

SPECIAL EDUCATION STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2004-05

Regional School District #7

ROBERTA OHOTNICKY, Superintendent

Telephone: 8603791084

Clint A. Montgomery, Shared Services Director

Telephone: (860) 379-8583



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 2004.

Table 1: OVERALL DISTRICT DESCRIPTION

Total Number of Students for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible (Excluding Pre-K and Adult Education)	1,076
Number of Students with Special Education Disabilities for Whom the District is Fiscally Responsible (Excluding Pre-K and Adult Education; Including Private Pay*)	128
District Special Education Prevalence Rate (% of Total Students with Disabilities)	11.9%
Number of Students with Disabilities Placed Out-of-District **	12
Number of Private Pay* Students with Disabilities	0
K-12 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Teachers	87.7
K-12 FTE Special Education Teachers	13.4
K-12 FTE Administrators	6.8
Regional Education Service Center (RESC)	Ed. Connection
Educational Reference Group (ERG)****	C
Total District Expenditures***	\$13,170,099
Special Education Expenditures***	\$2,511,218
Special Education Students Who Are:	
Limited English Proficient	0.0%
Free/Reduced-Price Meal Eligible	6.3%

*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 PREVALENCE

Prevalence 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 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	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05
School District Rate	11.5%	15.3%	13.9%	14.9%	14.2%	12.8%	11.9%
ERG Median Rate	12.3%	11.4%	10.7%	10.8%	10.4%	10.7%	10.7%
Statewide Rate	13.4%	12.8%	12.5%	12.3%	12.2%	12.1%	11.9%

SPECIAL EDUCATION PREVALENCE, continued

Table 3: Special Education Prevalence by Disability

Special Education Disability	K-12 Count of Students with Disabilities		Prevalence Rate		Comparison ERG	State Prevalence
	03-04	04-05	03-04	04-05	Prevalence Rate	Rate
Learning Disability	73	63	7.0%	5.9%	4.4%	4.6%
Intellectual Disability	8	8	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
Emotional Disturbance	18	17	1.7%	1.6%	0.7%	1.2%
Speech Impairment	8	7	0.8%	0.7%	2.3%	2.5%
Other Health Impairment	21	27	2.0%	2.5%	1.8%	1.8%
Other Disability*	6	3	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%
Autism		3		0.3%	0.5%	0.4%
Total	134	128	12.8%	11.9%	10.7%	11.9%

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.

*2004-05 Count of Specific Disabilities within "Other" Category					
Visual Impairment	0	Hearing Impairment	1	Developmental Delay**	0
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	2		

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	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Learning Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	63	100.0%	63	49.2%
Intellectual Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	8	6.3%
Emotional Disturbance	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	100.0%	17	13.3%
Speech/Language Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	5.5%
Other Health Impairments	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27	100.0%	27	21.1%
Other Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	2.3%
Autism	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	2.3%
District Total Students with Disabilities	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%	128	100.0%
<i>Comparison Statistics</i>												
All District Students	0	0.0%	11	1.0%	6	0.6%	4	0.4%	1,055	98.0%	1,076	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>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
79.1 to 100%	44	1	7	4	19	1	1	77	60.2%	69.2%	61.2%
40.1 to 79.0%	15	4	7	2	5	2	2	37	28.9%	22.7%	22.6%
0.0 to 40.0%	4	3	3	1	3	0	0	14	10.9%	8.1%	16.2%
Total	63	8	17	7	27	3	3	128	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	85.3%	52.9%	67.2%	79.8%	80.6%	78.1%	70.4%	79.1%		79.4%	72.8%

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>ERG Total Percent</i>	<i>State Total Percent</i>
79.1 to 100%	42	1	6	4	18	0	1	72	62.1%	72.8%	64.5%
40.1 to 79.0%	15	4	7	2	3	1	2	34	29.3%	23.7%	24.3%
0 to 40.0%	2	3	2	1	2	0	0	10	8.6%	3.5%	11.1%
Total	59	8	15	7	23	1	3	116	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean TWNDP	87.9%	52.9%	69.6%	79.8%	86.0%	65.6%	70.4%	81.6%		83.3%	77.0%

