

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2012-13**New London School District**

Nicholas A. Fischer, Superintendent

Location: 134 Williams Street
New London,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 447-6000

Website: newlondon.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: 25,671

1990-2000 Population Growth: -10.1%

Number of Public Schools: 5

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$18,437

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 19.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 4.3%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 90.8%

*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): I 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, 2012 3,067
5-Year Enrollment Change 5.5%

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	2,416	78.8	85.0	36.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	618	20.4	15.3	5.8
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	119	3.9	1.3	3.8
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	520	17.0	13.8	11.9
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	149	66.2	67.4	79.3
Homeless	24	0.8	1.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	15	42.9	9.9	12.7

*84.9 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	32	1.0
Asian American	42	1.4
Black	765	24.9
Hispanic	1,504	49.0
Pacific Islander	7	0.2
White	537	17.5
Two or more races	180	5.9
Total Minority	2,530	82.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 20.2%

Non-English Home Language:

28.7% 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 25.

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.

Our diverse student population continues to be one of the New London Public School's greatest strengths. Through community outreach we have successfully established venues to bring together various constituents to identify, discuss and address the needs of our students and their families. Students from 18 other districts attend our Science and Technology Magnet High School and students from 8 other districts attend our Winthrop Elementary Magnet STEM School. NLPS students are also enrolled in the following magnet or charter schools: Regional Multicultural Magnet School, The Friendship School, the Interdistrict School for Arts and Communication and the Dual Language Arts Academy. In 2012-2013 NLPS students participated in a myriad of activities with students from the surrounding school districts such as, field trips, workshops, athletic events/competitions, school-to-career and service learning programs to name a few. Students with disabilities are mainstreamed and are provided the least restrictive learning environment. The New London Public Schools also fostered a number of partnerships with area organizations and institutions of higher-education including the U.S Coast Guard Academy, Connecticut College, Mitchell College, Lawrence & Memorial Hospital, the Garde Arts Center, the CT Science Center, the New London Historical Society, the New London Maritime Custom House, Centro de la Comunidad and the Mystic Seaport. As part of our Strategic Operating Plan we adopted a goal to increase diversity in the teaching and administrative ranks. In order to accomplish this goal, we modified our recruitment process and expanded our search area. These changes have resulted in an increase in the number of candidates, particularly minority candidates, applying for positions in our district.

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	35.6	56.9	6.9
Writing	44.3	60.0	9.9
Mathematics	35.2	61.4	3.7
Grade 4 Reading	40.5	62.6	7.0
Writing	41.3	63.0	5.7
Mathematics	46.8	65.1	9.5
Grade 5 Reading	40.9	66.9	5.6
Writing	52.4	65.6	14.9
Mathematics	50.9	69.2	9.9
Science	40.3	62.3	11.2
Grade 6 Reading	43.6	73.3	4.2
Writing	46.4	65.1	9.4
Mathematics	38.8	67	6.0
Grade 7 Reading	53.8	78.9	4.4
Writing	39.9	64.9	7.0
Mathematics	32.0	65.4	6.3
Grade 8 Reading	52.1	76.2	5.1
Writing	45.3	67.2	8.2
Mathematics	28.3	65.0	4.4
Science	33.3	60.4	7.5

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 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	22.6	48.5	9.1
Writing Across the Disciplines	30.1	62.1	3.8
Mathematics	25.8	52.4	10.6
Science	21.7	48.8	10.5

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
	26.8	51.1	8.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2012		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		77.5	78.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	413	503	6.8
	Critical Reading	414	499	5.3
	Writing	412	504	6.0

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, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2012	61.9	84.8	5.9
2011-12 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.6	2.1	7.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	56.8	82.6
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	18.9	9.8

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	164.08
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	18.50
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	33.12
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	33.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	4.33
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.27
School Level	15.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	4.40
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	16.40
School Nurses	5.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	159.23

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	13.0	12.5	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	78.3	73.0	79.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	22.8	21.9	18.9
Grade 2	24.5	21.7	19.8
Grade 5	23.7	22.7	21.3
Grade 7	22.5	21.5	20.2
High School	16.3	17.6	18.8

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,041	1,040	999
Middle School	1,034	1,033	1,029
High School	932	1,069	1,027

*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	2.7	2.7
Middle School	1.7	2.3	2.1
High School	1.7	2.1	2.1

