

SPECIAL EDUCATION STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2005-06

Torrington School District

SUSAN O'BRIEN, Superintendent

Telephone: 8604892327

Judith C. Babcock, Director of Student Services

Telephone: (860) 489-2327, x15



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)			5,070
Number of Students with Special Education Disabilities for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible (Excluding Pre-K and Adult Education; Including Private Pay*)			597
District Special Education Prevalence Rate (% of Total Students with Disabilities)			11.8%
Number of Students with Disabilities Placed Out-of-District **			66
Number of Private Pay* Students with Disabilities			4
K-12 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Teachers	312.5	Total District Expenditures***	\$51,221,503
K-12 FTE Special Education Teachers	37.0	Special Education Expenditures***	\$10,511,674
K-12 FTE Administrators	23.0	Special Education Students Who Are:	
Regional Education Service Center (RESC)	Ed. Connection	Limited English Proficient	2.8%
District Reference Group (DRG)****	G	Free/Reduced-Price Meal Eligible	39.7%

*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	11.6%	13.9%	14.2%	14.1%	14.0%	12.5%	11.8%
DRG Median Rate	15.9%	12.8%	12.1%	12.1%	12.5%	12.6%	12.1%
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

Special Education Disability	K-12 Count of Students with Disabilities		Prevalence Rate		Comparison DRG Prevalence Rate	State Prevalence Rate
	04-05	05-06	04-05	05-06		
Learning Disability	266	229	5.2%	4.5%	4.0%	4.3%
Intellectual Disability	36	40	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.5%
Emotional Disturbance	82	78	1.6%	1.5%	1.3%	1.2%
Speech Impairment	104	86	2.0%	1.7%	2.7%	2.5%
Other Health Impairment	79	87	1.6%	1.7%	2.1%	1.9%
Other Disability*	49	52	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.8%
Autism	22	25	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Total	638	597	12.5%	11.8%	12.1%	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.

*2005-06 Count of Specific Disabilities within "Other" Category					
Visual Impairment	1	Hearing Impairment	9	Developmental Delay**	12
Orthopedic Impairment	0	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	30		

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	
Learning Disability	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	13	5.7%	19	8.3%	196	85.6%	229	38.4%
Intellectual Disability	0	0.0%	1	2.5%	5	12.5%	3	7.5%	31	77.5%	40	6.7%
Emotional Disturbance	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	14.1%	2	2.6%	65	83.3%	78	13.1%
Speech/Language Impairment	0	0.0%	2	2.3%	7	8.1%	8	9.3%	69	80.2%	86	14.4%
Other Health Impairments	1	3.4%	3	3.4%	10	11.5%	4	4.6%	69	79.3%	87	14.6%
Other Disability	0	0.0%	4	7.7%	3	5.8%	10	19.2%	35	67.3%	52	8.7%
Autism	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%	22	88.0%	25	4.2%
District Total Students with Disabilities	1	0.2%	11	1.8%	51	8.5%	47	7.9%	487	81.6%	597	100.0%
<i>Comparison Statistics</i>												
All District Students	19	0.4%	135	2.7%	285	5.6%	514	10.1%	4,117	81.2%	5,070	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%	159	11	21	46	49	17	10	313	52.4%	63.8%	66.3%
40.1 to 79.0%	59	25	26	38	24	14	8	194	32.5%	20.1%	20.2%
0.0 to 40.0%	11	4	31	2	14	21	7	90	15.1%	16.2%	13.5%
Total	229	40	78	86	87	52	25	597	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	81.9%	62.1%	46.9%	78.0%	72.2%	50.2%	58.0%	70.3%		73.4%	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%	154	11	18	46	45	16	10	300	56.9%	68.6%	69.9%
40.1 to 79.0%	58	24	21	38	22	14	8	185	35.1%	22.3%	21.8%
0 to 40.0%	10	1	10	2	7	8	4	42	8.0%	9.1%	8.3%
Total	222	36	49	86	74	38	22	527	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	82.1%	66.3%	61.7%	78.0%	77.4%	64.2%	65.9%	75.8%		79.1%	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%	4	1	23	1	7	10	5	51	8.5%	10.5%	7.8%
10.1 - 20%	0	1	3	0	1	4	0	9	1.5%	1.4%	2.0%
20.1 - 30%	2	1	4	1	1	1	0	10	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%
30.1 - 40%	5	1	1	0	5	6	2	20	3.4%	2.7%	2.3%
40.1 - 50%	1	5	5	7	2	3	2	25	4.2%	3.2%	2.7%
50.1 - 60%	11	8	7	4	5	8	2	45	7.5%	4.1%	3.8%
60.1 - 70%	18	9	7	9	7	1	2	53	8.9%	5.3%	5.6%
70.1 - 80%	31	4	9	21	12	5	2	84	14.1%	8.8%	9.4%
80.1 - 90%	53	7	6	12	17	7	7	109	18.3%	24.9%	23.6%
90.1 - 100%	104	3	13	31	30	7	3	191	32.0%	37.6%	41.5%
Total	229	40	78	86	87	52	25	597	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	16	0	4	12	2	35	53.0%	58.7%	60.5%
Placed Out By Other Parties*	5	3	13	0	7	2	1	31	47.0%	41.3%	39.5%
Total Placed Out	5	4	29	0	11	14	3	66	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	228	39	54	86	79	40	22	548	91.8%	91.7%	93.5%
Public Separate Facility	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	0.5%	2.6%	1.7%
Private Separate Facility	1	1	17	0	4	8	2	33	5.5%	3.9%	3.2%
Public Residential Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Private Residential Facility	0	0	6	0	4	2	1	13	2.2%	1.5%	1.3%
Hospital/Homebound	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	229	40	78	86	87	52	25	597	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	99.6%	90.0%	65.4%	95.3%	87.4%	69.2%	76.0%	88.4%
DRG	90.6%	81.0%	61.0%	94.4%	87.0%	62.3%	57.9%	83.6%
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	63.3%	5.0%	48.7%	51.2%	44.8%	63.5%	60.0%	52.9%
DRG Participation	38.9%	36.7%	23.2%	26.6%	32.3%	26.1%	23.1%	31.6%
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</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>Autism</i>	<i>District Total Number</i>	<i>District Total Percent</i>
Graduated with Diploma	15	4	9	4	4	0	1	37	30.6%
Grad. with Certificate of Completion / IEP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Dropped Out	15	0	7	2	6	0	0	30	24.8%
Returned to Regular Education	14	0	6	7	3	1	0	31	25.6%
Reached Maximum Age, Moved or Deceased	8	0	7	4	3	1	0	23	19.0%
Total	52	4	29	17	16	2	1	121	100.0%