*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 Impairment Number</i>	<i>Other Disability Number</i>	<i>Autism 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%	3	0	3	0	1	0	0	7	5.5%	5.0%	8.4%
10.1 - 20%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8%	0.7%	2.7%
20.1 - 30%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.8%	2.0%
30.1 - 40%	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	6	4.7%	1.6%	3.1%
40.1 - 50%	1	2	1	0	4	0	0	8	6.3%	2.5%	3.8%
50.1 - 60%	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	3.1%	3.8%	4.7%
60.1 - 70%	6	1	3	0	0	1	1	12	9.4%	6.5%	6.4%
70.1 - 80%	8	1	2	1	0	1	0	13	10.2%	11.3%	8.9%
80.1 - 90%	9	0	0	1	4	0	1	15	11.7%	27.9%	22.5%
90.1 - 100%	35	1	7	3	15	1	0	62	48.4%	39.9%	37.5%
Total	63	8	17	7	27	3	3	128	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	ERG Total Percent	State Total Percent
Placed Out By District	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	25.0%	72.3%	60.5%
Placed Out By Other Parties*	4	0	2	0	3	0	0	9	75.0%	27.7%	39.5%
Total Placed Out	4	0	2	0	4	2	0	12	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	ERG Percent	State Percent
Public School	61	8	16	7	24	3	3	122	95.3%	95.3%	94.1%
Public Separate Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.9%	1.6%
Private Separate Facility	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	2.3%	2.5%	2.8%
Public Residential Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Private Residential Facility	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1.6%	1.0%	1.4%
Hospital/Homebound	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.8%	0.3%	0.2%
Total	63	8	17	7	27	3	3	128	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	93.7%	100.0%	94.1%	100.0%	85.2%	33.3%	100.0%	91.4%
ERG	97.8%	85.6%	72.7%	99.1%	93.4%	83.0%	85.2%	93.8%
State	92.6%	77.1%	61.2%	93.8%	88.9%	66.0%	67.1%	85.6%

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	61.9%	50.0%	41.2%	28.6%	55.6%	66.7%	33.3%	54.7%
ERG Participation	47.4%	43.7%	39.2%	28.3%	39.5%	28.9%	28.7%	39.4%
State Participation	36.9%	33.4%	23.2%	27.5%	36.9%	22.2%	22.6%	31.8%



OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES, continued

**Table 12: Students with Disabilities (Ages 14-21) Reported in Dec. 2004,
As Exiting Special Education During the 03-04 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	12	1	2	0	3	1	0	19	50.0%
Grad. with Certificate of Completion / IEP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Dropped Out	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	15.8%
Returned to Regular Education	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	13.2%
Reached Maximum Age, Moved or Deceased	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	8	21.1%
Total	23	2	6	1	4	2	0	38	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>
82.6%	63.2%	97.0%	89.8%

<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>
7.2%	6.5%	1.2%	1.8%

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%	1.9%	0.0%	97.5%	0.6%
<i>Special Education</i>	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	94.7%	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%	100.0%	0.0%

All Students
Special Education

Table 13a: Unique Student Suspension and Expulsion Data (2003-04 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>Overall</i>	<i>In School</i>	<i>Out of School</i>	<i>Expulsion</i>	<i>Overall</i>	<i>In School</i>	<i>Out of School</i>	<i>Expulsion</i>	<i>Overall</i>
Student Counts	1	21	0	22	1	18	0	19	907	4,889	126	5922
Suspension Rate	0.1%	2.2%	0.0%	2.3%	0.8%	13.6%	0.0%	14.4%	1.2%	6.6%	0.2%	7.9%

**Table 13b: Suspension and Expulsion of Students for Greater than 10 Days (PreK-12)
(Rate of Suspensions and Proportion by Race/Ethnicity) [2003-04 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>Other</i>
<i>General Education</i>	3	0.3%	➔	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Special Education</i>	1	0.8%	➔	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>All Students</i>	4	0.4%	➔	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Racial Proportion for All District Students</i>				0.0%	1.0%	0.6%	98.0%	0.4%	NA



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	13.4	0.0	Speech-Language Pathologist	0.4	0.0
Partially Sighted	0.0	0.0	Psychological Examiner	0.0	0.0
Deafness	0.0	0.0	School Psychologist	2.0	0.0
Blindness	0.0	0.0	School Social Worker	1.0	0.0
			School Nurse-Teacher	0.0	0.0
			School Counselor	5.0	0.0
Total	13.4	0.0	Total	8.4	0.0

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	12.5	8.0	8.6
Speech Pathologists	0.4	1.6	1.5
School Nurses (non-certified staff)	1.4	2.1	1.9
School Nurse-Teachers	0.0	0.0	0.0
School Psychologists	1.9	1.7	1.5
School Social Workers	0.9	0.4	1.2
School Counselors	4.7	2.3	2.3
School Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	7.4	4.4	5.0
Special Education Aides	20.6	15.5	12.9



Table 16: Special Education Expenditures 2003-04 (Unaudited)



	<i>District, State and Federal Dollars</i>	<i>District Percent</i>	<i>ERG Percent</i>	<i>State Percent</i>
Certified Personnel	\$686,094	27.3%	39.4%	41.6%
Noncertified Personnel	\$231,587	9.2%	15.5%	13.8%
Employee Benefits	\$191,818	7.6%	11.9%	12.0%
Purchased Services	\$994,344	39.6%	7.5%	4.8%
Tuition to Other Schools	\$297,657	11.9%	17.4%	19.0%
Instructional Supplies	\$5,747	0.2%	1.0%	0.7%
Property Services	\$0	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%
Special Education Transportation	\$102,617	4.1%	6.5%	7.4%
Equipment	\$299	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%
Other Expenditures	\$1,055	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%
Total	\$2,511,218	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 2003-04 (Unaudited)



