DISTRICT REFERENCE GROUPS, 2006

District Reference Groups (DRGs) is a classification system in which districts that have public school students with similar socioeconomic status (SES) and need are grouped together. Grouping like districts together is useful in order to make legitimate comparisons among districts.

The 2006 DRGs are the fourth generation of the State Department of Education's (SDE) classification of school districts. In 1979, the SDE classified districts into six types of communities. That classification system was based on population, location relative to the five large cities of the state and location in or out of the U.S. Bureau of the Census Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of 1970 and 1980. In 1989, the SDE introduced Education Reference Groups (ERGs) that classified districts into seven groups according to 1980 census measures of socioeconomic status and need. The 1996 ERGs expanded the number of groups to nine, used census data based on families with children in public schools and used poverty and enrollment from recent state data. The 2006 DRGs maintain the changes introduced in 1996 and calculate poverty and non-English home language from the records of students attending the public schools in 2004.

Variables Used to Form 2006 DRGs

Four variables (income, education, occupation and family structure) were based on 2000 census data allocated to school districts for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The remaining three (poverty, home language and district enrollment) were taken from the State Department of Education's October 2004 records. All variables were based upon families with children attending public school.

Income - From the NCES census data, the median family income in 1999 for households with children in public school. This variable is comparable to the 1996 ERGs.

Education - From the "Parents with Children" universe of the NCES census data, the percentage of parents with a bachelor's degree or higher. In the 1996 ERGs, this was the percentage of children attending public school with at least one parent with a bachelor's degree or higher.

Occupation – From the "Children by Parents Characteristics" universe of the NCES census data, the percentage of public school children with parents aged 16 years or older, employed, and holding jobs in executive, managerial and professional specialty occupations. The census classification of occupations changed slightly between 1990 and 2000.

Family Structure - From the "Children by Household Characteristics" universe of NCES census data, the percentage of public school children living in families without a wife or husband present or in non-family households. This variable is similar to the 1996 ERGs.

Poverty – From the October 2004 Public School Information System (PSIS), the percentage of students from families with incomes eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals. In the 1996 ERGs, this variable was based upon the number of all children ages 5-17 within school district boundaries who received Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) in 1994-95.

Home Language - From the October 2004 PSIS, the percentage of public school children whose families speak a language other than English at home. In the 1996 ERGs, this variable was taken from NCES census data.

District Enrollment - The 2004 school district enrollment was classified into 10 groups (deciles) and then given a half-weighting in the model. This variable was calculated the same as in 1996.

Method

As an initial step in forming the new DRGs, the SDE surveyed school superintendents for their comments on the existing ERGs. The March 2004 survey had several key findings. Seventy-seven percent of superintendents responding (the response rate was 77 percent, or 128 districts) indicated their current ERG was about right, 6 percent wanted to move to a higher ERG and 17 percent wanted to move to a lower ERG. Most superintendents (83 percent) indicated that the size of their ERG was appropriate, 4 percent thought their ERG could be larger and 13 percent thought it could be smaller. Superintendents were generally satisfied with the variables used. Only 10 suggested that we delete any of

the current variables, with no one variable being cited by more than three superintendents. There were 103 suggestions for additional variables. The most mentioned variables were student mobility (11), special education percentage (8) and home value (8). No other indicator was mentioned by more than five superintendents. In light of this, the SDE decided to keep the variable set the same as in 1996.

The variables based on the 2000 census were taken from the NCES School District Demographics database (www.nces.ed.gov/surveys/sdds). The remaining three (poverty, home language and district enrollment) were taken from the State Department of Education's October 2004 Public School Information System (PSIS).

The SDE used an analytical technique called K-means cluster analysis to categorize districts into groups. Cluster analysis techniques use mathematical rules of thumb used to assign districts with similar characteristics into groups. The starting structure was the 1996 ERGs. The groups that are formed are sensitive to the variables chosen and the order in which the initial groups are entered. The seeding order of the 1996 ERGs was EDFCGBHAI. In this analysis, the 2004 enrollment deciles were weighted 0.5 so they would not overwhelm the other variables that have been shown to correlate with student achievement. The Gilbert School, Norwich Free Academy (NFA) and Woodstock Academy were assigned to DRGs using discriminant function analysis. The SDE generated the data for these schools by taking the variables from the communities that send students to these schools and weighting them by the October 2004 enrollment from these communities.