<i>Special Education Graduation Rate</i>		<i>All Student Graduation Rate</i>	
<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>
66.1%	67.7%	79.0%	91.2%

<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>
13.4%	5.6%	7.2%	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>	0.0%	2.4%	4.8%	88.9%	3.8%
<i>Special Education</i>	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	86.5%	8.1%

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>	0.9%	3.8%	4.7%	82.1%	8.5%
<i>Special Education</i>	0.0%	3.3%	13.3%	83.3%	0.0%

All Students
Special Education

**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>	213	4.63%	401	8.72%	2204
<i>Special Education Students</i>	108	16.36%	207	31.36%	1107

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

Serious offenses made up 19.2% 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>	57	1.2%	→	0.0%	1.8%	7.0%	80.7%	10.5%
<i>Special Education</i>	25	3.8%	→	0.0%	4.0%	8.0%	80.0%	8.0%
<i>All Students</i>	82	1.6%	→	0.0%	2.4%	7.3%	80.5%	9.8%
<i>Racial Proportion for All District Students</i>				0.4%	2.6%	5.6%	80.8%	10.5%



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>	
	K-12	Pre-K Only		K-12	Pre-K Only
Special Education Instructional Staff			Pupil Services Staff		
General Special Education Teacher	36.0	3.5	Speech-Language Pathologist	6.0	1.0
Partially Sighted	0.0	0.0	Psychological Examiner	0.0	0.0
Deafness	1.0	0.0	School Psychologist	6.0	0.0
Blindness	0.0	0.0	School Social Worker	7.0	0.0
			School Nurse-Teacher	1.0	0.0
			School Counselor	9.0	0.0
Total	37.0	3.5	Total	29.0	1.0

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	7.3	8.2	8.7
Speech Pathologists	1.2	1.5	1.5
School Nurses (non-certified staff)	1.7	2.2	2.0
School Nurse-Teachers	0.2	0.0	0.0
School Psychologists	1.2	1.6	1.5
School Social Workers	1.4	1.5	1.2
School Counselors	1.8	2.2	2.3
School Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	4.3	5.2	5.1
Special Education Aides	18.9	14.6	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	\$3,593,616	34.2%	38.2%	40.8%
Noncertified Personnel	\$1,904,992	18.1%	12.9%	14.0%
Employee Benefits	\$1,522,049	14.5%	12.3%	12.8%
Purchased Services	\$440,233	4.2%	3.9%	4.8%
Tuition to Other Schools	\$2,259,514	21.5%	23.6%	18.8%
Instructional Supplies	\$51,832	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%
Property Services	\$0	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Special Education Transportation	\$708,421	6.7%	8.1%	7.4%
Equipment	\$11,507	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Other Expenditures	\$19,510	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Total	\$10,511,674	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	20.5%	20.6%	20.0%





