.4	66.7	
Grade 8 Reading	90.0	74.7	79.6	
Writing	85.8	64.8	79.6	
Mathematics	88.9	66.6	86.6	
Science	81.4	63.1	68.8	

**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	58.3	44.7	66.7	
Writing Across the Disciplines	77.2	61.2	68.4	
Mathematics	62.2	49.5	63.9	
Science	44.5	47.0	37.6	

**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
	40.7	51.0	25.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		65.0	N/A	
Average Score	Mathematics	510	510	51.1
	Critical Reading	517	505	58.8
	Writing	503	510	41.2

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	80.0	91.8	8.3
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.4	3.0	12.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	81.0	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	14.0	9.1

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	123.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	28.76
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	19.20
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	38.38
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	7.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	11.45
School Nurses	7.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	111.45

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	14.3	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	76.4	76.3	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.1	16.3	18.4
Grade 2	20.7	18.8	19.9
Grade 5	18.7	19.5	21.2
Grade 7	19.7	19.8	20.6
High School	16.9	17.8	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	986	1,002	987
Middle School	1,022	1,019	1,017
High School	1,004	1,010	1,009

\*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*	3.2	3.0	3.1
Middle School	3.0	2.4	2.4
High School	2.5	2.1	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	\$14,971	\$8,141	\$8,232	\$7,870	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$385	\$210	\$299	\$275	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$419	\$228	\$477	\$265	\$463
Student Support Services	\$1,922	\$1,045	\$875	\$744	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$2,774	\$1,508	\$1,433	\$1,396	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,375	\$1,292	\$1,421	\$1,434	\$1,410
Transportation	\$2,017	\$1,050	\$701	\$710	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,607	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$83	\$45	\$161	\$168	\$159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$26,553</b>	<b>\$14,109</b>	<b>\$13,878</b>	<b>\$13,047</b>	<b>\$13,780</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,703	\$926	\$1,622	\$1,470	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,064,812	22.8	20.0	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	54.2	36.1	9.1	0.6
Excluding School Construction	53.4	36.3	9.7	0.6

### 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.

Equitable allocation of resources among district schools is determined by Stafford Board of Education policy and practice. The Board reviews the budget as recommended by the Superintendent of Schools. The Superintendent determines her recommendations for allocations beyond the established budget base after careful study and discussion of information regarding student needs provided by community members, parents, administrators, and staff. Upon the Board's approval and the subsequent confirming vote from the town, the budget is allocated as agreed upon. In an effort to maintain a balance among our district schools, each building receives a base budget allocation for resources as determined by enrollment and specific school needs. On a yearly basis, additional components of the budget are presented to address unique school and district learning and facility priorities. For example, in the budget year 2010- 2011, monies were targeted to address diversity and cultural awareness, teaching and learning with technology, improving literacy, and improving communication with the community and parents about educational issues.

### SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	171
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	24	1.4	1.1	1.1
Learning Disability	56	3.2	3.6	3.9
Intellectual Disability	7	0.4	0.5	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	23	1.3	1.1	1.0
Speech Impairment	26	1.5	2.2	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	23	1.3	2.0	2.1
Other Disabilities**	12	0.7	0.9	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>11.4</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

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	31.3	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	34.6	33.0	74.6	68.6
Writing	23.3	19.3	68.5	63.7
Mathematics	37.3	33.4	74.3	68.2
Science	33.3	21.2	74.8	61.5
CAPT Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	58.3	44.7
Writing Across the Disciplines	10.0	17.3	77.2	61.2
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	62.2	49.5
Science	N/A	N/A	44.5	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	5.1
	% With Accommodations	94.9
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	20.0
	% With Accommodations	80.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.4

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	1	0.6
Private Schools or Other Settings	15	8.8

### 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	120	0.7	76.5	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	32	0.2	13.9	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	19	0.1	9.6	11.0

