

SPECIAL EDUCATION STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2003-04

Torrington School District

Gregory J. Riccio, Superintendent

Telephone: (860) 489-2396

Romain Dallemard, Director of Special Education

Telephone: (860) 489-2320



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 2003.

Table 1: OVERALL DISTRICT DESCRIPTION

Total Number of Students for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible (Excluding Pre-K and Adult Education)			5,128
Number of Students with Special Education Disabilities for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible (Excluding Pre-K and Adult Education; Including Private Pay*)			719
District Special Education Incidence Rate (% of Total Students with Disabilities)			14.0%
Number of Students with Disabilities Placed Out-of-District **			68
Number of Private Pay* Students with Disabilities			5
K-12 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Teachers	315.8	Total District Expenditures***	\$47,143,597
K-12 FTE Special Education Teachers	37.3	Special Education Expenditures***	\$10,373,335
K-12 FTE Administrators	23.7	Special Education Students Who Are:	
Regional Education Service Center (RESC) Ed. Connection		Limited English Proficient	3.6%
Educational Reference Group (ERG)****	F	Free/Reduced-Price Meal Eligible	39.6%

*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 2002-03 fiscal year.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION INCIDENCE/PREVALENCE

Incidence is a special education rate of occurrence statistic. It indicates the percent of students in a district (ERG 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 incidence rate has been dropping for several years, although Connecticut's incidence rate is still slightly higher than the national average.

Table 2: Special Education Incidence Trends

	93-94	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04
School District Rate	11.6%	14.2%	14.6%	13.9%	14.2%	14.1%	14.0%
ERG Median Rate	13.6%	14.0%	13.4%	13.0%	12.7%	11.8%	11.7%
Statewide Rate	13.4%	13.5%	12.8%	12.5%	12.3%	12.2%	12.1%

SPECIAL EDUCATION INCIDENCE, continued

Table 3: Special Education Incidence by Disability

<i>Special Education Disability</i>	<i>K-12 Count of Students with Disabilities</i>		<i>Incidence Rate</i>		<i>Comparison</i>	<i>State</i>
	<i>02-03</i>	<i>03-04</i>	<i>02-03</i>	<i>03-04</i>	<i>ERG Incidence Rate</i>	<i>Incidence Rate</i>
Learning Disability	322	306	6.2%	6.0%	4.3%	4.8%
Intellectual Disability	35	36	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%
Emotional Disturbance	102	96	2.0%	1.9%	1.3%	1.3%
Speech Impairment	111	112	2.1%	2.2%	2.6%	2.5%
Other Health Impairment	111	105	2.1%	2.0%	1.8%	1.7%
Other Disability*	50	64	1.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Total	731	719	14.1%	14.0%	11.9%	12.1%

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>*2003-04 Count of Specific Disabilities within "Other" Category</i>			
Visual Impairment	2	Traumatic Brain Injury	1
Orthopedic Impairment		Autism	17
Deaf-Blindness		Multiple Disabilities	17
Hearing Impairment	9	Developmental Delay**	18

**CT statute limits the identification of students as Developmental Delay to children ages three through five.

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		Other Race		Disability Totals	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Learning Disability	1	0.3%	1	0.3%	16	5.2%	23	7.5%	263	85.9%	2	0.7%	306	42.6%
Intellectual Disability	0	0.0%	1	2.8%	5	13.9%	2	5.6%	28	77.8%	0	0.0%	36	5.0%
Emotional Disturbance	0	0.0%	2	2.1%	9	9.4%	2	2.1%	83	86.5%	0	0.0%	96	13.4%
Speech/Language Impairment	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	7	6.3%	14	12.5%	90	80.4%	0	0.0%	112	15.6%
Other Health Impairments	0	1.0%	1	1.0%	11	10.5%	6	5.7%	87	82.9%	0	0.0%	105	14.6%
Other Disability	0	0.0%	2	3.1%	5	7.8%	7	10.9%	50	78.1%	0	0.0%	64	8.9%
District Total Students with Disabilities	1	0.1%	8	1.1%	53	7.4%	54	7.5%	601	83.6%	2	0.3%	719	100.0%
<i>Comparison Statistics</i>														
District All Students	13	0.3%	139	2.7%	267	5.2%	375	7.3%	4,321	84.3%	13	0.3%	5,128	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 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>Total District Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>	<i>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
79.1 to 100%	178	1	26	65	52	17	339	47.1%	58.8%	58.2%
40.1 to 79.0%	92	20	14	39	33	26	224	31.2%	24.1%	23.2%
0.0 to 40.0%	36	15	56	8	20	21	156	21.7%	17.1%	18.6%
Total	306	36	96	112	105	64	719	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	73.6%	44.0%	36.0%	78.1%	53.0%	68.0%	65.1%		71.7%	70.6%