Since there is no one "correct" classification of districts, census data are subject to some sampling error and districts may have changed between 2000 and 2006, superintendents were given the opportunity to request a change in their proposed 2006 DRG. The SDE received responses from 139 districts (82.2 percent). A total of 115 of the 139 districts responding agreed with their DRG grouping, including 36 of 55 that were reclassified. Twenty-four districts appealed their 2006 proposed DRG placement.

To review the appeals of districts that questioned their DRG placement, staff members took both an analytic and holistic approach to evaluating each district's request. The SDE found that the poverty data for Norwich Free Academy and The Gilbert School were sufficiently below the poverty from the sending towns, so a staff member reran the model with poverty data reflecting their sending communities. This resulted in moving NFA and The Gilbert School from DRG F to DRG G. Redding and Region 9 presented survey data to refute the census estimates of income and education level. They both were moved from DRG B to DRG A.

For the remaining 20 districts, SDE staff used multiple components in the analysis and a holistic approach to evaluate their requests. To insure consistency, two staff consultants independently reviewed the analyses and made recommendations. They considered five components:

- the ranking of each variable in both the Department-proposed DRG and superintendent-requested ERG;
- the computed likelihood of membership in the Department-proposed and superintendent-requested ERG from a statistical procedure, discriminant function analysis;
- the pairing resulting from a different clustering procedure, Ward's analysis;
- the DRGs of the districts that cited the district in question as a comparison district in the March 2004 superintendent survey; and
- the compatibility of the district's 2003 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) scores with those of the requested DRG.

Based on this analysis, 16 districts remained in the Department-proposed DRG and four were moved: Ansonia (G to H), East Haven (F to G), Mansfield (B to C) and New Fairfield (C to B). These moves accommodated the superintendent requests, without compromising the statistical strength of the resulting DRGs.

Group Characteristics

By design, the cluster analysis maintained nine groups. These are labeled A to I, the same as the 1996 ERGs. The groups run from the very affluent, low-need suburban districts of group A to the seven high-need, low SES urban districts of group I.

DRG A - This group includes nine of the 12 ERG A districts. All are affluent Fairfield County districts. The median family income, education level and percentage in managerial or professional occupations are all significantly higher than any other group. This group also has the lowest percentage of single-parent families and children in poverty. It has a moderate percentage of people who do not speak English at home. The average enrollment is 3,283.

DRG B - This group consists of three ERG A districts, 17 ERG B districts and one ERG C district. These 21 districts are also high SES communities, but less so than 2006 DRG A. Their median family income, education level and percent in managerial or professional occupations are second only to DRG A, and significantly different from all other groups. The group has a similar percentage of children from single-parent families and percentage of children in poverty as adjacent groups. It has the fourth highest percentage of families who do not speak English at home. Its average enrollment is 4,741.

Characteristics of 2006 DRGs

Variable	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
					2006 DRG				
Median Family Income	$169,513*	$97,210*	$78,650	$72,984	$65,152*	$59,143	$53,931	$50,598	$30,995*
Percent with Bachelor's Degree	79.0%*	59.5%*	45.9%*	35.8%*	29.9%*	17.0%	20.6%	19.7%	10.5%*
Percent Managerial/ Professional Occupation	67.5%*	61.2%*	52.1%*	45.3%*	39.8%*	31.2%	33.7%	28.8%	21.8%*
Percent Children in Single-Parent Families	9.1%	10.6%	12.9%	17.7%	16.5%	21.7%*	28.3%*	33.5%*	54.9%*
2004 Percent Children in Poverty	0.8%	3.7%	4.4%	9.2%	9.4%	17.9%*	31.0%*	41.9%*	65.2%*
2004 Percent Non-English Home Language	2.1%	4.6%	1.5%	5.0%	1.1%	2.6%	6.1%	22.3%*	31.6%*
2004 Average Enrollment	3,283	4,741	1,308	3,704	766	1,848	4,274	7,535*	14,374*
Number of Districts	9	21	30	24	35	17	17	9	7

* Value is significantly different from every other group.