---

### SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

As a pre-kindergarten through grade 12 learning community, we continually strive to prepare our students for the rigors of the 21st century. Stafford Public Schools purposefully combines early prevention programs, focused and on-going staff development activities, and a strong emphasis on developing essential skills and content knowledge as specified in CT State frameworks and assessments. Improving achievement data provides strong evidence about the effectiveness of our programs, instruction, and support structures. For the past several years, early literacy has been a priority. A strong pre-kindergarten program focusing on language skills, school routines, and social skills ensures that students enter kindergarten ready to learn. At the same time, the Stafford Family Resource Center reaches out to the community with programs for parents and children from the earliest years on. The Early Reading Success, Reading Recovery, Teaching for Literacy Competence (TLC), Early Intervention Project (EIP), Scientific Research-Based Interventions (SRBI) programs, and Title I services are keystones to early intervention at the primary level. In 14 of the 20 subtests (Math, Reading, Writing, and Science) of the 2011 CMT assessments, Stafford students in grades three through eight performed above both the DRG and State averages. Notably, there are fewer students performing at the intervention level as students progress through the educational system. Student achievement on the 2011 CMT improved in 8 of the 10 tests in math and reading when comparing results over a two year period. Stafford's 2011 CAPT results for students at proficient or better were higher than the state average in all four areas for the 8th consecutive year. Stafford High School students' participation rate in the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) has steadily increased from 29% in 1997 to 72% in 2011. Similarly, enrollment in 2- and 4-year colleges has climbed to 81% in 2011, up from 66% in 1996. This data indicates a steady, improving, and impressive performance for Stafford. Stafford's successes over the past several years are building blocks for a culture of continuous improvement. District goals include strengthening achievement for all students through a district wide and systemic approach that connects our efforts in teacher evaluation, walk-through observations, school improvement strategies using data-driven decision making, curriculum development, and professional development in a cohesive and effective plan for improving student learning and achievement. The Five Year Strategic Plan, adopted by the BOE in 2009, will provide structure to district- and school-based efforts for continuous academic achievement. The percentage of students eligible for special education continues to be below the average as compared to the DRG and State levels, reflecting both the district's commitment to and successful implementation of an effective early intervention program (EIP) model and SRBI strategies. Staff and administrators initiated discussions to define a vertical articulation (elementary to middle to high schools) of a 3-tier intervention model to identify common effective practices and service gaps. The district implemented the SRBI model in all schools, increased access to best practice instruction in literacy and math, and strengthened the implementation of co-teaching models at the secondary schools. As a result, there was improvement in achievement results for students with disabilities on CMT and CAPT. Staff will continue to focus on aligning IEP goals and objectives to State standards. A review of the effectiveness of accommodations and modifications, including 504 plans, is ongoing. The district continues to strive to develop program capacity within district to reduce the percentage of students with disabilities served in out-of-district programs.

---

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2010-11 Data - As Submitted**