	<i>District</i>	<i>ERG</i>	<i>State</i>
School District Expenditures for Special Education	19.1%	19.5%	19.9%



PARTICIPATION IN AND PERFORMANCE ON STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

**Table 19: Percentage of Students Performing at Proficient or Above on Statewide Assessments
[Fall, 2004 CMT: Grades 4, 6 and 8] [Spring, 2005 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								
Grade 4: ERG	51.0%	90.3%	32.9%	82.3%	44.7%	91.5%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	
Grade 4: CT	45.6%	83.1%	28.1%	71.7%	42.5%	86.0%		
Grade 6: District								
Grade 6: ERG	55.6%	94.9%	40.7%	91.4%	58.2%	93.9%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	
Grade 6: CT	39.4%	85.7%	27.8%	78.4%	41.7%	87.7%		
Grade 8: District								
Grade 8: ERG	49.8%	93.5%	50.0%	91.7%	55.5%	93.5%	<i>Not Applicable</i>	
Grade 8: CT	33.5%	81.5%	31.8%	81.1%	38.8%	86.1%		
Grade 10: District								
Grade 10: ERG	54.2%	94.5%	52.8%	1.0%	59.7%	95.1%	72.3%	97.5%
Grade 10: CT	36.8%	80.9%	42.2%	0.8%	45.1%	87.7%	51.5%	87.0%

Table 20. Participation in the 4th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities [Fall, 2004]

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	0		94.6%	92.4%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		0.0%	0.7%
	Absent	0		0.3%	0.5%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		5.2%	6.1%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.2%
	Total	0	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CMT	0		93.0%	90.9%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		0.8%	1.9%
	Absent	0		1.0%	0.8%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		5.2%	6.1%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.2%
	Total	0	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CMT	0		92.2%	87.3%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		1.8%	5.3%
	Absent	0		0.8%	1.0%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		5.2%	6.1%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.2%
	Total	0	100%	100%	100%

Table 21. Participation in the 6th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities [Fall, 2004]

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	0		95.0%	92.0%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		0.2%	0.9%
	Absent	0		0.4%	1.4%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		4.3%	5.6%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.1%
	Total	0	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CMT	0		94.6%	91.8%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		0.2%	1.2%
	Absent	0		0.9%	1.3%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		4.3%	5.6%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.1%
	Total	0	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CMT	0		93.7%	89.6%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		1.7%	3.0%
	Absent	0		0.2%	1.7%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		4.3%	5.6%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.1%
	Total	0	100%	100%	100%

Table 22. Participation in the 8th Grade CMT by Students with Disabilities [Fall, 2004]

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	11	100.0%	94.5%	90.2%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		0.4%	1.4%
	Absent	0		0.6%	2.1%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		4.5%	6.2%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.1%
	Total	11	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CMT	11	100.0%	94.9%	90.6%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		0.2%	1.2%
	Absent	0		0.4%	1.9%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		4.5%	6.2%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.1%
	Total	11	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CMT	11	100.0%	93.5%	88.3%
	With an Invalid CMT Test	0		1.0%	2.5%
	Absent	0		1.0%	2.9%
	Taking Skills Checklist	0		4.5%	6.2%
	Exempt from CMT	0		0.0%	0.1%
	Total	11	100%	100%	100%

**Table 23. Participation in the 10th Grade CAPT by Students with Disabilities
[Spring, 2005]**

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	21	80.8%	84.6%	79.3%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	0		4.4%	7.0%
	Taking Skills Checklist	5	19.2%	7.4%	6.5%
	Absent	0		3.4%	7.0%
	Exempt from CAPT	0		0.2%	0.1%
	Total (Grade 10)	26	100%	100%	100%
<i>Reading</i>	Taking Standard CAPT	21	80.8%	86.3%	80.4%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	0		3.9%	6.0%
	Taking Skills Checklist	5	19.2%	7.4%	6.5%
	Absent	0		2.2%	6.9%
	Exempt from CAPT	0		0.2%	0.1%
	Total (Grade 10)	26	100%	100%	100%
<i>Writing</i>	Taking Standard CAPT	20	76.9%	83.3%	79.2%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	1	3.8%	4.7%	6.4%
	Taking Skills Checklist	5	19.2%	7.4%	6.5%
	Absent	0		4.4%	7.8%
	Exempt from CAPT	0		0.2%	0.1%
	Total (Grade 10)	26	100%	100%	100%
<i>Science</i>	Taking Standard CAPT	18	69.2%	86.8%	81.7%
	With an Invalid CAPT Test	0		2.7%	4.8%
	Taking Skills Checklist	5	19.2%	7.4%	6.5%
	Absent	3	11.5%	2.9%	6.9%
	Exempt from CAPT	0		0.2%	0.1%
	Total (Grade 10)	26	100%	100%	100%