

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10**Ellington School District**

STEPHEN C. CULLINAN, Superintendent

Location: 47 Main Street

Telephone: (860) 896-2300

Ellington,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.ellingtonschools.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: Tolland

Town Population in 2000: 12,921

1990-2000 Population Growth: 15.4%

Number of Public Schools: 6

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,766

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.5%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 96.2%

*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): C 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 2,667

5-Year Enrollment Change 9.6%

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	203	7.6	6.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	32	1.2	0.7	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	45	1.7	4.6	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	251	9.4	10.8	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	162	79.0	85.9	80.5
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	53	16.1	12.7	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	9	0.3
Asian American	114	4.3
Black	93	3.5
Hispanic	81	3.0
White	2,370	88.9
Total Minority	297	11.1

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.7%

Open Choice:

34 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:

3.2% 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 24.

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.

Reducing racial, ethnic and economic isolation continues to be a challenge for the Ellington Public Schools due to its demographics. Over the past several years, Ellington has increased its enrollment from ten (10) students to eighteen (18) students to thirty-two (32) students enrolled in its schools through the Hartford Open Choice Program. Due to the size and configuration of our schools enrollment opportunities are limited and thus this increase is impressive. The district has committed itself to another increase in available seats in 2010-2011. In addition, some Ellington students do participate in magnet school programs such as the Connecticut International Baccalaureate Academy, the Greater Hartford Academy of the Arts, the Greater Hartford Academy of Math & Science, and Great Paths Academy. Ellington High School did sponsor a foreign exchange student from Germany for the entire school year and continued its an interdistrict program with East Hartford. Ellington students do participate in a variety of locally funded programs to increase awareness of the diversity of individuals and cultures. Ellington Middle School students participated in an Adopt a Student from Guatemala through Project Common Hope. The high school students participated in the Day of Silence which recognized world injustices. A highlight of the intermediate school curriculum is culminated in Immigration Day. The middle school students continue with a most impressive and important program by visiting nursing homes. Among the other varied activities that Ellington students participated in were: Exploring Diverse Cultures Workshop, African Dance Program, Pequot Museum Field trip, Kids' Character Education, Use Another Word, Responsive Classroom, Making Diversity Count, Teaching Children to Care, Anti-Bullying Program, Character and Respect Assembly, Camp Jewel, PAWS, and grade four Pen Pals. Support for a number of these programs comes from our PTOs.

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	69.3	57.0	60.1
Writing	60.8	58.3	40.5
Mathematics	69.6	62.4	52.8
Grade 4 Reading	76.5	59.9	75.5
Writing	73.1	63.6	53.8
Mathematics	77.9	67.0	62.9
Grade 5 Reading	78.7	61.8	72.7
Writing	78.3	68.2	57.8
Mathematics	87.1	72.4	74.7
Science	73.8	59.4	58.4
Grade 6 Reading	92.5	74.9	89.0
Writing	83.5	65.9	76.2
Mathematics	87.4	70.7	75.5
Grade 7 Reading	92.4	77.4	81.8
Writing	74.6	61.2	63.0
Mathematics	90.3	68.5	88.3
Grade 8 Reading	85.4	73.3	66.9
Writing	76.0	62.6	64.3
Mathematics	84.9	67.3	78.3
Science	81.5	62.8	73.9

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	59.0	45.9	65.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	69.1	59.6	57.1
Mathematics	58.4	48.7	55.3
Science	67.5	45.3	82.6

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
	49.4	50.7	44.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		72.6	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	527	508	60.5
	Critical Reading	521	503	61.2
	Writing	531	506	72.1

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	98.9	91.3	91.5
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.4	3.0	84.6

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	89.8	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.4	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	153.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	9.85
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	22.60
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	43.70
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	7.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.40
School Level	8.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.70
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	11.50
School Nurses	6.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	108.80

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	15.0	14.5	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	78.1	79.0	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	20.5	17.2	18.5
Grade 2	21.3	18.5	19.7
Grade 5	24.8	20.7	21.1
Grade 7	20.5	19.9	20.8
High School	17.5	19.0	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	986	994	992
Middle School	1,036	1,034	1,018
High School	1,016	1,007	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*	4.1	3.1	3.2
Middle School	1.9	2.2	2.5
High School	2.7	2.4	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	\$18,096	\$6,870	\$7,819	\$7,380	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$531	\$202	\$274	\$281	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$935	\$355	\$474	\$406	\$459
Student Support Services	\$1,456	\$553	\$863	\$816	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$2,208	\$838	\$1,405	\$1,400	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,225	\$1,224	\$1,469	\$1,468	\$1,462
Transportation	\$1,704	\$648	\$701	\$675	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,071	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$407	\$155	\$163	\$148	\$162
Total	\$29,633	\$11,208	\$13,458	\$13,077	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,709	\$649	\$1,864	\$1,030	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,087,234	20.5	20.2	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	64.7	33.3	1.9	0.2
Excluding School Construction	63.1	34.8	2.0	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.

