

SPECIAL EDUCATION STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2005-06

Litchfield School District

DOMINICK VITA, Superintendent

Telephone: 8605677500

Gary H. Zaremski, Director of Special Services

Telephone: (860) 567-7505



This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c).
Unless otherwise noted, data were provided by the local school district during the fall of 2005.

Table 1: OVERALL DISTRICT DESCRIPTION

Total Number of Students for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible (Excluding Pre-K and Adult Education)	1,287		
Number of Students with Special Education Disabilities for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible (Excluding Pre-K and Adult Education; Including Private Pay*)	143		
District Special Education Prevalence Rate (% of Total Students with Disabilities)	11.1%		
Number of Students with Disabilities Placed Out-of-District **	8		
Number of Private Pay* Students with Disabilities	1		
K-12 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Teachers	91.6	Total District Expenditures***	\$14,536,065
K-12 FTE Special Education Teachers	8.0	Special Education Expenditures***	\$2,442,509
K-12 FTE Administrators	7.0	Special Education Students Who Are:	
Regional Education Service Center (RESC)	Ed. Connection	Limited English Proficient	0.0%
District Reference Group (DRG)****	E	Free/Reduced-Price Meal Eligible	7.0%

*Private Pay = Private/Parochial students, not placed or referred by public agencies, whose basic education is paid through private resources and who receive special education and related services at public expense under a service plan.

**Excludes Endowed and Incorporated Academies and private/parochial students placed out-of-district by parents.

***Expenditures are unaudited figures from the full 2004-05 fiscal year.

****DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, and occupation, and have similar enrollment.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PREVALENCE

Prevalence is a special education rate of occurrence statistic. It indicates the percent of students in a district (DRG or state) who are students with disabilities, receiving special education and related services. This number is calculated by dividing the number of K-12 students with disabilities for whom a district is fiscally responsible by the total number of K-12 students for whom the district is fiscally responsible (excludes preschool and adult education students). Statewide, the special education prevalence rate has been dropping for several years, although Connecticut's prevalence rate is still slightly higher than the national average.

Table 2: Special Education Prevalence Trends

	93-94	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
School District Rate	11.5%	10.1%	10.9%	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%	11.1%
DRG Median Rate	14.2%	12.9%	11.9%	11.6%	12.6%	11.7%	11.3%
Statewide Rate	13.4%	12.5%	12.3%	12.2%	12.1%	11.9%	11.8%

SPECIAL EDUCATION PREVALENCE, continued

Table 3: Special Education Prevalence by Disability

<i>Special Education Disability</i>	<i>K-12 Count of Students with Disabilities</i>		<i>Prevalence Rate</i>		<i>Comparison DRG</i>	<i>State Prevalence</i>
	<i>04-05</i>	<i>05-06</i>	<i>04-05</i>	<i>05-06</i>	<i>Prevalence Rate</i>	<i>Rate</i>
Learning Disability	54	49	3.9%	3.8%	4.0%	4.3%
Intellectual Disability	5	3	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%
Emotional Disturbance	4	5	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	1.2%
Speech Impairment	50	57	3.7%	4.4%	3.3%	2.5%
Other Health Impairment	24	20	1.8%	1.6%	1.8%	1.9%
Other Disability*	6	4	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%
Autism	4	5	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Total	147	143	10.7%	11.1%	11.3%	11.8%

CT identification rates for Emotional Disturbance (ED) and Other Health Impairments (OHI) are significantly higher than national averages, ranking among the top 15 states for ED and the top 5 for OHI. CT is in the bottom 15 for identification of students with Intellectual Disabilities.

<i>*2005-06 Count of Specific Disabilities within "Other" Category</i>					
Visual Impairment	1	Hearing Impairment	0	Developmental Delay**	0
Orthopedic Impairment	2	Traumatic Brain Injury	0	**CT statute limits the identification of students as Developmental Delay to children ages three through five.	
Deaf-Blindness	0	Multiple Disabilities	1		

The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires states to monitor the disproportionate identification of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity. CT public school districts monitor this issue through the comparison of race/ethnicity proportions within disability subgroups to the expected proportions found within the all district student data. Large variation in proportions may indicate potential problems, although small student subgroup counts impact data interpretation and unique district circumstances can alter the racial/ethnic makeup of disability subgroups.