Town Code	Town Name	ADM 2010-11	NCE 2010-11	NCEP 2010-11	NCEP Rank
001	ANDOVER	637.41	7,828,796	12,282	140
002	ANSONIA	2,795.42	30,656,052	10,967	166
003	ASHFORD	701.78	10,273,910	14,640	53
004	AVON	3,585.43	44,166,484	12,318	137
005	BARKHAMSTED	660.10	7,874,375	11,929	151
006	BEACON FALLS	1,021.25	13,711,345	13,426	96
007	BERLIN	3,166.44	40,887,033	12,913	115
008	BETHANY	1,014.45	13,705,852	13,511	88
009	BETHEL	2,953.22	41,141,452	13,931	70
010	BETHLEHEM	486.38	6,991,117	14,374	58
011	BLOOMFIELD	2,406.11	41,515,434	17,254	17
012	BOLTON	829.15	11,596,324	13,986	66
013	BOZRAH	356.91	5,440,306	15,243	34
014	BRANFORD	3,488.31	48,689,803	13,958	68
015	BRIDGEPORT	20,949.07	281,947,431	13,459	94
016	BRIDGEWATER	223.94	4,583,680	20,468	4
017	BRISTOL	8,761.05	107,842,198	12,309	138
018	BROOKFIELD	2,940.23	36,068,057	12,267	141
019	BROOKLYN	1,285.65	15,680,257	12,196	144
020	BURLINGTON	1,852.22	21,029,517	11,354	160
021	CANAAN	139.99	3,094,595	22,106	1
022	CANTERBURY	712.94	10,522,192	14,759	50
023	CANTON	1,811.36	22,710,028	12,538	128
024	CHAPLIN	288.58	5,483,537	19,002	10
025	CHESHIRE	4,792.48	60,014,271	12,523	130
026	CHESTER	556.14	8,503,958	15,291	33
027	CLINTON	2,083.21	30,219,550	14,506	55
028	COLCHESTER	3,135.15	36,145,869	11,529	159
029	COLEBROOK	253.20	3,708,282	14,646	52
030	COLUMBIA	766.30	11,098,580	14,483	56
031	CORNWALL	169.40	3,735,508	22,051	2
032	COVENTRY	1,927.33	24,831,872	12,884	118
033	CROMWELL	2,019.10	27,228,311	13,485	92
034	DANBURY	10,485.54	124,425,721	11,866	154
035	DARIEN	4,849.08	75,723,867	15,616	27
036	DEEP RIVER	653.40	9,815,782	15,023	38
037	DERBY	1,590.32	19,475,480	12,246	143
038	DURHAM	1,350.69	20,235,123	14,981	39
039	EASTFORD	245.93	3,679,115	14,960	42
040	EAST GRANBY	923.78	13,759,193	14,894	45
041	EAST HADDAM	1,371.28	18,598,344	13,563	83
042	EAST HAMPTON	2,004.01	27,125,783	13,536	85
043	EAST HARTFORD	8,028.42	95,547,952	11,901	152
044	EAST HAVEN	3,775.85	48,379,300	12,813	119
045	EAST LYME	2,878.75	38,049,775	13,217	104
046	EASTON	1,553.24	23,575,753	15,178	36
047	EAST WINDSOR	1,397.21	20,465,433	14,647	51
048	ELLINGTON	2,732.43	29,289,384	10,719	169
049	ENFIELD	6,051.60	73,096,193	12,079	147
050	ESSEX	992.68	13,823,385	13,925	71
051	FAIRFIELD	10,211.77	146,844,757	14,380	57
052	FARMINGTON	4,127.78	54,335,196	13,163	105
053	FRANKLIN	306.16	3,836,908	12,532	129
054	GLASTONBURY	6,987.54	87,307,588	12,495	132

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2010-11 Data - As Submitted**

<b>Town Code</b>	<b>Town Name</b>	<b>ADM 2010-11</b>	<b>NCE 2010-11</b>	<b>NCEP 2010-11</b>	<b>NCEP Rank</b>
055	GOSHEN	423.71	6,586,162	15,544	28
056	GRANBY	2,205.55	26,651,434	12,084	146
057	GREENWICH	8,720.48	161,471,040	18,516	12
058	GRISWOLD	1,869.25	24,505,348	13,110	107
059	GROTON	5,175.16	74,052,632	14,309	60
060	GUILFORD	3,706.17	50,264,376	13,562	84
061	HADDAM	1,351.76	18,244,940	13,497	90
062	HAMDEN	6,942.44	104,726,849	15,085	37
063	HAMPTON	205.49	3,969,162	19,316	9
064	HARTFORD	20,982.29	379,784,614	18,100	13
065	HARTLAND	319.04	4,461,199	13,983	67
066	HARWINTON	918.19	10,424,837	11,354	160
067	HEBRON	2,122.78	23,570,871	11,104	164
068	KENT	356.95	6,158,347	17,253	18
069	KILLINGLY	2,591.30	35,918,956	13,861	73
070	KILLINGWORTH	1,142.24	15,417,013	13,497	90
071	LEBANON	1,258.00	16,679,627	13,259	103
072	LEDYARD	2,538.26	31,580,428	12,442	135
073	LISBON	722.75	9,331,796	12,912	116
074	LITCHFIELD	1,203.87	16,467,774	13,679	79
075	LYME	309.25	5,264,713	17,024	20
076	MADISON	3,681.08	47,880,315	13,007	114
077	MANCHESTER	7,503.04	102,489,391	13,660	80
078	MANSFIELD	1,975.67	30,338,684	15,356	32
079	MARLBOROUGH	1,229.45	13,270,151	10,794	168
080	MERIDEN	9,203.28	114,391,035	12,429	136
081	MIDDLEBURY	1,375.29	17,915,423	13,027	111
082	MIDDLEFIELD	707.44	10,598,387	14,981	39
083	MIDDLETOWN	5,385.36	71,813,700	13,335	101
084	MILFORD	7,024.29	104,002,503	14,806	48
085	MONROE	3,799.82	51,586,277	13,576	82
086	MONTVILLE	2,756.17	36,044,002	13,078	108
087	MORRIS	352.17	5,474,142	15,544	28
088	NAUGATUCK	4,854.68	62,602,573	12,895	117
089	NEW BRITAIN	10,855.37	137,063,891	12,626	126
090	NEW CANAAN	4,175.21	70,943,600	16,992	22
091	NEW FAIRFIELD	2,869.78	36,173,025	12,605	127
092	NEW HARTFORD	1,129.60	15,165,000	13,425	98
093	NEW HAVEN	17,637.80	352,994,710	20,014	7
094	NEWINGTON	4,500.94	62,817,302	13,956	69
095	NEW LONDON	3,554.19	47,598,463	13,392	100
096	NEW MILFORD	4,649.16	57,182,416	12,300	139
097	NEWTOWN	5,568.81	67,224,732	12,072	148
098	NORFOLK	246.98	4,079,395	16,517	23
099	NORTH BRANFORD	2,360.13	28,913,803	12,251	142
100	NORTH CANAAN	444.05	7,896,561	17,783	15
101	NORTH HAVEN	3,635.30	45,970,734	12,646	125
102	NORTH STONINGTON	813.32	11,513,786	14,157	61
103	NORWALK	11,158.74	173,065,848	15,509	31
104	NORWICH	5,396.19	73,832,973	13,682	78
105	OLD LYME	1,221.31	20,791,745	17,024	20
106	OLD SAYBROOK	1,568.88	21,835,720	13,918	72
107	ORANGE	2,509.00	35,128,316	14,001	65
108	OXFORD	2,245.49	26,638,474	11,863	155