DRG C - This group consists of one ERG B district, 26 ERG C districts and three ERG D districts. The median family income, education level, percentage in managerial or professional occupations and small enrollment differentiate these 30 smaller districts from their adjacent groups. It has a similar percentage of children from single-parent families and percentage of children in poverty as adjacent groups. This group has a very low percentage of families who do not speak English at home. The average enrollment is 1,308.

DRG D - This group consists of one ERG B district, two ERG C districts, 16 ERG D districts, one ERG E district and four ERG F districts. The 24 districts in this group are ranked fourth in median family income, education level and percentage in managerial or professional occupations. These are all significantly different from any other group. It has significantly higher percentage in poverty and percentage of children from single-parent families than DRG C, but not DRG E. The percentage of families who do not speak English at home and average enrollment are both significantly higher than the adjacent groups. The average enrollment is 3,704.

DRG E - This group consists of nine ERG C districts, one ERG D district, 23 ERG E districts and two ERG G districts. The 35 small districts in this group are ranked fifth in median family income, education level and percentage in managerial or professional occupations. These are all significantly different from any other group. It has a significantly lower percentage of children from single-parent families and percentage of children in poverty than DRG F, but both these figures are similar to those of DRG D. The percentage of families who do not speak English at home is the lowest of all groups. The average enrollment of 766 is the smallest of any group.

DRG F - This group consists of two ERG E districts, five ERG F districts and 10 ERG G districts. The 17 small- and medium-size districts in this group have a similar median family income, education level and percent in managerial or professional occupations as DRG G, but significantly lower levels than DRG E. This group's percentage of children from single-parent families and percentage of children in poverty are both significantly different from all other groups. The group's relatively low percentage of families who do not speak English at home is significantly lower than DRG G, but similar to DRG E. The average enrollment of this group is 1,848, but ranges from 333 to 6,688.

DRG G - This group consists of one ERG D district, seven ERG F districts, four ERG G districts and five ERG H districts. It is not comparable to the former ERG G. The 17 districts in this group have similar median family income and education level as adjacent DRGs. The percentage in managerial or professional occupations is similar to DRG F, but higher than DRG H. The percentage of children from single-parent families and percentage of children in poverty are ranked seventh among the DRGs and significantly different from all other DRGs. The percentage of families who do not speak English at home is similar to DRG F, but well below DRG H. The average enrollment of this group is 4,274.

DRG H - The nine larger districts in this group all come from ERG H. The median family income and education level of this group is similar to that in DRG G, but well above DRG I. This group's percentage in managerial or professional occupations is significantly different from adjacent DRGs. This group's percentage of children from single-parent families, percentage of children in poverty and percentage of families who do not speak English at home are ranked eighth among the nine DRGs and are

significantly different from all other DRGs. The average enrollment of this group is 7,535.

DRG I - The composition of this DRG did not change between 1996 and 2006. The seven districts in this group have significantly lower SES levels and significantly higher need levels than all other DRGs. Median family income is significantly lower than any other group. The average enrollment of this group is 14,374.

A Comparison of 1996 ERGs and 2006 DRGs

1996 ERG	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Total
					2006 DRG					
A	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
B	0	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	19
C	0	1	26	2	9	0	0	0	0	38
D	0	0	3	16	1	0	1	0	0	21
E	0	0	0	1	23	2	0	0	0	26
F	0	0	0	4	0	5	7	0	0	16
G	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	0	0	16
H	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	14
I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total	9	21	30	24	35	17	17	9	7	169

Comparing the 1996 ERGs and 2006 DRGs

For most districts, the classification in 2006 is similar to that in 1996. Fully 68.6 percent of the districts are in a DRG comparable to a 1996 ERG. DRGs B, D and I were particularly stable. There are many reasons why a district could move. First, the income disparity among districts grew significantly and that caused a ripple effect through the model. Second, a district could have changed relatively more or less than others between the 1990 and 2000 censuses. Third, either poverty increased dramatically but disproportionately across districts; or the change from using AFDC to eligibility for free and reduced-price meals caused this variable to be more prominent in the model in 2006. Finally, the cluster analysis started with a pre- existing structure in 2006, but not in 1996.

