

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**Groton School District**

JAMES E. MITCHELL, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 572-2110

Location: 1300 Flanders Road
Mystic,
Connecticut

Website: www.groton.k12.ct.us

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	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$23,995
Town Population in 2000: 39,907	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 12.4%
1990-2000 Population Growth: -11.6%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.1%
Number of Public Schools: 11	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.6%

*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): G 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, 2008 5,134
5-Year Enrollment Change -8.9%

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	1,512	29.5	33.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	94	1.9	3.3	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	41	0.8	3.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	647	12.6	12.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	338	70.4	77.0	79.7
Homeless	14	0.3	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	238	36.8	21.3	19.0

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	90	1.8
Asian American	399	7.8
Black	723	14.1
Hispanic	519	10.1
White	3,403	66.3
Total Minority	1,731	33.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 6.7%

Open Choice: 1 student(s) attended this district as part of the Open Choice program. Open Choice brings students from urban areas to attend school in suburban or rural towns, and students from non-urban areas to attend city schools.

Non-English Home Language: 6.6% 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 23.

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.

The Groton Public School System continues to make a concerted effort to ensure that our students receive an educational experience which enables them to interact with teachers and students from diverse racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds.

During the 2008-2009 school year, 29 of our teachers and their students participated in numerous Interdistrict LEARN partnerships with surrounding districts with diverse/different populations. Examples at the elementary level included 36 fifth graders participating in "Pixels and Palettes", a performing arts activity; 105 Kindergarten/first grade students participated in "We Are The World", a multicultural initiative. Examples at the secondary level included 54 students engaging in the Amistad Friendship Society, using the Amistad incident as a way to build bridges and break down barriers among diverse groups. Seventy-nine middle and high school students engaged in the "Young Educators Society." This program encourages youth to become teachers. In total, 573 students from across the district were included in these activities.

In 2008-2009, 80 Groton students were enrolled in the regional Multicultural Magnet School; 3 students participated in the Open Choice Program; 24 students attended the Science Magnet School; 27 students attended the Ledyard Vo-Ag Program. Fitch High School's International Baccalaureate Program and Advanced Placement classes continued to incorporate studies to increase cultural awareness.

The Groton School System has tapped into resources such as the N.L. Naval Submarine Base, the Mystic Seaport, Project Oceanology, the Pfizer Corporation, and the Eastern Connecticut Symphony. These organizations have continued to offer enriching and diverse experiences for our students in our school and/or community. Feedback and outcomes have been very positive.

Lastly, as part of addressing racial imbalance in our school system, the district created an intra-district magnet school as a strategy to reduce racial isolation. In 2008-09, 32 students from all elementary schools within the district were integrated into the Catherine Kolnaski Magnet School. The magnet integration of students reduced the racial imbalance to the pending level.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % 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.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	52.1	54.6	28.9
Writing	53.0	62.5	19.5
Mathematics	55.6	62.8	23.3
Grade 4 Reading	58.1	60.7	28.8
Writing	58.0	64.2	20.6
Mathematics	56.7	63.6	22.6
Grade 5 Reading	65.5	66.0	32.9
Writing	64.1	66.5	30.2
Mathematics	67.0	68.8	32.7
Science	56	58.1	25.9
Grade 6 Reading	60.0	68.9	18.4
Writing	49.4	62.2	15.3
Mathematics	62.9	68.8	22.1
Grade 7 Reading	70.0	74.9	26.1
Writing	65.3	62.9	40.1
Mathematics	58.5	66.0	22.9
Grade 8 Reading	66.9	68.4	30.3
Writing	62.2	66.5	25.8
Mathematics	58.1	64.5	23.9
Science	61.2	60.6	31.6

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.com.

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 scoreable 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	40.1	47.4	30.3
Writing Across the Disciplines	40.1	55.0	17.6
Mathematics	38.8	47.8	27.5
Science	33.4	42.8	25.2

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
	30.2	36.2	31.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		73.8	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	518	507	58.9
	Critical Reading	503	503	44.2
	Writing	496	506	37.2

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 2008	92.9	92.1	39.7
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	5.2	6.6	44.5
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.5	2.5	40.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	83.8	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	15.5	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	358.50
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	45.28
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	55.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	102.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	20.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	10.00
School Level	24.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.70
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	26.00
School Nurses	12.60
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	212.12

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	17.3	14.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	85.0	77.2	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.1	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	20.3	18.3	19.3
Grade 5	22.6	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	16.1	19.7	20.5
High School	19.3	19.5	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	999	981	988
Middle School	1,019	1,001	1,016
High School	1,039	1,005	1,007