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2010-11 Data - As Submitted**

<b>Town Code</b>	<b>Town Name</b>	<b>ADM 2010-11</b>	<b>NCE 2010-11</b>	<b>NCEP 2010-11</b>	<b>NCEP Rank</b>
109	PLAINFIELD	2,506.63	32,781,983	13,078	108
110	PLAINVILLE	2,500.76	33,675,375	13,466	93
111	PLYMOUTH	1,907.89	22,924,995	12,016	150
112	POMFRET	744.72	10,123,297	13,593	81
113	PORTLAND	1,444.33	18,308,376	12,676	122
114	PRESTON	650.72	10,248,394	15,749	25
115	PROSPECT	1,548.43	20,789,286	13,426	96
116	PUTNAM	1,282.26	17,670,589	13,781	75
117	REDDING	1,726.95	29,737,648	17,220	19
118	RIDGEFIELD	5,456.92	77,002,667	14,111	63
119	ROCKY HILL	2,626.06	33,238,211	12,657	124
120	ROXBURY	294.26	6,023,014	20,468	4
121	SALEM	739.26	9,908,073	13,403	99
122	SALISBURY	394.90	7,767,833	19,670	8
123	SCOTLAND	236.20	4,478,032	18,959	11
124	SEYMOUR	2,504.83	29,432,401	11,750	158
125	SHARON	286.55	6,283,556	21,928	3
126	SHELTON	5,395.51	64,135,702	11,887	153
127	SHERMAN	591.84	8,131,391	13,739	77
128	SIMSBURY	4,818.62	62,916,566	13,057	110
129	SOMERS	1,620.20	20,191,893	12,463	134
130	SOUTHBURY	3,082.55	40,155,302	13,027	111
131	SOUTHINGTON	6,842.07	82,243,086	12,020	149
132	SOUTH WINDSOR	4,683.47	64,668,747	13,808	74
133	SPRAGUE	453.20	6,371,803	14,060	64
134	STAFFORD	1,894.24	24,854,924	13,121	106
135	STAMFORD	15,123.27	246,545,506	16,302	24
136	STERLING	639.92	7,566,158	11,824	157
137	STONINGTON	2,543.33	31,842,889	12,520	131
138	STRATFORD	7,502.22	97,712,791	13,025	113
139	SUFFIELD	2,407.78	30,014,498	12,466	133
140	THOMASTON	1,250.79	14,802,165	11,834	156
141	THOMPSON	1,279.27	16,209,275	12,671	123
142	TOLLAND	3,116.18	34,526,285	11,080	165
143	TORRINGTON	4,664.37	64,231,861	13,771	76
144	TRUMBULL	6,853.81	87,006,389	12,695	121
145	UNION	109.00	1,473,352	13,517	87
146	VERNON	3,768.89	51,004,925	13,533	86
147	VOLUNTOWN	429.92	6,067,750	14,114	62
148	WALLINGFORD	6,586.87	88,581,313	13,448	95
149	WARREN	176.28	2,740,102	15,544	28
150	WASHINGTON	415.72	8,509,098	20,468	4
151	WATERBURY	17,594.53	256,520,588	14,580	54
152	WATERFORD	3,165.79	42,756,539	13,506	89
153	WATERTOWN	3,183.33	35,983,226	11,304	162
154	WESTBROOK	965.38	14,321,117	14,835	46
155	WEST HARTFORD	10,447.46	133,734,360	12,801	120
156	WEST HAVEN	7,554.40	91,512,422	12,114	145
157	WESTON	2,530.77	45,048,138	17,800	14
158	WESTPORT	5,738.91	100,058,692	17,435	16
159	WETHERSFIELD	3,929.27	52,380,381	13,331	102
160	WILLINGTON	799.23	11,958,607	14,963	41
161	WILTON	4,331.64	67,850,615	15,664	26
162	WINCHESTER	1,373.29	20,475,368	14,910	44