Table 4: Count and Percent of Students (K-12) by Racial/Ethnic Group within Disability Subgroups

	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native		Asian/ Pacific Islander		Black/African American		Hispanic or Latino		White		Disability Totals	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Learning Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	4	8.2%	44	89.8%	49	34.3%
Intellectual Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	2.1%
Emotional Disturbance	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	3.5%
Speech/Language Impairment	0	0.0%	4	7.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	52	91.2%	57	39.9%
Other Health Impairments	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	100.0%	20	14.0%
Other Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	2.8%
Autism	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	3.5%
District Total Students with Disabilities	0	0.0%	4	2.8%	1	0.7%	5	3.5%	133	93.0%	143	100.0%
<i>Comparison Statistics</i>												
All District Students	9	0.7%	15	1.2%	7	0.5%	25	1.9%	1,231	95.6%	1,287	100.0%

PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH NON-DISABLED PEERS (TWNDP)

Time spent with non-disabled peers (TWNDP) is an important indicator of student access to the general curriculum as well as demonstration of compliance with the IDEA requirement that students with disabilities are educated with their non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. Two ways to look at TWNDP are to examine the data for all students with disabilities for whom the district is fiscally responsible and then to review the data for students with disabilities whose education is provided in-district. The data reported in the next two tables reports on the three federal TWNDP categories. 0-40.0% is considered the most isolated setting. 40.1-79.0% is typically a pull-out or resource room type of setting. 79.1-100% is considered a general education placement. In the third table on this page, TWNDP data is examined with a more detailed breakout across 10 TWNDP groups.



Table 5: TWNDP: All K-12 Students with Disabilities

<i>Federal Categories</i>	<i>Learning Disability Number</i>	<i>Intellectual Disability Number</i>	<i>Emotional Disturbance Number</i>	<i>Speech Impairment Number</i>	<i>Other Health Impaired Number</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>Autism Number</i>	<i>Total District Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>	<i>DRG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
79.1 to 100%	45	1	2	51	18	2	2	121	84.6%	69.9%	66.3%
40.1 to 79.0%	4	1	1	6	1	1	2	16	11.2%	22.4%	20.2%
0.0 to 40.0%	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.2%	7.7%	13.5%
Total	49	3	5	57	20	4	5	143	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	88.3%	44.6%	55.1%	90.9%	85.0%	68.7%	64.3%	85.4%		79.4%	76.0%

Table 6: TWNDP: In-District* K-12 Students with Disabilities Only

<i>Federal Categories</i>	<i>Learning Disability Number</i>	<i>Intellectual Disability Number</i>	<i>Emotional Disturbance Number</i>	<i>Speech Impairment Number</i>	<i>Other Health Impaired Number</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>Autism Number</i>	<i>Total District Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>	<i>DRG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
79.1 to 100%	42	1	2	51	17	2	2	117	87.3%	72.8%	69.9%
40.1 to 79.0%	3	1	1	6	1	1	2	15	11.2%	23.4%	21.8%
0 to 40.0%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1.5%	3.9%	8.3%
Total	45	2	3	57	19	4	4	134	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	88.4%	66.9%	88.3%	90.9%	85.1%	68.7%	80.3%	87.9%		82.5%	80.2%

*Excludes both private pay and out-of-district students with disabilities.

Table 7: Ten TWNDP Categories: All K-12 Students with Disabilities

	<i>Learning Disability Number</i>	<i>Intellectual Disability Number</i>	<i>Emotional Disturbance Number</i>	<i>Speech Impairment Number</i>	<i>Other Health Impaired Number</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>Autism Number</i>	<i>Total District Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>	<i>DRG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
0 - 10.0%	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	2.1%	4.8%	7.8%
10.1 - 20%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.7%	0.7%	2.0%
20.1 - 30%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1.4%	0.8%	1.4%
30.1 - 40%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	1.4%	2.3%
40.1 - 50%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	2.0%	2.7%
50.1 - 60%	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	2.1%	4.4%	3.8%
60.1 - 70%	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1.4%	6.5%	5.6%
70.1 - 80%	4	1	1	4	0	1	3	14	9.8%	10.9%	9.4%
80.1 - 90%	17	0	0	15	9	2	1	44	30.8%	32.2%	23.6%
90.1 - 100%	27	0	2	36	9	0	0	74	51.7%	36.3%	41.5%
Total	49	3	5	57	20	4	5	143	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT

In 2002-03, CT was identified by OSEP as a state with significant concerns in the area of placement of students into private and public separate school facilities, ranking 9th from the bottom among states. CT placed 4.5% of all students with disabilities (ages 6-21) into separate school facilities. This is more than 50% greater than the national average of 2.9%. Out placement reduces a student's chance of interacting with their non-disabled peers and accessing the general curriculum.