*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*	2.7	3.9	3.3
Middle School	2.2	2.8	2.6
High School	1.7	2.6	2.4

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

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	\$39,930	\$7,734	\$7,521	\$7,445	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$2,208	\$428	\$267	\$227	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,949	\$571	\$461	\$396	\$446
Student Support Services	\$6,033	\$1,169	\$808	\$887	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$7,120	\$1,379	\$1,351	\$1,294	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$8,189	\$1,586	\$1,382	\$1,360	\$1,377
Transportation	\$4,056	\$738	\$649	\$667	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,802	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$152	\$166	\$151
Total	\$73,287	\$13,724	\$12,869	\$12,779	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$36,400	\$7,050	\$1,791	\$2,153	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$15195682	20.7	22.1	20.5

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	54.9	43.3	1.7	0.1
Excluding School Construction	61.6	35.7	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.

Groton Board of Education policy concerning the annual distribution of resources ensures that each of the eleven schools in the district receives an adequate level of material, supplies, and personnel to implement and execute educational programs. As part of the budget process, each school requests funding based on student enrollment, district-wide education programs, and the unique needs of its students. The Superintendent and Board of Education review these requests and forward them to the Town Council for funding. Commensurate with district goals and available resources, each school is funded to ensure equity and address needs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	634
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.4%

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	61	1.2	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	184	3.6	3.8	3.9
Intellectual Disability	45	0.9	0.5	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	57	1.1	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	137	2.7	2.6	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	69	1.4	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	81	1.6	1.1	0.9
Total	634	12.4	12.3	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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	82.1	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

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	19.1	30.2	61.9	65.7
	Writing	10.6	19.5	58.7	64.1
	Mathematics	20.2	30.7	59.6	65.7
	Science	16.2	23.8	58.6	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	0.0	14.1	40.1	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	0.0	13.6	40.1	55.0
	Mathematics	9.5	15.4	38.8	47.8
	Science	0.0	10.6	33.4	42.8

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	16.6
	% With Accommodations	83.4
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	37.5
	% With Accommodations	62.5
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.1

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	5	0.8
Private Schools or Other Settings	33	5.2

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	527	83.1	70.2	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	63	9.9	14.6	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	44	6.9	15.2	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

This year we implemented Year Two of our three-year District Improvement Plan, which focuses the entire district's efforts on improving student achievement for all students in the areas of reading, writing and math. To accomplish these goals, Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) were developed and used to inform and differentiate instruction in language arts and math so that all students can succeed. All teachers participated in regularly scheduled, collaborative and structured meetings, following the five step Data Team process to review student achievement results as measured by state tests and district CFAs. All staff received professional development on effective teaching strategies, concentrating this year on similarities and differences and nonlinguistic representation. All elementary teachers were trained in using the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Book Assessment System, a scientifically, research based assessment tool for reading. End of the year grade level expectations and criteria to identify at-risk students were determined. Data regarding the results of the implementation of these professional development efforts were the focus for grade level, department and building Data Teams.

Administrators conducted Classroom Walk-Through Observations in order to monitor the implementation of curriculum and differentiation for special populations. Teachers made their unit/lesson plans available to administrators to view during the Walk-Through process. Each teacher's unit/lesson plan was based on a prioritized grade level standard in either the language arts or mathematics curriculum framework. The identification of prioritized standards is a hallmark of Making Standards Work, an initiative embraced by Groton Public Schools. In the area of special education, we continue to focus our efforts on inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education setting to the maximum extent appropriate. Teachers continue to align individual education plans with the grade level curriculum standards as appropriate for students with disabilities. All special education and pupil personnel department members participated in the data driven decision making process through membership on grade level or content area Data Teams. Professional development in the use of the Wilson Reading System was provided for more teachers in the district in order to expand the use of this scientifically, research based program with students identified as struggling readers. Further, professional development in inclusion practices, IDEA, differentiated instruction and culturally and racially relevant instruction was offered to all teachers.

Parent engagement continues to be a focus for our district. Parents are involved on each school's School Improvement Team (SIT), a building based Data Team that meets at least monthly and monitors the implementation of the District Improvement Plan. The SIT is also involved with hiring qualified staff for the district. Parents involved on the SIT may also serve on the District Quality Council (DQC), which monitors the third goal of the District Improvement Plan that focuses on parent engagement as a strategy to increase student achievement. The DQC developed a parent engagement data collection tool that was piloted at some schools. The team also created a parent survey to gather feedback from families about the number and quality of opportunities for meaningful parent engagement at their schools. This survey will be implemented next school year. Parent engagement continues to be a high priority for Groton Public Schools.