Table 6: TWNDP: In-District* 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>Total District Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>	<i>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
79.1 to 100%	171	1	24	63	47	16	322	49.8%	62.1%	61.3%
40.1 to 79.0%	91	20	12	38	31	26	218	33.7%	26.0%	25.0%
0 to 40.0%	31	9	31	8	16	11	106	16.4%	11.9%	13.7%
Total	293	30	67	109	94	53	646	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	74.5%	50.0%	47.0%	78.0%	69.0%	62.0%	69.3%		76.0%	74.7%

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

Table 7: Ten TWNDP Categories: All 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 Impairment Number</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>Total District Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>	<i>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
0 - 10.0%	24	4	48	2	14	12	104	14.5%	9.0%	9.4%
10.1 - 20%	0	1	3	0	0	4	8	1.1%	1.7%	3.1%
20.1 - 30%	1	2	3	0	4	1	11	1.5%	2.7%	2.5%
30.1 - 40%	11	8	2	6	2	4	33	4.6%	3.6%	3.6%
40.1 - 50%	18	3	3	3	4	8	39	5.4%	4.7%	4.4%
50.1 - 60%	10	10	3	8	6	4	41	5.7%	5.4%	4.8%
60.1 - 70%	40	6	7	14	13	6	86	12.0%	6.5%	6.2%
70.1 - 80%	27	1	1	17	12	8	66	9.2%	8.2%	8.9%
80.1 - 90%	62	1	8	18	13	3	105	14.6%	21.7%	21.8%
90.1 - 100%	113	0	18	44	37	14	226	31.4%	36.4%	35.2%
Total	306	36	96	112	105	64	719	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	District Total	District Percent	ERG Total Percent	State Total Percent
Placed Out By District	1	3	12	0	2	9	27	39.7%	61.6%	63.5%
Placed Out By Other Parties*	10	3	17	1	8	2	41	60.3%	38.4%	36.5%
Total Placed Out	11	6	29	1	10	11	68	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	District Total	Total Percent	ERG Percent	State Percent
Public School	301	32	70	112	100	54	669	93.0%	93.8%	93.7%
Public Separate Facility	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0.3%	1.7%	1.6%
Private Separate Facility	2	2	12	0	3	7	26	3.6%	2.9%	2.9%
Public Residential Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Private Residential Facility	3	2	14	0	2	1	22	3.1%	1.4%	1.5%
Hospital/Homebound	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Total	306	36	96	112	105	64	719	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	District Total
District	92.2%	83.3%	55.2%	100.0%	88.6%	79.7%	86.4%
ERG	95.7%	76.8%	62.1%	96.4%	90.3%	68.0%	87.5%
State	92.9%	75.5%	62.6%	93.0%	88.9%	64.5%	85.2%

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	Total SWD
District	58.8%	61.1%	42.7%	62.5%	59.0%	54.7%	57.0%
ERG Participation	39.0%	38.8%	23.6%	28.1%	38.0%	25.9%	33.4%
State Participation	32.6%	26.0%	18.3%	22.2%	31.1%	17.7%	26.9%



OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES, continued

**Table 12: Students with Disabilities (Ages 14-21) Reported in Dec. 2003,
As Exiting Special Education During the 02-03 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</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>District Total Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>
Graduated with Diploma	11	1	9	2	3	3	29	30.2%
Grad. with Certificate of Completion / IEP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Dropped Out	8	0	14	0	1	1	24	25.0%
Returned to Regular Education	13	0	2	0	0	0	15	15.6%
Reached Maximum Age, Moved or Deceased	8	1	12	3	4	0	28	29.2%
Total	40	2	37	5	8	4	96	100.0%

Regardless of the reason for exit, all students must, as part of their IEP and starting at age 14, receive effective transition planning for life after high school.

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



<i>Special Education Graduation Rate</i>		<i>All Student Graduation Rate</i>	
<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>
59.2%	61.8%	83.2%	89.0%

<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>
10.7%	7.9%	3.7%	2.1%

Table 13: Suspension and Expulsion Information (2002-03 School Year Data; PreK-12)

	<i>General Education Students Suspended/Expelled</i>			<i>Special Education Students Suspended/Expelled</i>			<i>Statewide Special Education Students Suspended/Expelled</i>		
	<i>In School</i>	<i>Out of School</i>	<i>Expulsion</i>	<i>In School</i>	<i>Out of School</i>	<i>Expulsion</i>	<i>In School</i>	<i>Out of School</i>	<i>Expulsion</i>
Student Counts	21	112	6	11	68	1	1,109	5,019	115
Suspension Rate	0.5%	2.6%	0.1%	1.7%	10.2%	0.2%	1.6%	7.3%	0.2%



