STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10

Stonington School District

PAUL E. SMOTAS, Superintendent

Location: 49 North Stonington Rd
Old Mystic,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 572-0506

Website: www.stoningtonschools.org

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c) using data and narratives provided by the school district, testing services, or the US Census. Profiles and additional education data, including longitudinal data, are available on the internet at www.sde.ct.gov.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: New London
Town Population in 2000: 17,906
1990-2000 Population Growth: 5.8%
Number of Public Schools: 6

Per Capita Income in 2000: $29,653
Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 12.2%
Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.6%
District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 89.0%

*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

District Reference Group (DRG): D DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment. The Connecticut State Board of Education approved DRG classification for purposes of reporting data other than student performance.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Enrollment on October 1, 2009   2,521
5-Year Enrollment Change   1.7%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range   PK - 12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	253	10.0	13.4	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	13	0.5	2.3	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	162	6.4	4.8	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	299	11.9	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	119	77.8	85.6	80.5
Homeless	5	0.2	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	90	24.9	15.5	13.6

*0.0 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	38	1.5
Asian American	99	3.9
Black	70	2.8
Hispanic	69	2.7
White	2,245	89.1
Total Minority	276	10.9

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.6%

Non-English Home Language:

1.1% of this district's students (excluding prekindergarten students) come from homes where English is not the primary language.The number of non-English home languages is 12.

EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Below is the description submitted by this school of how it provides educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

Stonington Public Schools continues to place emphasis on reducing racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Throughout the district, numerous activities exist for this purpose. Each school has children involved in lessons, units of study, assemblies, fieldtrips and other special programs which highlight the importance of diversity and understanding amongst people.Throughout the K-12 experience, students are exposed to opportunities to learn about their local and the global communities. Stonington's curriculum pushes students to understand the degree to which they can impact change in the world.Among the many opportunities available, Stonington High School students experience "Diversity Day" which has received recognition as a highly effective program. Given a variety of workshops to choose from, students select activities that interest and motivate them. Facilitators and guest speakers fill the event with engaging content and urge participants to see situations and the world through the eyes of others.Significant community service is part of the middle level experience for students in Stonington. Groups of students work tirelessly to support community food banks and other organizations dedicated to serving those in need. These opportunities exist as outgrowths of classroom study and as part of the schools' club and activity offerings. One middle school has built a school for their peers as part of the Chikumbuso Project in Africa.Elementary students are regularly involved in character education programming and literacy activities which prompt a better understanding of how humans interact and intervene to improve quality of life for themselves and others. Using Title-1 monies, we were also able to institute a full day kindergarten experience for those children assessed to be most at-risk in terms of school-readiness. Recently, Stonington embarked on a Sister-City and Sister-School relationships with China. In 2009-2010 we hosted a delegation of Chinese educators in our schools and used this visit as an opportunity to teach students about different cultures and to celebrate their own.We are proud of all we do in Stonington to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3	Reading	69.9	57.0	62.0
	Writing	66.1	58.3	54.6
	Mathematics	73.9	62.4	59.5
Grade 4	Reading	65.0	59.9	43.4
	Writing	62.2	63.6	31.3
	Mathematics	71.1	67.0	42.8
Grade 5	Reading	68.8	61.8	50.9
	Writing	73.9	68.2	44.6
	Mathematics	78.5	72.4	49.4
	Science	72.2	59.4	53.6
Grade 6	Reading	76.4	74.9	36.2
	Writing	65.6	65.9	35.4
	Mathematics	64.4	70.7	21.5
Grade 7	Reading	85.9	77.4	51.3
	Writing	65.6	61.2	42.9
	Mathematics	80.6	68.5	62.3
Grade 8	Reading	86.0	73.3	70.1
	Writing	76.3	62.6	65.6
	Mathematics	72.7	67.3	45.2
	Science	75.7	62.8	56.1

These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. The following results reflect the performance of students with scorable tests who were enrolled in the school at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the school. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Reading Across the Disciplines	45.9	45.9	43.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	65.3	59.6	52.6
Mathematics	53.8	48.7	48.5
Science	40.5	45.3	34.8

For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Physical Fitness. The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body strength and aerobic endurance.

Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	74.2	50.7	95.3

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		67.4	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	534	508	70.5
	Critical Reading	533	503	74.4
	Writing	542	506	80.6

SAT® I. The lowest possible score on each SAT® I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Class of 2009	93.7	91.3	40.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	2.3	3.0	27.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	80.9	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	16.3	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	153.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	11.80
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	33.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	63.01
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	10.82
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	6.00
School Level	8.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.60
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	13.60
School Nurses	8.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	116.84

In the full-time equivalent (FTE) count, staff members working part-time in the school district are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in the district contributes 0.50 to the district's staff count.