Table 18: Preschool Student Data



<i>Age</i>			<i>Education Setting</i>			<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>		
3 year-olds:	21		Early Childhood/80-100% TWNDP:	65.4%		Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native:	0.0%	
4 year-olds:	31		Early Childhood/40-79% TWNDP:	13.5%		Asian American:	0.0%	
5 year-olds:	0		Early Childhood/0-40% TWNDP:	1.9%		Black/African American:	13.5%	
6 year-olds:	0		Separate Classroom:	17.3%		White (non-Hispanic):	84.6%	
7 year-olds:	0		Separate School:	1.9%		Hispanic:	1.9%	
			Home:	0.0%				
			Itinerant Services:	0.0%				
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Students Placed Out of District</i>			<i>Percent of Time with Non-Disabled Peers</i>		
Males:	80.8%		In District:	98.1%		All PreK	Without Itinerant Services Students	
Females:	19.2%		Out:	1.9%		79.1-100%:	65.4%	65.4%
			Parochial/Private:	0.0%		40.1-79.0%:	15.4%	15.4%
						0-40.0%:	19.2%	19.2%
						Mean:	74.7%	74.7%
<i>FAPE at Three*</i>								
	<i>District</i>	<i>State</i>						
Count:	13	1156						
Yes:	92.3%	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

1. Train and support co-teaching opportunities to assure greater exposure to regular curriculum expectations.
2. Develop (or contract for) a systematic method for transition opportunities for all students, particularly the more handicapped population.
3. Develop a closer collaboration with DCF, DMR, and other agencies to provide united services for students.
4. Changing format, time and composition of ESY programs to best serve population.
5. Provide opportunities for staff to have Professional Development instruction from the experts in the field, and to visit exemplary programs.
6. All special education staff members instructed in the new literacy model and new math textbooks use. Regular staff invited to workshops in special education related topics.
7. Develop and explore enhancements to assist at risk students' complete HS diploma IE: Courses on line, Computer courses, tutors during the day, extended hours etc.

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	31.5	76.8	18.5	73.2	23.1	85.4	<i>Science is not a subject tested on the 2006 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)</i>	
Grade 4: District	40.5	86.2	16.7	74.7	31.6	88.5		
Grade 5: District	31.3	88.3	31.3	78.6	53.2	88.5		
Grade 6: District	26.7	90.7	22.2	81.3	23.3	82.3		
Grade 7: District	25.6	84.9	28.2	83.1	22.5	76.3		
Grade 8: District	34.2	91.1	35.1	84.9	22.2	83.3		
Grade 10: District	35.5	81.4	25.9	79.7	16.7	78.7	24.1	77.6

*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	<i>Math</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>
Taking Standard CMT	94.7%	94.7%	91.2%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
Taking Skills Checklist	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	57	57	57

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

Students with Disabilities	<i>Math</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>
Taking Standard CMT	87.5%	87.5%	79.2%
With an Invalid CMT Test	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Taking Skills Checklist	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	48	48	48

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

Students with Disabilities	<i>Math</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>
Taking Standard CMT	90.6%	90.6%	88.7%
With an Invalid CMT Test	1.9%	1.9%	3.8%
Taking Skills Checklist	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	53	53	53

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

Students with Disabilities	<i>Math</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>
Taking Standard CMT	91.8%	91.8%	87.8%
With an Invalid CMT Test	6.1%	6.1%	10.2%
Taking Skills Checklist	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	49	49	49

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

Students with Disabilities	<i>Math</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>
Taking Standard CMT	88.6%	88.6%	90.9%
With an Invalid CMT Test	6.8%	6.8%	4.5%
Taking Skills Checklist	4.5%	4.5%	4.5%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	44	44	44

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

Students with Disabilities	<i>Math</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>
Taking Standard CMT	86.4%	84.1%	81.8%
With an Invalid CMT Test	9.1%	11.4%	13.6%
Taking Skills Checklist	4.5%	4.5%	4.5%
Exempt from CMT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	44	44	44

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

Students with Disabilities	<i>Math</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Science</i>	<i>Writing</i>
Taking Standard CAPT	83.8%	73.0%	78.4%	81.1%
With an Invalid CAPT Test	10.8%	21.6%	16.2%	13.5%
Taking Skills Checklist	5.4%	5.4%	5.4%	5.4%
Exempt from CAPT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total # Students Assessed	37	37	37	37