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2010-11 Data - As Submitted**

Town Code	Town Name	ADM 2010-11	NCE 2010-11	NCEP 2010-11	NCEP Rank
163	WINDHAM	3,344.95	49,409,789	14,771	49
164	WINDSOR	4,153.88	61,511,947	14,808	47
165	WINDSOR LOCKS	1,890.98	28,713,554	15,184	35
166	WOLCOTT	2,979.94	32,446,356	10,888	167
167	WOODBIDGE	1,511.22	22,535,542	14,912	43
168	WOODBURY	1,385.71	19,917,884	14,374	58
169	WOODSTOCK	1,383.76	15,557,596	11,243	163

		<i>Group Totals</i>	<i>Averages</i>
<b>State (N = 169)</b>	544,105.51	7,612,675,425	13,991
<b>DRG</b>			
<b>A (N = 8)</b>	30,362.72	489,940,980	16,136
<b>B (N = 21)</b>	98,478.34	1,334,048,197	13,547
<b>C (N = 33)</b>	39,195.36	511,571,917	13,052
<b>D (N = 24)</b>	84,994.91	1,119,309,166	13,169
<b>E (N = 36)</b>	26,615.58	369,021,820	13,865
<b>F (N = 16)</b>	29,712.17	380,792,320	12,816
<b>G (N = 15)</b>	68,492.65	933,218,550	13,625
<b>H (N = 9)</b>	71,335.58	969,452,989	13,590
<b>I (N = 7)</b>	94,918.20	1,505,319,486	15,859
<i>Please refer to Appendix A for a complete list of DRGs.</i>			
<b>Maximum NCEP</b>			22,106
<b>Minimum NCEP</b>			10,719

\* To satisfy the statutory NCE definition, elementary and high school expenditures are combined regardless of district configuration.

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2009-10 Data - As Submitted**