Teachers and Instructors	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Education	14.0	14.4	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	84.7	77.1	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.3	17.2	18.5
Grade 2	20.6	18.9	19.7
Grade 5	20.7	20.9	21.1
Grade 7	23.3	20.3	20.8
High School	26.3	19.6	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	980	985	992
Middle School	1,036	1,025	1,018
High School	1,012	1,000	1,006

*State law requires that at least 900 hours of instruction be offered to students in grade 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours to half-day kindergarten students.

Students Per Academic Computer	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School*	3.3	3.5	3.2
Middle School	2.7	2.8	2.5
High School	1.8	2.8	2.3

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2008-09

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. DRG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	$17,564	$7,003	$7,819	$7,408	$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	$308	$123	$274	$280	$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	$1,736	$692	$474	$389	$459
Student Support Services	$1,949	$777	$863	$800	$859
Administration and Support Services	$2,720	$1,085	$1,405	$1,309	$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	$3,528	$1,407	$1,469	$1,377	$1,462
Transportation	$2,070	$763	$701	$641	$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	$1,540	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	$457	$182	$163	$169	$162
Total	$31,874	$12,623	$13,458	$12,685	$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	$3,451	$1,376	$1,864	$1,136	$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	$7,106,000	22.3	20.9	20.7

Revenue Sources, % of Expenditures from Source. Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	88.7	8.8	2.3	0.2
Excluding School Construction	88.0	9.2	2.6	0.2

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

Stonington's Board of Education dictates that comparable resources are distributed to each school in district. Students in each grade, regardless of school assignment, receive equal access to these resources.Budgets are developed annually to address school and district needs. Consideration is given to enrollment figures, class-size, programs, student achievement data, curriculum and district initiatives, and our Strategic Planning document. The process of budget development at the district level is informed by building level contributions to budget discussions. Equitable requests are made to the Board of Education. Monies for supplies, texts and other academic materials are budgeted on a per-pupil basis.In January, the Superintendent presents a proposed budget to the Board of Education. This is formulated based on input from building level and district administrators, as well as on the input of school based teams. Public meetings are conducted in January and February as the Board of Education studies financial figures and builds its budget for presentation to the Board of Finance. Input from the community is welcomed. May brings a town-wide referendum.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible   308
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities   12.3%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities				
Disability	Count	District Percent	DRG Percent	State Percent
Autism	40	1.6	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	130	5.2	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	16	0.6	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	24	1.0	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	34	1.4	2.4	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	46	1.8	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	18	0.7	0.9	0.9
Total	308	12.3	11.4	11.6

*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy
**Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2008-09 with a Standard Diploma	77.3	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	7.1	4.1

STATE ASSESSMENTS

Percent of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. These results are for students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.
- **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation.** The CMT reading, writing and mathematics tests are administered to students in Grades 3 through 8, and the CMT science test to students in Grades 5 and 8.
- **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), Third Generation.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students.

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	**State**	**District**	**State**
CMT	Reading	28.2	31.6	75.5	67.5
	Writing	14.7	19.6	68.1	63.3
	Mathematics	29.7	32.9	73.4	68.1
	Science	25.6	23.7	73.9	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	45.9	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	9.1	16.8	65.3	59.6
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	53.8	48.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	40.5	45.3

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools		
CMT	% Without Accommodations	16.1
	% With Accommodations	83.9
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	7.4
	% With Accommodations	92.6
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.9

Accommodations for a student's disability may be made to allow him or her to participate in testing. Students whose disabilities prevent them from taking the test even with accommodations are assessed by means of a list of skills aligned to the same content and grade level standards as the CMT and CAPT.

Federal law requires that students with disabilities be educated with their non-disabled peers as much as is appropriate. Placement in separate educational facilities tends to reduce the chances of students with disabilities interacting with non-disabled peers, and of receiving the same education.

K-12 Students with Disabilities Placed in Educational Settings Other Than This District's Schools		
Placement	**Count**	**Percent**
Public Schools in Other Districts	3	1.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	35	11.4

Number and Percentage of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible by the Percentage of Time They Spent with Their Non-Disabled Peers				
Time Spent with Non-Disabled Peers	**Count of Students**	**Percent of Students**		
		District	**DRG**	**State**
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	236	76.6	76.7	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	54	17.5	13.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	18	5.8	9.5	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Spring of 2010 brought Strategic Planning to Stonington Public Schools. This plan resulted in a comprehensive plan for the district which will guide our work in the years ahead. Fundamental to this plan is:1. Personalization of the school experience in order to enhance student achievement2. Review of school structures to expand opportunities for innovative redesign3. A renewed commitment to building stronger connections between the schools and larger community to impact student achievement.Stonington Public Schools has dedicated significant time and energy into embracing a philosophy of inclusive education known as Step-by-Step. In concert with colleagues from the State Education Resource Center (SERC) each school in Stonington is developing a plan for improving the quality of instruction for all. Components of this philosophy include: a belief in efficient and effective resource allocation to best meet student needs, a commitment to a co-teaching model which pairs regular and special education professionals, a demand that all children be exposed to goals and objectives that match grade level curriculum and an overall belief that students will benefit by our re-evaluating our programming through this new lens.