Table 8: Students Placed Out-of-District

Placing Agency	Learning Disability	Intellectual Disability	Emotional Disturbance	Speech Impairment	Other Health Impairment	Other Disability	Autism	District Total	District Percent	DRG Total Percent	State Total Percent
Placed Out By District	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	50.0%	65.2%	60.5%
Placed Out By Other Parties*	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	50.0%	34.8%	39.5%
Total Placed Out	4	1	2	0	0	0	1	8	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Other parties includes DCF, other state agencies, juvenile and superior courts, as well as physicians and others

Table 9: Educational Placement of Students with Disabilities (count and percent by 6 Federal Categories)

Education Placement	Learning Disability	Intellectual Disability	Emotional Disturbance	Speech Impairment	Other Health Impairment	Other Disability	Autism	District Total	Total Percent	DRG Percent	State Percent
Public School	48	2	3	57	20	4	4	138	96.5%	94.8%	93.5%
Public Separate Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.7%	1.5%	1.7%
Private Separate Facility	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	2.1%	2.6%	3.2%
Public Residential Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Private Residential Facility	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.7%	0.8%	1.3%
Hospital/Homebound	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	49	3	5	57	20	4	5	143	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Public School includes all students attending CT public school districts including Endowed/Incorporated Academies, Charter and Magnet Schools. Public Separate Facility includes students attending RESC's (non-magnet schools). Private Separate Facility includes students attending Private Special Education Facilities and Other Agencies. Public Residential Facility includes students attending RESC's who reside in group homes/shelters or attend out-of-state public residential facilities. Private Residential Facility includes students who reside and are educated at Private Special Education Facilities, students who reside in group homes/shelters, and students who attend out-of state private residential facilities. Hospital/Homebound includes students who live and are educated in permanent family residences, or students who receive their education in a home/hospital setting, both in- and out-of-state.

Table 10: Home School* Attendance by Students with Disabilities

	Learning Disability	Intellectual Disability	Emotional Disturbance	Speech Impairment	Other Health Impairment	Other Disability	Autism	District Total
District	91.8%	66.7%	60.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	94.4%
DRG	98.2%	81.9%	77.3%	99.5%	94.8%	84.6%	84.8%	94.8%
State	95.0%	82.4%	64.4%	95.4%	90.6%	70.0%	70.3%	87.9%

Students attending magnet and charter school programs as a result of school choice options (identical to those of their nondisabled peers) are considered to be attending their home school, unlike students placed into programs as a result of PPT programming decisions.

*Home School is defined as where the student would otherwise attend school if not disabled.

OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES



Table 11: Extracurricular Participation by Students with Disabilities

	Learning Disability	Intellectual Disability	Emotional Disturbance	Speech Impairment	Other Health Impairment	Other Disability	Autism	Total SWD
District	36.7%	33.3%	0.0%	21.1%	30.0%	25.0%	20.0%	27.3%
DRG Participation	48.5%	31.9%	41.6%	29.6%	39.0%	23.1%	26.1%	38.1%
State Participation	41.2%	41.0%	26.3%	30.6%	40.5%	24.6%	25.3%	35.5%



OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES, continued

**Table 12: Students with Disabilities (Ages 14-21) Reported in Dec. 2005,
As Exiting Special Education During the 04-05 School Year**

<i>Reason for Exiting</i>	<i>Learning Disability Number</i>	<i>Intellectual Disability Number</i>	<i>Emotional Disturbance Number</i>	<i>Speech Impairment Number</i>	<i>Other Health Impaired Number</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>Autism</i>	<i>District Total Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>
Graduated with Diploma	2	1	0	3	0	1	0	7	41.2%
Grad. with Certificate of Completion / IEP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Dropped Out	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Returned to Regular Education	2	0	1	1	4	0	0	8	47.1%
Reached Maximum Age. Moved or Deceased	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	11.8%
Total	5	1	2	4	4	1	0	17	100.0%



<i>Special Education Graduation Rate</i>		<i>All Student Graduation Rate</i>		<i>Special Education Drop Out Rate</i>		<i>All Student Drop Out Rate</i>	
<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>
100.0%	67.7%	92.0%	91.2%	0.0%	5.6%	2.3%	1.7%

Graduation, drop out and suspension/expulsion are all indicators of student access to the general curriculum.

Percent of Students by Racial/Ethnic Group included in the Graduation Rates above.

	<i>American Indian</i>	<i>Asian American</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>
<i>All Students</i>	1.0%	1.9%	0.0%	94.2%	2.9%
<i>Special Education</i>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%

Percent of Students by Racial/Ethnic Group included in the Drop Out Rates above.