DISTRICT RESOURCES



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

	<i>Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Number of Staff</i>			<i>Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Number of Staff</i>	
	<i>K-12</i>	<i>Pre-K Only</i>		<i>K-12</i>	<i>Pre-K Only</i>
Special Education Instructional Staff	K-12	Pre-K Only	Pupil Services Staff	K-12	Pre-K Only
General Special Education Teacher	36.5	3.0	Speech-Language Pathologist	6.0	1.0
Partially Sighted	0.0	0.0	Psychological Examiner	0.0	0.0
Deafness	0.9	0.0	School Psychologist	6.0	0.0
Blindness	0.0	0.0	School Social Worker	6.0	0.0
			School Nurse-Teacher	1.0	0.0
			School Counselor	9.0	0.0
Total	37.3	3.0	Total	28.0	1.0

DISTRICT RESOURCES, continued

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



	<i>District</i>	<i>ERG</i>	<i>State</i>
Special Education Teachers	7.2	8.1	8.4
Speech Pathologists	1.2	1.5	1.5
School Nurses (non-certified staff)	1.6	2.2	1.9
School Nurse-Teachers	0.2	0.0	0.0
School Psychologists	1.2	1.3	1.5
School Social Workers	1.2	1.4	1.2
School Counselors	1.7	2.3	2.2
School Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	4.1	5.0	4.8
Special Education Aides	13.6	12.5	12.1



Table 16: Special Education Expenditures 2002-03 (Unaudited)



	<i>District, State and Federal Dollars</i>	<i>District Percent</i>	<i>ERG Percent</i>	<i>State Percent</i>
Certified Personnel	\$3,650,924	35.2%	43.3%	41.9%
Noncertified Personnel	\$1,794,143	17.3%	13.5%	13.7%
Employee Benefits	\$1,454,578	14.0%	11.0%	11.4%
Purchased Services	\$437,864	4.2%	3.8%	4.8%
Tuition to Other Public Schools	\$184,668	1.8%	5.6%	6.3%
Tuition to Private Schools	\$2,110,911	20.3%	13.1%	12.8%
Instructional Supplies	\$96,953	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%
Property Services	\$23,992	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
Special Education Transportation	\$597,014	5.8%	8.1%	7.6%
Equipment	\$16,423	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%
Other Expenditures	\$5,865	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Total	\$10,373,335	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 2002-03 (Unaudited)



	<i>District</i>	<i>ERG</i>	<i>State</i>
School District Expenditures for Special Education	22.0%	19.5%	19.7%





Table 18: Preschool Student Data



Number of Pre-K Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible: **54**

Age		Education Setting		Race/Ethnicity		
3 year-olds:	19	Regular/Early Childhood:	27.8%	Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native:	0.0%	
4 year-olds:	22	Early Childhood Special Ed.:	27.8%	Asian American:	0.0%	
5 year-olds:	13	Reverse Mainstream:	5.6%	Black/African American:	9.3%	
6 year-olds:	0	Home/Hospital:	0.0%	White (non-Hispanic):	87.0%	
7 year-olds:	0	Part-Time:	7.4%	Hispanic:	3.7%	
		Residential Facility:	0.0%	Other:	0.0%	
		Separate School:	0.0%			
		Itinerant Services:	31.5%			
Gender		Students Placed Out of District		Percent of Time with Non-Disabled Peers		
Males:	68.5%	In District:	79.6%	All PreK	Without Itinerant Services Students	
Females:	31.5%	Out:	20.4%	79.1-100%:	40.7%	59.5%
		Parochial/Private:	0.0%	40.1-79.0%:	20.4%	29.7%
				0-40.0%:	38.9%	10.8%
				Mean:	48.4%	70.7%
FAPE at Three*						
	<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>				
Count:	10	911				
Yes:	90.0%	83.5%				

**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

District chose not to submit a narrative.

PARTICIPATION IN AND PERFORMANCE ON STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

**Table 19: Percentage of Students Performing at Proficient or Above on Statewide Assessments
[Fall, 2003 CMT: Grades 4, 6 and 8] [Spring, 2004 CAPT: Grade 10]**

	<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 4: District	30.2%	83.7%	21.4%	73.8%	38.1%	81.7%		
Grade 4: ERG	52.4%	85.8%	27.6%	74.2%	43.1%	88.4%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	
Grade 4: CT	48.6%	83.6%	28.5%	73.0%	44.4%	86.5%		
Grade 6: District	46.2%	91.5%	30.0%	89.2%	55.3%	91.5%		
Grade 6: ERG	46.8%	89.6%	35.8%	83.2%	48.3%	90.7%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	
Grade 6: CT	44.2%	85.9%	33.4%	78.7%	45.2%	87.9%		
Grade 8: District	37.0%	87.2%	31.6%	88.5%	33.8%	87.8%		
Grade 8: ERG	36.6%	84.5%	37.1%	84.2%	39.2%	87.3%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	
Grade 8: CT	36.1%	81.5%	34.6%	81.8%	38.5%	85.7%		
Grade 10: District	25.7%	80.1%	22.0%	76.0%	25.0%	79.6%	37.5%	79.9%
Grade 10: ERG	35.6%	80.1%	30.1%	80.0%	39.4%	86.1%	46.3%	85.5%
Grade 10: CT	38.5%	76.4%	39.0%	79.1%	46.6%	84.5%	49.7%	81.7%