Using District Reference Groups

The DRGs set a context for districts to critically review the resources they allocate to education and student participation in academic programming. In accordance with the April 5, 2006, State Board of Education resolution, the SDE will no longer report DRG averages for performance data such as CMT, Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), SAT and Advanced Placement (AP) test results. Much of the resource data on the Strategic School Profiles and other Department of Education publications will include both statewide and DRG averages. We anticipate that this will facilitate comparing district resources to those of other districts within the same DRG. DRGs can give policy-makers a

more insightful picture than merely a comparison to the state average.

The table on pages 6-8 presents districts ordered within DRGs using a linear combination of the six demographic variables (excluding district enrollment). When interpreting level of resources within a DRG, this ordering should be considered.

Caveats

There are several cautions that must be exercised when using the DRGs. The groupings are based, in part, on 2000 census data. If a district has undergone significant changes in population after 2000 compared to other districts, its placement may no longer be appropriate.

DRGs are based on families residing in a district, not school attendance areas or neighborhoods. It would be inappropriate to use DRGs to compare schools whose attendance areas cover only part of a district.

DRGs may not accurately reflect the characteristics of districts that serve students from other communities through the Open Choice program or through magnet schools. The families of these non-resident students may have different characteristics than those of the families residing in their town. While the poverty and home language data include these students, the income, education, occupation and family status data derived from the census exclude their families.

DRGs should NOT be used as a proxy for the quality of instruction in a school or district. They only reflect the characteristics of the families with children attending public school. Performance results do vary considerably between and within DRGs. There is considerable overlap in performance results across the DRGs. What constitutes the "best" district is an illusive concept that is dependent on the characteristics of the individual student and certainly not the DRG in which a district is grouped. The educational experience within a district or school can be different for the gifted, the athlete, the hands-on learner, the artist or the special-needs student. Areas of programmatic and academic excellence exist in most schools and districts in Connecticut. While DRGs and summary statistics from the Strategic School Profiles can be a starting point in determining the school or district that could best meet an individual child's needs, there is no substitute for meeting with the principal and staff to learn about the programs and opportunities within the school or district.

Finally, while districts are ranked by SES and need in the table on pages 6-8, census data are subject to sampling error, which could move a district up or down in its relative position within a DRG.

Connecticut District Reference Groups, 2006

DRG = A

Darien	Redding	Westport
Easton	Ridgefield	Wilton
New Canaan	Weston	Region 9

DRG = B

Avon	Greenwich	Simsbury
Brookfield	Guilford	South Windsor
Cheshire	Madison	Trumbull
Fairfield	Monroe	West Hartford
Farmington	New Fairfield	Woodbridge
Glastonbury	Newtown	Region 5
Granby	Orange	Region 15

DRG = C

Andover	Mansfield	Region 4
Barkhamsted	Marlborough	Region 7
Bethany	New Hartford	Region 8
Bolton	Oxford	Region 10
Canton	Pomfret	Region 12
Columbia	Salem	Region 13
Cornwall	Sherman	Region 14
Ellington	Somers	Region 17
Essex	Suffield	Region 18
Hebron	Tolland	Region 19

DRG = D

Berlin	East Lyme	Shelton
Bethel	Ledyard	Southington
Branford	Milford	Stonington
Clinton	Newington	Wallingford
Colchester	New Milford	Waterford
Cromwell	North Haven	Watertown
East Granby	Old Saybrook	Wethersfield
East Hampton	Rocky Hill	Windsor

DRG = E

Ashford	Hampton	Scotland
Bozrah	Hartland	Sharon
Brooklyn	Kent	Thomaston
Canaan	Lebanon	Union
Chaplin	Lisbon	Westbrook
Chester	Litchfield	Willington
Colebrook	Norfolk	Woodstock
Coventry	North Branford	Region 1
Deep River	North Stonington	Region 6
Eastford	Portland	Region 16
East Haddam	Preston	Woodstock Academy
Franklin	Salisbury	

DRG = F

Canterbury	Plainville	Thompson
East Windsor	Plymouth	Voluntown
Enfield	Seymour	Windsor Locks
Griswold	Sprague	Wolcott
Montville	Stafford	Region 11
North Canaan	Sterling	