Town Code	Town Name	ADM 2009-10	NCE 2009-10	NCEP 2009-10	NCEP Rank
001	ANDOVER	631.35	7,525,655	11,920	137
002	ANSONIA	2,867.97	30,173,580	10,521	169
003	ASHFORD	696.74	10,607,901	15,225	33
004	AVON	3,616.52	42,223,213	11,675	147
005	BARKHAMSTED	671.83	7,823,840	11,646	150
006	BEACON FALLS	1,038.90	13,029,689	12,542	110
007	BERLIN	3,219.34	40,252,339	12,503	114
008	BETHANY	1,039.59	13,649,313	13,130	82
009	BETHEL	3,061.31	40,385,303	13,192	79
010	BETHLEHEM	495.04	7,086,065	14,314	48
011	BLOOMFIELD	2,529.41	41,579,674	16,438	22
012	BOLTON	839.24	11,960,280	14,251	50
013	BOZRAH	387.81	5,314,859	13,705	65
014	BRANFORD	3,581.27	47,965,639	13,393	76
015	BRIDGEPORT	21,022.70	274,422,248	13,054	89
016	BRIDGEWATER	232.07	4,590,692	19,781	4
017	BRISTOL	8,783.64	106,777,368	12,156	127
018	BROOKFIELD	2,988.01	34,609,738	11,583	153
019	BROOKLYN	1,312.93	15,268,128	11,629	152
020	BURLINGTON	1,874.20	21,262,514	11,345	158
021	CANAAN	136.10	2,716,431	19,959	3
022	CANTERBURY	770.26	10,719,713	13,917	60
023	CANTON	1,793.32	22,564,618	12,583	108
024	CHAPLIN	290.45	5,621,525	19,355	7
025	CHESHIRE	4,943.37	58,206,376	11,775	143
026	CHESTER	574.04	8,178,571	14,247	51
027	CLINTON	2,069.22	29,244,877	14,133	55
028	COLCHESTER	3,237.30	35,383,455	10,930	164
029	COLEBROOK	255.02	3,491,719	13,692	67
030	COLUMBIA	785.83	10,817,013	13,765	64
031	CORNWALL	182.19	3,766,345	20,673	2
032	COVENTRY	1,987.86	24,485,533	12,318	123
033	CROMWELL	2,050.33	25,456,797	12,416	120
034	DANBURY	10,255.04	121,132,480	11,812	140
035	DARIEN	4,794.63	71,654,322	14,945	35
036	DEEP RIVER	654.64	9,491,222	14,498	41
037	DERBY	1,580.69	18,609,128	11,773	144
038	DURHAM	1,371.68	19,381,210	14,130	56
039	EASTFORD	236.52	3,680,278	15,560	28
040	EAST GRANBY	939.07	13,561,601	14,442	44
041	EAST HADDAM	1,424.00	18,155,885	12,750	103
042	EAST HAMPTON	2,040.47	25,879,986	12,683	105
043	EAST HARTFORD	8,009.39	91,408,687	11,413	156
044	EAST HAVEN	3,803.24	49,825,466	13,101	86
045	EAST LYME	2,878.61	37,700,690	13,097	87
046	EASTON	1,555.96	22,832,669	14,674	37
047	EAST WINDSOR	1,475.86	19,051,583	12,909	92
048	ELLINGTON	2,669.99	28,154,945	10,545	168
049	ENFIELD	6,215.03	73,620,564	11,846	139
050	ESSEX	986.29	13,226,218	13,410	74
051	FAIRFIELD	10,114.33	146,228,718	14,458	42
052	FARMINGTON	4,143.27	52,286,036	12,620	106
053	FRANKLIN	302.88	4,094,220	13,518	70
054	GLASTONBURY	6,999.18	84,491,521	12,072	134

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2009-10 Data - As Submitted**