	<i>American Indian</i>	<i>Asian American</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>
<i>All Students</i>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<i>Special Education</i>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table 13a: Out-of-School Suspension and Expulsion Data
(2004-05 School Year Data; PreK-12)**

	<i># Unique Students Suspended/ Expelled</i>	<i>Unique Student Suspension Rate</i>	<i>Total Incidents* of Suspension/ Expulsion</i>	<i>Incident-based Suspension Rate</i>	<i>Total Days of Suspension/ Expulsion</i>
<i>General Education Students</i>	44	3.82%	78	6.76%	237
<i>Special Education Students</i>	8	5.10%	20	12.74%	64

**Suspensions can be for serious (weapons, fighting, drugs, etc.) and non-serious offenses (tardies, other school policy offenses).*

Serious offenses made up 23.5% of the total incidents reported by this district.

**Table 13b: Suspension and Expulsion of Students for Greater than 10 Days (PreK-12)
(Rate of Suspensions and Proportion by Race/Ethnicity) [2004-05 School Year Data]**

	<i># and Rate of Suspension/ Expulsion for 10+ days</i>		<i>Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native</i>	<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>
<i>General Education</i>	5	0.4% →	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<i>Special Education</i>	3	1.9% →	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<i>All Students</i>	8	0.6% →	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<i>Racial Proportion for All District Students</i>			0.7%	1.1%	0.5%	95.7%	1.9%



DISTRICT RESOURCES



Table 14: Certified Staff: Special Education Teachers and Pupil Services Staff

Special Education Instructional Staff	<i>Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Number of Staff</i>		Pupil Services Staff	<i>Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Number of Staff</i>	
	K-12	Pre-K Only		K-12	Pre-K Only
General Special Education Teacher	8.0	1.0	Speech-Language Pathologist	3.0	0.0
Partially Sighted	0.0	0.0	Psychological Examiner	0.0	0.0
Deafness	0.0	0.0	School Psychologist	1.4	0.0
Blindness	0.0	0.0	School Social Worker	1.0	0.0
			School Nurse-Teacher	1.0	0.0
			School Counselor	4.6	0.0
Total	8.0	1.0	Total	11.0	0.0

Table 15: Staffing Ratios: Index of Staff (K-12) Per 1,000 Student Population (K-12)

	<i>District</i>	<i>DRG</i>	<i>State</i>
Special Education Teachers	6.2	8.2	8.7
Speech Pathologists	2.3	1.8	1.5
School Nurses (non-certified staff)	1.6	2.4	2.0
School Nurse-Teachers	0.8	0.0	0.0
School Psychologists	1.1	1.6	1.5
School Social Workers	0.8	1.0	1.2
School Counselors	3.6	1.9	2.3
School Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	5.4	4.5	5.1
Special Education Aides	15.0	14.7	13.5



Table 16: Special Education Expenditures 2004-05 (Unaudited)



	<i>District, State and Federal Dollars</i>	<i>District Percent</i>	<i>DRG Percent</i>	<i>State Percent</i>
Certified Personnel	\$1,001,388	41.0%	38.9%	40.8%
Noncertified Personnel	\$400,552	16.4%	13.4%	14.0%
Employee Benefits	\$462,868	19.0%	13.0%	12.8%
Purchased Services	\$162,403	6.6%	8.3%	4.8%
Tuition to Other Schools	\$207,336	8.5%	18.7%	18.8%
Instructional Supplies	\$21,276	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%
Property Services	\$8,747	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
Special Education Transportation	\$149,335	6.1%	6.2%	7.4%
Equipment	\$26,816	1.1%	0.4%	0.2%
Other Expenditures	\$1,788	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%
Total	\$2,442,509	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Connecticut continues to receive increasing amounts of IDEA funds to help address resource issues within the state. Additionally, utilization of other State supported opportunities for high quality professional development at minimal cost, is another method to maximize resources (i.e., SERC, CPAC, etc.).

Table 17: Percentage of Expenditures for Special Education 2004-05 (Unaudited)



	<i>District</i>	<i>DRG</i>	<i>State</i>
School District Expenditures for Special Education	16.8%	18.7%	20.0%