DRG = G

Bloomfield	Manchester	Torrington
Bristol	Middletown	Vernon
East Haven	Naugatuck	Winchester
Groton	Plainfield	Gilbert School
Hamden	Putnam	Norwich Free Acad.
Killingly	Stratford	

DRG = H

Ansonia	East Hartford	Norwich
Danbury	Meriden	Stamford
Derby	Norwalk	West Haven

DRG = I

Bridgeport	New Haven	Waterbury
Hartford	New London	Windham
New Britain		

Characteristics of Districts Ordered within 2006 DRG

District Name	Median Family Income 1999	Percent with BA Degree 2000	Percent Managers/ Profes- sionals 2000	Percent Poverty 2004	Percent Single- Parent Families 2000	Pct. Non- English Home Language 2004	District Enrollment 2004
DRG = A							
WESTON	$186,915	80.7	72.0	0.8	7.4	0.9	2,533
NEW CANAAN	$200,001	80.4	65.0	0.5	7.0	3.0	4,081
DARIEN	$192,581	81.5	62.8	1.5	7.8	2.5	4,367
WILTON	$169,201	79.8	69.3	0.5	9.0	2.6	4,311
WESTPORT	$176,813	79.3	68.8	1.3	11.8	3.0	5,280
EASTON	$163,072	71.3	68.1	0.2	8.5	1.5	1,137
RIDGEFIELD	$139,772	74.5	71.8	1.1	7.7	1.9	5,560
REGION 9	$151,536	80.2	66.4	1.0	12.0	2.4	984
REDDING	$145,729	83.7	63.2	0.6	10.8	1.5	1,298
DRG = B							
AVON	$116,616	73.4	69.1	1.8	9.4	4.1	3,301
WOODBRIDGE	$106,506	66.5	77.5	3.9	8.4	6.2	853
SIMSBURY	$101,045	69.8	68.3	3.4	10.9	3.4	5,055
MADISON	$103,308	65.6	61.9	1.4	6.8	1.4	3,773
GLASTONBURY	$104,475	65.7	65.8	3.3	12.3	5.9	6,628
CHESHIRE	$94,840	63.2	63.5	3.2	10.0	1.1	5,179
NEWTOWN	$98,901	59.8	60.9	1.9	9.3	1.2	5,493
GRANBY	$92,696	57.3	65.4	1.9	10.9	1.2	2,225
REGION 5	$93,868	59.1	63.5	2.0	12.0	3.2	2,492
FAIRFIELD	$105,623	63.4	57.6	4.9	10.8	6.2	9,024
GREENWICH	$119,604	65.0	60.2	7.5	15.1	17.1	9,103
ORANGE	$90,870	55.4	55.8	1.1	6.9	4.3	1,378
TRUMBULL	$94,224	53.9	56.5	3.4	7.7	3.8	6,773
MONROE	$99,416	45.7	56.9	2.0	6.9	3.1	4,349