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2011-12

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	\$25,235	\$8,514	\$8,570	\$8,744	\$8,570
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$691	\$233	\$252	\$259	\$257
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,592	\$537	\$475	\$558	\$471
Student Support Services	\$3,553	\$1,199	\$949	\$860	\$950
Administration and Support Services	\$5,779	\$1,950	\$1,526	\$1,618	\$1,547
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,106	\$1,723	\$1,466	\$1,453	\$1,459
Transportation	\$3,320	\$920	\$775	\$955	\$765
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$4,677	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$434	\$146	\$170	\$168	\$170
Total	\$50,387	\$13,946	\$14,444	\$14,982	\$14,333
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,818	\$613	\$1,405	\$2,290	\$1,398

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$14,134,094	28.1	23.0	21.8

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	2.2	88.1	9.2	0.5
Excluding School Construction	34.7	55.2	9.6	0.5

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.

Our district believes that the school budget is the basic mechanism for developing and carrying out its educational plan. We utilized a site-based budgetary process which put control of the educational dollar where it was spent and where the results would be most obvious. This ensured that each of our students received the benefits of equal resources. District- and school-level budgets were developed under the umbrella of the newly adopted Strategic Operating Plan which focused on the following 6 goals: (1) Creating a regional system of high performing, effective schools; (2) Improving teacher and leader quality, diversity and retention; (3) Improving instruction for all students; (4) Increasing parent and community involvement and support; (5) Removing barriers to high performance and (6) Creating a stable system of support that sustains New London's schools and maximizes the use of public resources. School budgets were developed around the above 6 goals. Our budgeting system necessitated that each school in the district establish an individual budget and educational priorities within the confines of the total system. Projected enrollments were reviewed to assess the need for additional staff within a building. The Director of Business and Finance submitted the total budget to the Superintendent and collaboratively they reviewed the various budgets for final submission to the BOE's Finance and Audit Committee. The BOE's Finance and Audit Committee modified the Superintendent's budgetary recommendations as they deemed appropriate – and submitted the final budget to the full Board for final approval.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	623
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	18.0%

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	62	1.8	1.2	1.3
Learning Disability	169	4.9	5.3	4.0
Intellectual Disability	27	0.8	0.7	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	88	2.5	1.4	1.0
Speech Impairment	97	2.8	2.2	2.0
Other Health Impairment*	144	4.2	2.7	2.4
Other Disabilities**	36	1.0	1.3	1.0
Total	623	18.0	14.9	12.1

*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 2011-12 with a Standard Diploma	42.1	64.4
2011-12 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	5.8	3.2

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	11.6	34.5	43.7	69.2
	Writing	10.0	19.9	45.0	64.4
	Mathematics	12.6	29.0	39.5	65.5
	Science	10.4	21.3	37.3	61.3
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	11.8	15.7	22.6	48.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	12.1	16.7	30.1	62.1
	Mathematics	12.1	16.8	25.8	52.4
	Science	8.8	14.6	21.7	48.8

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	21.3
	% With Accommodations	78.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	32.6
	% With Accommodations	67.4
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		9.4

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	63	10.1
Private Schools or Other Settings	65	10.4

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	414	66.5	68.2	72.0
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	75	12.0	16.7	16.4
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	134	21.5	15.1	11.6

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2012-2013 our district began the process of developing a Strategic Operating Plan to create a regional system of high performing, effective schools. We adopted a Vision Statement which affirms that the New London Public Schools are a regional center for educational excellence, making creative use of the city's great cultural assets and building student achievement upon a foundation of outstanding, diverse schools. The core of excellence is relevance, academic rigor, innovative and engaging instruction and a diverse staff that challenges all students to reach their potential. Parental involvement adds greatly to student success. All students graduate high school and are college and career ready. We also adopted a Theory of Action which states that the district will define its relationship with each school on the basis of the school's performance. High-performing and/or significantly improving schools are given considerable autonomy and freedom from bureaucratic operating constraints. Schools in the relative mid-range of achievement and improvement are provided with "defined autonomy" for programs and operations to build their capacity for improvement. Chronically low-performing schools that fail to improve are subject to district intervention, redesign, closure or replacement with higher-performing school models. A managed performance empowerment theory of action leads to a system of high performing, diverse, financially sustainable, schools of choice.