<b>Town Code</b>	<b>Town Name</b>	<b>ADM 2009-10</b>	<b>NCE 2009-10</b>	<b>NCEP 2009-10</b>	<b>NCEP Rank</b>
055	GOSHEN	432.76	6,621,140	15,300	30
056	GRANBY	2,258.61	26,663,635	11,805	142
057	GREENWICH	8,712.22	154,979,689	17,789	11
058	GRISWOLD	1,897.24	23,791,824	12,540	112
059	GROTON	5,221.76	74,022,692	14,176	54
060	GUILFORD	3,733.58	49,432,608	13,240	78
061	HADDAM	1,362.02	17,855,957	13,110	83
062	HAMDEN	6,883.82	102,751,292	14,926	36
063	HAMPTON	223.43	4,015,360	17,971	9
064	HARTFORD	21,318.38	373,604,486	17,525	12
065	HARTLAND	317.05	4,436,992	13,995	58
066	HARWINTON	935.80	10,616,509	11,345	158
067	HEBRON	2,118.04	23,229,543	10,967	163
068	KENT	354.95	6,153,160	17,335	15
069	KILLINGLY	2,588.06	35,871,064	13,860	63
070	KILLINGWORTH	1,149.02	15,063,547	13,110	83
071	LEBANON	1,304.00	15,519,466	11,901	138
072	LEDYARD	2,597.06	33,500,162	12,899	94
073	LISBON	757.87	9,249,448	12,205	125
074	LITCHFIELD	1,233.19	15,994,554	12,970	91
075	LYME	315.07	5,223,971	16,580	19
076	MADISON	3,747.15	46,795,685	12,488	115
077	MANCHESTER	7,470.54	100,418,249	13,442	71
078	MANSFIELD	1,954.34	29,928,876	15,314	29
079	MARLBOROUGH	1,219.21	13,131,356	10,770	165
080	MERIDEN	9,245.94	114,101,217	12,341	122
081	MIDDLEBURY	1,370.86	17,086,392	12,464	118
082	MIDDLEFIELD	738.16	10,429,863	14,130	56
083	MIDDLETOWN	5,340.37	70,194,253	13,144	81
084	MILFORD	7,166.76	102,713,443	14,332	47
085	MONROE	3,957.69	50,708,470	12,813	101
086	MONTVILLE	2,765.67	35,538,272	12,850	98
087	MORRIS	359.15	5,494,922	15,300	30
088	NAUGATUCK	5,104.73	61,821,171	12,111	130
089	NEW BRITAIN	10,873.74	131,918,088	12,132	128
090	NEW CANAAN	4,094.29	69,728,693	17,031	16
091	NEW FAIRFIELD	2,984.60	34,921,380	11,701	145
092	NEW HARTFORD	1,139.44	14,697,170	12,899	94
093	NEW HAVEN	17,704.41	316,891,873	17,899	10
094	NEWINGTON	4,503.98	60,434,410	13,418	73
095	NEW LONDON	3,467.50	47,501,702	13,699	66
096	NEW MILFORD	4,775.94	54,878,158	11,491	154
097	NEWTOWN	5,534.24	66,893,063	12,087	133
098	NORFOLK	252.58	4,043,303	16,008	24
099	NORTH BRANFORD	2,432.91	28,403,428	11,675	147
100	NORTH CANAAN	455.40	7,693,069	16,893	18
101	NORTH HAVEN	3,736.64	44,618,356	11,941	136
102	NORTH STONINGTON	815.53	11,711,211	14,360	46
103	NORWALK	10,941.90	170,644,882	15,596	27
104	NORWICH	5,451.35	73,038,661	13,398	75
105	OLD LYME	1,210.39	20,068,690	16,580	19
106	OLD SAYBROOK	1,600.80	21,056,569	13,154	80
107	ORANGE	2,516.46	34,343,677	13,648	68
108	OXFORD	2,238.54	25,161,358	11,240	160

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2009-10 Data - As Submitted**