REGION 15	$87,671	53.0	57.4	1.8	9.2	2.4	4,494
GUILFORD	$84,784	59.3	58.7	3.9	12.9	0.9	3,819
FARMINGTON	$89,082	59.8	60.0	4.6	12.5	7.4	4,369
NEW FAIRFIELD	$96,011	49.1	50.9	4.3	4.9	1.2	3,129
BROOKFIELD	$94,889	53.2	58.2	3.1	13.8	1.6	3,110
SOUTH WINDSOR	$86,912	49.3	54.3	5.5	11.3	5.4	5,073
WEST HARTFORD	$79,865	62.9	63.7	12.1	21.6	16.4	9,940
DRG = C							
REGION 17	$88,307	48.3	57.9	3.6	9.0	0.4	2,401
NEW HARTFORD	$81,445	51.2	51.3	4.1	5.1	0.2	632
ESSEX	$85,650	63.6	51.0	3.1	14.3	1.8	543
REGION 10	$84,246	42.5	55.0	2.4	5.3	2.1	2,721
HEBRON	$77,184	46.9	54.0	2.9	6.3	0.2	1,198
SUFFIELD	$80,100	49.1	58.8	4.5	12.3	1.9	2,524
CANTON	$76,113	47.5	58.6	3.1	12.3	1.1	1,699
MARLBOROUGH	$86,208	48.9	46.7	1.3	9.6	2.4	636
REGION 7	$84,090	40.8	56.2	3.2	13.0	0.1	1,136
SALEM	$77,757	44.6	58.0	2.5	14.9	0.4	567
TOLLAND	$82,095	44.0	49.1	3.4	8.3	1.0	3,102
ANDOVER	$75,860	41.6	61.7	5.5	12.3	5.2	383
BARKHAMSTED	$73,194	44.0	50.9	5.4	5.8	0.8	370
BETHANY	$80,552	50.9	55.6	3.3	18.1	1.9	583
REGION 18	$78,025	55.5	51.9	3.2	18.2	1.8	1,582
REGION 8	$81,862	45.0	51.2	2.3	15.1	0.1	1,582
REGION 19	$70,239	50.0	58.9	7.2	17.3	1.7	1,251
MANSFIELD	$67,143	62.0	62.8	15.3	17.8	10.5	1,376
BOLTON	$81,293	47.4	54.1	10.1	16.2	0.0	933
REGION 12	$83,514	39.9	42.7	0.6	10.3	0.8	1,157
REGION 14	$82,025	46.9	52.6	4.1	19.6	1.4	2,326
CORNWALL	$67,000	48.6	50.9	2.1	16.7	0.0	142
SOMERS	$77,795	34.9	46.3	2.8	9.5	1.2	1,733
REGION 4	$82,620	43.9	50.8	8.6	16.3	1.7	862
REGION 13	$79,900	40.2	47.8	3.0	16.3	0.2	2,179
ELLINGTON	$81,196	36.1	48.5	5.0	13.0	1.7	2,434
SHERMAN	$79,782	42.5	40.9	0.0	15.0	1.2	482
OXFORD	$77,694	38.1	45.3	6.8	11.5	1.6	1,486
POMFRET	$62,208	43.1	48.4	9.2	9.9	0.8	521
COLUMBIA	$74,432	39.6	44.8	2.4	16.7	0.2	659

