

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**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: 12	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 93.7%

*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, 2007 5,162
5-Year Enrollment Change -9.8%

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	1,500	29.1	31.0	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	99	2.0	3.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	59	1.1	3.3	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	658	12.7	11.8	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	257	59.9	74.1	79.2
Homeless	17	0.3	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	254	36.6	24.8	20.2

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	92	1.8
Asian American	384	7.4
Black	726	14.1
Hispanic	526	10.2
White	3,434	66.5
Total Minority	1,728	33.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 6.4%

Open Choice: 3 students 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: 5.6% 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 22.

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 2007-08 school year, thirty-five 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: "Pixels and Palettes", a performing arts activity and "We Are the World", a multicultural initiative. Secondary students participated in the Amistad Friendship Society, using the Amistad incident as a way to build bridges and break down barriers among diverse groups. They also participated in the Young Educators Society (YES). The purpose of this program is to encourage all youth to become teachers.

Other opportunities to support diversity included Groton's elementary and middle school summer school programs. Elementary students as well as middle school students came together at their respective levels from across the district to attend classes and to meet and work with each other. Additionally, resources such as the U.S. Naval Submarine Base, the Mystic Seaport, Project Oceanology, the Pfizer Corporation, and the Eastern Connecticut Symphony have continued to offer enriching and diverse experiences for our students in our schools and/or community.

In 2007-08, 92 Groton students were enrolled in the regional Multicultural Magnet School; 3 students participated in the School Choice Program; 16 attended the Science Magnet School; 33 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.

As part of a plan to address racial imbalance in the Groton School System, the implementation of redistricting boundaries occurred in 2007-08. Additionally, the Catherine Kolnaski Intradistrict Magnet School came on line with 54 students attending from other schools in the district. It has been and continues to be an exciting initiative for the children of Groton.

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	49.6	52.0	31.9
Writing	57.3	63.4	19.0
Mathematics	54.1	60.0	21.5
Grade 4 Reading	56.9	55.9	38.6
Writing	57.3	62.9	23.9
Mathematics	49.7	60.3	20.1
Grade 5 Reading	60.8	62.2	27.8
Writing	62.6	64.5	30.2
Mathematics	62.8	65.9	29.6
Science	51.6	54.9	27.2
Grade 6 Reading	64.5	66.3	25.6
Writing	44.1	61.9	12.5
Mathematics	60.0	66.4	22.0
Grade 7 Reading	64.2	71.1	22.6
Writing	57.0	62.0	27.1
Mathematics	52.5	63.0	20.0
Grade 8 Reading	66.7	64.8	38.4
Writing	60.0	63.4	30.2
Mathematics	56.6	60.8	26.4
Science	52.9	58.6	26.4

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	39.9	45.5	34.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	43.0	57.9	16.9
Mathematics	43.7	50.1	28.5
Science	40.6	46.3	32.3

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
	31.8	36.1	31.0

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		82.3	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	503	504	46.9
	Critical Reading	508	502	53.8
	Writing	504	503	46.9

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 2007	98.1	92.6	73.1
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	1.3	6.2	77.4
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.8	1.7	68.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	84.6	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	15.0	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	356.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	38.90
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	55.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	132.00
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	20.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	9.00
School Level	24.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	26.20
School Nurses	14.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	194.32

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	18.1	14.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	84.6	76.5	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.8	17.1	18.1
Grade 2	18.2	18.2	19.3
Grade 5	22.6	19.9	20.9
Grade 7	19.6	19.7	20.5
High School	21.7	20.4	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	993	983	987
Middle School	1,025	1,006	1,017
High School	1,035	997	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*	3.4	4.3	3.4
Middle School	2.0	3.0	2.7
High School	3.0	3.0	2.7

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2006-07

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	\$39,759	\$7,590	\$7,153	\$7,108	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,970	\$376	\$262	\$235	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,955	\$564	\$443	\$365	\$429
Student Support Services	\$5,828	\$1,113	\$764	\$785	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$6,507	\$1,242	\$1,256	\$1,216	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$7,212	\$1,377	\$1,329	\$1,287	\$1,322
Transportation	\$4,127	\$742	\$605	\$613	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,008	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$147	\$147	\$145
Total	\$71,366	\$13,194	\$12,203	\$12,064	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$23,951	\$4,573	\$1,875	\$2,074	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$15,240,089
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	21.4%

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	46.2	51.4	2.3	0.1
Excluding School Construction	61.2	35.5	3.1	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 thirteen 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	632
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	58	1.1	0.7	0.7
Learning Disability	198	3.9	3.7	4.0
Intellectual Disability	45	0.9	0.6	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	55	1.1	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	137	2.7	2.6	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	76	1.5	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	63	1.2	1.0	0.9
Total	632	12.3	12.1	11.5

*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 2006-07 with a Standard Diploma	79.2	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	2.8

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	17.8	20.4	60.3	62.1
	Writing	11.1	19.3	56.4	63.0
	Mathematics	18.0	22.6	55.9	62.7
	Science	12.5	22.2	52.3	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	0.0	11.4	39.9	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	0.0	16.3	43.0	57.9
	Mathematics	0.0	14.7	43.7	50.1
	Science	0.0	14.4	40.6	46.3

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	12.1
	% With Accommodations	87.9
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	16.7
	% With Accommodations	83.3
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		5.2

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	34	5.4

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	518	82.0	66.9	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	73	11.6	15.0	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	41	6.5	18.1	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

This year we implemented Year One 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, all staff received professional development on the five step data team process which consists of collaborative, structured scheduled team meetings that focus on teaching and learning. Our district calendar was revised this year to allow for adequate time for teachers to meet after school and during school with the addition of 2 delayed opening days. All teachers participated in this data driven decision making process through participation in grade level or department Data Teams. The development and implementation of District-Wide Benchmark Assessments in reading, writing and math instruction is a continuing district-wide effort. There is also ongoing training in the development and use of Common Formative Assessments to inform and differentiate instruction so that all students can succeed.

All administrators received training in Classroom Walk-Through Observations which enabled them to monitor the implementation of curriculum and differentiation for special populations. Teacher developed lesson/unit plans are available for administrators to view during these classroom walk-throughs. Each teacher's lesson/unit plan is based on an identified grade level power standard in either the language arts or math curriculum framework. The identification of power standards in each curriculum area is one of the major components of the Making Standards Work initiative which the Groton Public Schools has embraced.

In the area of special education, we continue to focus our efforts on the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education setting to the maximum extent appropriate. Efforts have been made 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 with grade levels or content area departments. The use of the Wilson Reading System was expanded this year to provide targeted interventions using a scientifically research based program for students who are struggling readers.

Additionally, professional development was provided to all teachers in differentiated instruction, inclusion practices and IDEA, effective teaching strategies and culturally and racially relevant instructional strategies. The intent of this training is to enable teachers to instruct all students with greater understanding and awareness of their differences and to plan instruction which meets their individual needs.

Engaging parents in the planning and improvement of school programs is an ongoing goal. Parents are involved on each school's School Improvement Team (SIT). These teams meet at least monthly and assist with the implementation of the District Improvement Plan. The teams are also involved with hiring qualified staff for the district. Additionally, parents are involved on the District Quality Council (DQC). One task of the DQC is to develop ways to engage more parents, as outlined in the District Improvement Plan. Plans have been made to hold forums for parent input regarding the education of their children; surveys are also in the process of being developed for that same purpose. Engaging parents is a high priority in the Groton Public School System.