Table 18: Preschool Student Data



<i>Number of Pre-K Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible:</i>				9	
Age		Education Setting		Race/Ethnicity	
3 year-olds:	4	Early Childhood/80-100% TWNDP:	66.7%	Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native:	0.0%
4 year-olds:	5	Early Childhood/40-79% TWNDP:	33.3%	Asian American:	0.0%
5 year-olds:	0	Early Childhood/0-40% TWNDP:	0.0%	Black/African American:	0.0%
6 year-olds:	0	Separate Classroom:	0.0%	White (non-Hispanic):	100.0%
7 year-olds:	0	Separate School:	0.0%	Hispanic:	0.0%
		Home:	0.0%		
		Itinerant Services:	0.0%		
Gender				Percent of Time with Non-Disabled Peers	
Males:	66.7%			All PreK	Without Itinerant Services Students
Females:	33.3%				
		Students Placed Out of District		79.1-100%:	66.7%
		In District:	100.0%	40.1-79.0%:	33.3%
		Out:	0.0%	0-40.0%:	0.0%
		Parochial/Private:	0.0%	Mean:	78.4%
FAPE at Three*					
District	State				
Count:	3	1156			
Yes:	100.0%	91.9%			

**FAPE: Students who exited the Department of Mental Retardation's Birth to Three program at age 3, were referred to special education, had a transition conference convened at least 90 days before the child's third birthday, and received a Free Appropriate Public Education by age three.*

District Description of Activities and Efforts around Special Education Program Improvement

The focus for improvement in our special education programs continues to be on educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Each child and young adult with a disability will be offered a meaningful individualized program leading to positive outcomes. Providing needed and appropriate special education in the regular classroom setting in the home school is a top priority. The involvement of families in the development of meaningful objectives and transition activities will be an added focus for the 06-07 school year. Emphasis will be placed on the formulation and documentation of program modifications, adaptations, and instructional strategies so the completed IEP's will be very meaningful to all service providers, especially the regular education classroom teachers. Our assumption is that our students with disabilities will continue to spend the vast majority of their day with their typical peers in the regular education classes and activities. The teachers and administrators have embraced the concept that we will provide needed specialized services in regular education settings in our district schools. In our attempt to comply with the P. J. Settlement Agreement, our students with disabilities will need to spend the majority of their school day with non-disabled peers (eighty percent or more as measured by the federal definition). We need to continue having our students with mental retardation or intellectual disability participate in regular classes and activities, continue providing services in-district as appropriate, and continue to encourage our students with disabilities to participate in school-sponsored extracurricular activities with non-disabled students.

PARTICIPATION IN AND PERFORMANCE ON STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

**Table 19: Percentage of Students Performing at Proficient or Above on Statewide Assessments
[CMT: Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; CAPT: Grade 10; Spring, 2006]**

	<i>Mathematics</i>		<i>Reading</i>		<i>Writing</i>		<i>Science</i>	
	<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	<i>All Other Students</i>	<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	<i>All Other Students</i>	<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	<i>All Other Students</i>	<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	<i>All Other Students</i>
Grade 3: District	38.1	91.8	61.9	88.5	*	95.1		
Grade 4: District	*	95.4	*	96.9	*	93.8		
Grade 5: District	*	95.5	*	97	*	100	<i>Science is not a subject tested on the 2006 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)</i>	
Grade 6: District	*	97	*	98	*	99		
Grade 7: District	*	96.2	*	95.3	*	93.4		
Grade 8: District	*	95.4	*	93.6	*	96.3		
Grade 10: District	*	97.2	*	97.2	*	94.5		*

*Note: An * denotes that the number of students with disabilities participating in the standard assessment was too small to report proficiency data.*

**Table 20. Participation in the 3rd Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2006]**

Students with Disabilities	Math	Reading	Writing
Taking Standard CMT	100.0%	100.0%	90.5%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%
Taking Skills Checklist	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	21	21	21

**Table 21. Participation in the 4th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2006]**

Students with Disabilities	Math	Reading	Writing
Taking Standard CMT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taking Skills Checklist	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	8	8	8

**Table 22. Participation in the 5th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2006]**

Students with Disabilities	Math	Reading	Writing
Taking Standard CMT	100.0%	100.0%	94.4%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
Taking Skills Checklist	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	18	18	18

**Table 23. Participation in the 6th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2006]**

Students with Disabilities	Math	Reading	Writing
Taking Standard CMT	90.9%	90.9%	90.9%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taking Skills Checklist	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	11	11	11

**Table 24. Participation in the 7th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2006]**

Students with Disabilities	Math	Reading	Writing
Taking Standard CMT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taking Skills Checklist	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	12	12	12

**Table 25. Participation in the 8th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2006]**

Students with Disabilities	Math	Reading	Writing
Taking Standard CMT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taking Skills Checklist	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	15	15	15

**Table 26. Participation in the 10th Grade CAPT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2006]**

Students with Disabilities	Math	Reading	Science	Writing
Taking Standard CAPT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
With an Invalid CAPT Test	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Taking Skills Checklist	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Exempt from CAPT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	8	8	8	8