District Name	Percent Median Family Income 1999	Percent with BA Degree 2000	Managers/ Profes- sionals 2000	Percent Poverty 2004	Pct. Non- Single- Parent Families 2000	English Home Language 2004	District Enrollment 2004
			DRG = D				
ROCKY HILL	$74,976	43.9	53.4	6.2	14.0	9.8	2,486
EAST LYME	$75,441	46.0	50.3	4.4	18.3	3.9	3,235
BETHEL	$79,246	42.0	49.5	6.4	14.9	8.2	3,258
NORTH HAVEN	$81,683	34.2	41.5	6.4	9.8	5.6	3,807
BERLIN	$81,188	38.7	42.1	5.7	12.6	7.2	3,352
COLCHESTER	$77,551	33.4	44.9	4.5	14.1	1.8	3,164
WETHERSFIELD	$67,986	44.4	55.3	10.8	20.9	6.0	3,722
LEDYARD	$69,427	35.8	46.0	5.9	15.0	2.1	3,011
EAST GRANBY	$77,852	29.8	49.5	1.0	20.6	3.6	888
NEW MILFORD	$76,734	34.0	46.5	6.2	16.0	4.9	5,206
OLD SAYBROOK	$73,409	43.3	44.0	7.6	19.9	5.0	1,569
CLINTON	$70,776	35.9	45.7	9.6	16.2	1.3	2,167
STONINGTON	$63,462	38.0	51.2	11.2	20.6	0.4	2,497
SOUTHINGTON	$73,488	33.6	44.8	7.1	18.0	3.4	6,827
SHELTON	$75,866	29.8	40.9	10.6	14.6	8.3	5,787
WATERFORD	$70,725	31.0	45.3	6.7	21.3	5.0	3,157
EAST HAMPTON	$70,400	32.6	44.1	8.1	22.1	1.4	2,116
WATERTOWN	$70,365	28.8	37.5	10.9	13.0	4.0	3,506
NEWINGTON	$70,495	34.0	44.2	13.4	18.1	8.9	4,624
CROMWELL	$69,395	35.4	42.3	10.5	20.8	6.5	1,927
BRANFORD	$71,841	38.8	41.0	12.9	24.2	5.7	3,608
WALLINGFORD	$68,531	30.7	39.3	11.5	17.3	6.8	7,143
MILFORD	$69,297	30.7	42.5	15.2	19.6	5.5	7,525
WINDSOR	$71,474	34.5	45.2	26.9	23.2	3.5	4,324
			DRG = E				
CANAAN	$63,333	43.6	37.8	10.5	4.2	0.9	114
KENT	$66,648	48.2	37.9	8.1	12.3	1.6	308
LITCHFIELD	$66,809	36.5	43.6	3.9	14.0	0.0	1,363
WOODSTOCK	$62,105	38.3	40.3	8.5	11.1	2.4	994
REGION 16	$77,260	27.6	35.8	7.9	8.8	1.9	2,666
CHESTER	$66,250	30.0	44.3	4.2	16.4	0.6	333
EAST HADDAM	$68,393	29.7	41.1	8.7	11.1	1.2	1,420
SHARON	$67,813	23.7	47.6	12.8	12.2	0.0	258
WOODSTOCK ACADEMY	$63,945	35.2	41.4	11.2	14.2	0.7	1,075
LEBANON	$66,652	26.8	43.0	9.5	13.3	0.7	1,522
REGION 6	$65,759	28.7	38.7	6.2	13.7	0.2	1,068
HAMPTON	$61,250	40.9	37.9	9.9	16.2	1.2	162
HARTLAND	$63,438	23.6	35.3	1.7	11.1	0.0	233
LISBON	$61,350	24.5	44.8	15.6	9.3	0.6	628
UNION	$71,875	23.6	35.1	5.3	13.0	0.0	76
COLEBROOK	$65,625	34.9	23.4	6.6	7.4	0.0	121
WILLINGTON	$75,258	30.7	39.2	8.8	19.1	3.4	580
PORTLAND	$68,802	38.4	41.0	9.0	25.3	0.6	1,426
FRANKLIN	$68,854	25.1	37.9	8.8	15.0	0.4	239
NORTH STONINGTON	$64,423	28.0	53.4	13.5	24.7	0.7	845
NORFOLK	$52,250	35.0	40.7	5.9	19.4	0.7	152
CHAPLIN	$58,750	19.7	46.3	14.2	12.0	0.4	233
WESTBROOK	$75,568	31.9	35.4	10.2	19.4	1.7	1,025
BROOKLYN	$69,784	33.9	44.8	17.5	21.7	1.6	999
PRESTON	$66,307	18.6	39.9	9.8	14.1	1.4	491
NORTH BRANFORD	$72,021	25.8	34.9	8.5	17.6	1.7	2,525
SALISBURY	$59,833	39.2	39.7	7.9	26.2	0.3	331
BOZRAH	$62,917	20.7	42.6	11.7	16.9	1.4	283
SCOTLAND	$60,833	19.0	42.9	14.5	16.1	1.1	186
EASTFORD	$61,250	28.4	34.9	9.9	19.6	0.0	182
THOMASTON	$62,208	21.4	40.6	10.6	19.3	2.1	1,311
REGION 1	$56,591	29.4	44.5	5.7	30.1	1.0	613
COVENTRY	$65,707	20.8	40.1	9.5	22.7	0.3	2,105
DEEP RIVER	$63,214	34.0	35.3	5.6	31.0	5.1	375
ASHFORD	$57,232	30.9	31.2	15.4	20.3	1.0	577