Table 20. Participation in the 4th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities [Fall, 2003]

Students with Disabilities		<i>Student Count</i>	<i>District Percent</i>	<i>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
<i>Math</i>	Taking Standard CMT	43	89.6%	82.7%	81.2%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	4	8.3%	11.3%	11.6%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Absent	0	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	2.1%	4.8%	5.8%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	48	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CMT	42	87.5%	79.9%	76.8%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	5	10.4%	14.1%	14.9%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0	0.0%	0.7%	1.6%
	Absent	0	0.0%	0.6%	0.9%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	2.1%	4.8%	5.8%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	48	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CMT	42	87.5%	79.9%	75.1%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	5	10.4%	11.4%	13.0%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0	0.0%	2.7%	4.4%
	Absent	0	0.0%	1.3%	1.6%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	2.1%	4.8%	5.8%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	48	100%	100%	100%

Table 21. Participation in the 6th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities [Fall, 2003]

Students with Disabilities		<i>Student Count</i>	<i>District Percent</i>	<i>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
<i>Math</i>	Taking Standard CMT	39	83.0%	84.1%	79.2%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	6	12.8%	10.6%	13.9%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0	0.0%	0.5%	0.9%
	Absent	1	2.1%	1.1%	1.4%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	2.1%	3.7%	4.7%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	47	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CMT	40	85.1%	81.8%	77.3%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	5	10.6%	13.6%	15.7%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	1	2.1%	0.5%	1.1%
	Absent	0	0.0%	0.4%	1.3%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	2.1%	3.7%	4.7%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	47	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CMT	38	80.9%	81.9%	76.7%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	5	10.6%	11.7%	14.0%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	1	2.1%	1.4%	2.3%
	Absent	2	4.3%	1.4%	2.3%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	2.1%	3.7%	4.7%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	47	100%	100%	100%

Table 22. Participation in the 8th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities [Fall, 2003]

Students with Disabilities		<i>Student Count</i>	<i>District Percent</i>	<i>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
<i>Math</i>	Taking Standard CMT	73	82.0%	83.1%	77.7%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	10	11.2%	12.4%	14.3%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	1	1.1%	0.5%	1.0%
	Absent	4	4.5%	1.7%	2.2%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	1.1%	2.3%	4.7%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	89	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CMT	76	85.4%	82.0%	77.3%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	10	11.2%	14.1%	14.6%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	1	1.1%	0.6%	1.2%
	Absent	1	1.1%	1.0%	2.2%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	1.1%	2.3%	4.7%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	89	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CMT	74	83.1%	81.7%	76.9%
	Taking Out-Of-Level CMT	7	7.9%	12.0%	13.6%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	3	3.4%	1.5%	2.0%
	Absent	4	4.5%	2.6%	2.8%
	Taking Skills Checklist	1	1.1%	2.3%	4.7%
	Exempt from CMT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	89	100%	100%	100%

**Table 23. Participation in the 10th Grade CAPT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2004]**

Students with Disabilities		<i>District Number</i>	<i>District Percent</i>	<i>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
<i>Math</i>	Taking Standard CAPT	35	72.9%	80.7%	82.2%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	7	14.6%	6.6%	4.8%
	Taking Skills Checklist	2	4.2%	7.7%	6.5%
	Absent	4	8.3%	5.1%	6.4%
	Exempt from CAPT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total (Grade 10)	48	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CAPT	41	85.4%	83.6%	82.5%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	4	8.3%	5.1%	5.2%
	Taking Skills Checklist	2	4.2%	7.7%	6.5%
	Absent	1	2.1%	3.7%	5.8%
	Exempt from CAPT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total (Grade 10)	48	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CAPT	36	75.0%	80.5%	81.0%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	8	16.7%	8.4%	5.7%
	Taking Skills Checklist	2	4.2%	7.7%	6.5%
	Absent	2	4.2%	3.4%	6.8%
	Exempt from CAPT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total (Grade 10)	48	100%	100%	100%
<i>Science</i>	Taking Standard CAPT	40	83.3%	84.5%	84.6%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	4	8.3%	4.3%	3.4%
	Taking Skills Checklist	2	4.2%	7.7%	6.5%
	Absent	2	4.2%	3.5%	5.5%
	Exempt from CAPT	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total (Grade 10)	48	100%	100%	100%