Town Code	Town Name	ADM 2009-10	NCE 2009-10	NCEP 2009-10	NCEP Rank
109	PLAINFIELD	2,572.90	33,193,711	12,901	93
110	PLAINVILLE	2,552.01	33,437,654	13,102	85
111	PLYMOUTH	1,943.43	22,608,752	11,633	151
112	POMFRET	771.55	9,945,952	12,891	96
113	PORTLAND	1,471.33	17,595,483	11,959	135
114	PRESTON	660.77	10,379,803	15,709	25
115	PROSPECT	1,573.36	19,732,785	12,542	110
116	PUTNAM	1,240.37	17,915,783	14,444	43
117	REDDING	1,752.41	28,916,741	16,501	21
118	RIDGEFIELD	5,477.44	75,970,653	13,870	61
119	ROCKY HILL	2,673.53	32,537,067	12,170	126
120	ROXBURY	292.55	5,787,077	19,781	4
121	SALEM	765.91	9,973,257	13,021	90
122	SALISBURY	405.01	7,509,090	18,541	8
123	SCOTLAND	247.88	4,328,757	17,463	13
124	SEYMOUR	2,522.65	29,500,668	11,694	146
125	SHARON	293.35	6,095,018	20,777	1
126	SHELTON	5,548.08	64,740,470	11,669	149
127	SHERMAN	631.67	7,945,244	12,578	109
128	SIMSBURY	4,926.32	63,360,644	12,862	97
129	SOMERS	1,634.39	19,297,036	11,807	141
130	SOUTHBURY	3,207.65	39,980,132	12,464	118
131	SOUTHINGTON	6,826.46	82,732,098	12,119	129
132	SOUTH WINDSOR	4,792.31	61,217,157	12,774	102
133	SPRAGUE	444.22	6,006,349	13,521	69
134	STAFFORD	1,877.73	24,917,404	13,270	77
135	STAMFORD	14,966.30	241,472,290	16,134	23
136	STERLING	667.00	7,624,369	11,431	155
137	STONINGTON	2,565.73	31,830,223	12,406	121
138	STRATFORD	7,542.96	94,082,914	12,473	117
139	SUFFIELD	2,440.64	29,538,834	12,103	131
140	THOMASTON	1,286.29	14,664,726	11,401	157
141	THOMPSON	1,342.79	16,232,980	12,089	132
142	TOLLAND	3,244.60	34,410,841	10,606	167
143	TORRINGTON	4,784.74	64,265,556	13,431	72
144	TRUMBULL	6,856.73	86,389,306	12,599	107
145	UNION	111.19	1,426,178	12,826	100
146	VERNON	3,738.02	46,811,973	12,523	113
147	VOLUNTOWN	413.64	6,020,254	14,554	39
148	WALLINGFORD	6,737.62	86,496,622	12,838	99
149	WARREN	176.01	2,692,917	15,300	30
150	WASHINGTON	426.67	8,440,172	19,781	4
151	WATERBURY	17,623.54	251,010,064	14,243	52
152	WATERFORD	3,241.03	41,247,362	12,727	104
153	WATERTOWN	3,262.80	36,538,634	11,199	161
154	WESTBROOK	990.06	13,724,154	13,862	62
155	WEST HARTFORD	10,315.31	128,691,786	12,476	116
156	WEST HAVEN	7,419.41	91,264,538	12,301	124
157	WESTON	2,558.96	44,420,692	17,359	14
158	WESTPORT	5,704.45	96,828,310	16,974	17
159	WETHERSFIELD	3,945.63	51,573,765	13,071	88
160	WILLINGTON	824.09	11,690,527	14,186	53
161	WILTON	4,360.57	68,426,889	15,692	26
162	WINCHESTER	1,417.66	20,614,342	14,541	40

**Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil\***  
**2009-10 Data - As Submitted**

Town Code	Town Name	ADM 2009-10	NCE 2009-10	NCEP 2009-10	NCEP Rank
163	WINDHAM	3,389.59	47,371,560	13,976	59
164	WINDSOR	4,271.85	61,392,208	14,371	45
165	WINDSOR LOCKS	1,916.58	28,793,777	15,024	34
166	WOLCOTT	3,027.17	32,354,474	10,688	166
167	WOODBURGE	1,537.87	22,408,162	14,571	38
168	WOODBURY	1,413.73	20,236,309	14,314	48
169	WOODSTOCK	1,385.90	15,508,874	11,190	162

		<i>Group Totals</i>	<i>Averages</i>
<b>State (N = 169)</b>	548,313.48	7,439,356,816	13,568
<b>DRG</b>			
<b>A (N = 8)</b>	30,298.71	478,778,969	15,802
<b>B (N = 21)</b>	99,256.28	1,301,917,388	13,117
<b>C (N = 33)</b>	39,574.36	502,790,270	12,705
<b>D (N = 24)</b>	86,530.83	1,102,120,234	12,737
<b>E (N = 36)</b>	27,206.55	361,127,257	13,274
<b>F (N = 16)</b>	30,286.68	377,911,706	12,478
<b>G (N = 15)</b>	69,022.22	920,145,508	13,331
<b>H (N = 9)</b>	70,737.99	951,845,463	13,456
<b>I (N = 7)</b>	95,399.86	1,442,720,021	15,123
<i>Please refer to Appendix A for a complete list of DRGs.</i>			
<b>Maximum NCEP</b>			20,777
<b>Minimum NCEP</b>			10,521

\* To satisfy the statutory NCE definition, elementary and high school expenditures are combined regardless of district configuration.