Characteristics of Districts Ordered within 2006 DRG (Cont'd)

District Name	Median Family Income 1999	Percent with BA Degree 2000	Percent Managers/ Profes- sionals 2000	Percent Poverty 2004	Percent Single- Parent Families 2000	Pct. Non- English Home Language 2004	District Enrollment 2004
DRG = F							
SEYMOUR	$61,309	17.1	38.7	12.8	14.5	6.6	2,664
WOLCOTT	$65,509	21.5	33.8	14.0	17.9	0.6	2,972
CANTERBURY	$63,807	15.8	29.3	12.2	12.6	0.2	573
PLYMOUTH	$65,917	16.4	33.9	12.4	18.8	1.5	1,936
REGION 11	$64,732	21.5	32.6	16.5	20.3	0.0	333
MONTVILLE	$63,895	20.4	30.5	13.8	20.1	3.5	2,917
EAST WINDSOR	$60,438	17.9	34.7	19.4	19.5	5.5	1,586
WINDSOR LOCKS	$55,250	22.7	35.4	18.8	26.4	5.2	1,936
PLAINVILLE	$61,530	21.0	29.5	16.1	23.9	7.1	2,637
ENFIELD	$61,727	18.0	31.8	21.4	22.5	2.9	6,688
STERLING	$57,813	9.9	29.0	16.2	21.4	0.0	476
VOLUNTOWN	$57,159	14.6	37.7	29.6	22.2	0.0	334
THOMPSON	$53,011	16.5	28.2	17.3	22.5	0.5	1,489
GRISWOLD	$56,444	14.6	29.6	15.1	27.8	2.0	2,167
NORTH CANAAN	$55,417	14.1	20.3	23.5	17.7	5.1	391
STAFFORD	$55,293	14.5	27.1	20.2	30.6	1.6	1,988
SPRAGUE	$46,176	13.0	27.5	25.5	30.2	2.1	326
DRG = G							
HAMDEN	$65,735	34.3	44.3	25.4	27.8	2.4	6,302
GROTON	$46,158	20.9	42.1	26.8	22.6	4.1	5,589
VERNON	$58,469	26.5	39.3	24.6	30.0	5.4	3,989
STRATFORD	$62,042	25.1	35.6	33.7	23.9	6.2	7,568
GILBERT SCHOOL	$56,167	19.7	38.4	31.8	22.7	8.1	516
MIDDLETOWN	$52,209	28.5	40.3	32.7	31.8	3.7	5,156
WINCHESTER	$55,153	19.1	38.8	36.0	24.3	4.9	1,093
BLOOMFIELD	$53,448	23.3	38.7	38.1	30.5	1.6	2,366
NAUGATUCK	$57,125	18.5	29.2	27.3	24.6	12.0	5,335
TORRINGTON	$52,354	17.3	25.1	27.0	24.3	8.1	4,988
MANCHESTER	$54,432	26.4	38.6	31.8	37.2	11.6	7,475
EAST HAVEN	$56,714	13.4	21.6	27.2	21.1	8.0	3,907
BRISTOL	$57,789	15.6	28.8	27.4	31.3	7.0	9,028
PUTNAM	$48,646	16.0	30.1	33.5	33.7	3.7	1,329
NORWICH FREE ACADEMY	$49,034	20.1	31.1	39.0	31.3	10.5	2,424
PLAINFIELD	$46,582	9.2	26.6	28.7	31.8	1.5	2,618
KILLINGLY	$44,779	15.7	23.5	35.6	31.9	4.2	2,979
DRG = H							
NORWALK	$58,502	30.6	39.9	23.1	27.8	29.5	11,040
DANBURY	$57,594	28.0	33.2	27.6	21.6	36.6	9,556
STAMFORD	$60,401	33.4	36.6	42.7	29.4	34.6	15,077
ANSONIA	$46,674	12.1	24.3	46.3	33.3	9.2	2,705
DERBY	$50,636	10.5	19.7	37.4	34.1	14.1	1,492
WEST HAVEN	$49,139	15.8	23.8	44.4	38.1	14.3	7,037
NORWICH	$42,218	20.3	27.4	52.1	39.4	18.1	4,045
MERIDEN	$47,370	14.2	30.4	54.0	37.8	26.8	8,946
EAST HARTFORD	$42,846	12.7	24.0	49.5	40.2	17.8	7,916
DRG = I							
WINDHAM	$34,728	13.5	27.3	56.8	44.5	28.3	3,635
WATERBURY	$32,836	9.5	19.2	64.9	49.1	13.2	17,896
NEW BRITAIN	$34,297	11.3	23.2	62.0	50.9	41.2	10,953
NEW LONDON	$31,363	12.4	22.8	64.2	59.2	25.0	3,076
NEW HAVEN	$27,092	13.9	27.4	71.7	61.5	29.1	20,499
BRIDGEPORT	$33,177	7.0	16.9	70.0	50.5	37.3	22,264
HARTFORD	$23,469	6.1	16.0	66.6	68.6	47.4	22,297