The budget process for the 2009-2010 school year was most difficult. The positive trend of restoring accounts that were reduced in previous years, and in incrementally increasing staffing to meet growing enrollments, could not be sustained. It was replaced by across the board reductions, producing a district budget that was a \$60,000 decrease from the previous year. In spite of voluntary wage freezes or furlough days from staff, there was a reduction of 6.5 FTE in certified staff. In addition, there were reductions in all accounts supporting student achievement. Great care was made to minimize the negative impact of budget reductions at all schools and at all levels. The district closely monitors class size so as to maintain an equitable allocation across the district. In addition, each school develops and maintains a list of students in need of support or intervention and lists the corresponding support provided. This process focuses the administration and staff to appropriately prioritize available resources based upon student need. Prioritization of budget requests and any subsequent reductions are made by building principals for their respective schools. The future challenge will be to hopefully make appropriate restoration in staff and materials that is reflective of student needs and consistent with a rapidly increasing student population. This challenge will be further compounded by the end of the two-year funding provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	247
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	9.3%

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	16	0.6	1.0	1.0
Learning Disability	104	3.9	3.9	3.9
Intellectual Disability	5	0.2	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	21	0.8	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	43	1.6	2.1	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	29	1.1	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	29	1.1	0.7	0.9
Total	247	9.3	10.5	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	88.2	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	1.1	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	49.3	31.6	82.4	67.5
	Writing	23.0	19.6	74.3	63.3
	Mathematics	51.6	32.9	82.9	68.1
	Science	31.1	23.7	77.4	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	6.2	13.8	59.0	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	10.5	16.8	69.1	59.6
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	58.4	48.7
	Science	5.3	13.0	67.5	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	19.6
	% With Accommodations	80.4
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	17.6
	% With Accommodations	82.4
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		15.6

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	1.2
Private Schools or Other Settings	11	4.5

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	186	75.3	76.7	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	41	16.6	16.4	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	20	8.1	6.9	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

For the fourth consecutive year, the Ellington Public Schools continued its ambitious and highly focused process to address improved student achievement through the development of both District and School Instructional Plans. In August, the administrative team again analyzed school and district student achievement results to develop district goals in 1) reading 2) mathematics and 3) community involvement. Each district and school goal is supported by multiple actions, strategies, and interventions with corresponding timelines, means of evaluation and person or persons responsible. School goals are aligned with the District Instructional Plan and at least one professional growth objective for each administrator and teacher is aligned to the school focus goals. Each school produces a monthly instructional report that provides detailed information on the 1) status of initiatives 2) next steps and 3) recognitions. The superintendent produces a similar report each month for the entire district that is presented to the board of education and is published on the district website. The recognitions section contains information of excellent work completed by students, staff and parents. The plans are grounded in the research of Douglas Reeves and have been supported by significant professional development activities. This year, continuing to use district staff as trainers, the district completed a three-year effort in which all certified staff members were trained in the Center for Learning and Leading module Data Driven Decision Making/Data Teams. The district continued to provide common planning time for all staff either by grade level or by department so as to be able to implement the Data Driven Decision Making/Data Team model. The district continued its intense collaboration with the Columbia Teachers College Reading & Writing Project. Staff developers spent fifteen days in district modeling lessons and assisting staff in the implementation of the Readers Workshop. In addition, a number of staff members participated in Saturday Reunions in New York City. A number of staff members attended workshops on Common Formative Assessments and the results of this professional development are starting to be seen in classrooms. The district also continues training to teachers in grades 1-6 in First Steps Mathematics. Significant focus continues to be given to the achievement of special education students as well as all students performing below expectation in reading and mathematics. Special workshops relating to CMT and CAPT skills were presented to special educators. Study groups of special educators to support our initiatives were formed at each building. The process of reviewing IEPs to ensure that objectives were aligned with CMT/CAPT objectives continued. In addition, district staff has been developing Tier I, II, and III interventions for use with the SRBI model. The district expanded its efforts and created four district-level SRBI vertical teams. Much planning, organization and training led to the implementation of co-teaching models in several of our schools. The district, as well as each school, had one of their three goals focused upon community involvement. The superintendent continued to meet quarterly with officers of all school PTOs. The district has expanded its effort to use e-mails to convey important information as it introduced School Messenger, providing rapid communication with all families and staff. The use of the district website to publish pertinent information for parents continued. This included publication of the superintendent's monthly report as well as all documents related to the development of the budget. The superintendent contributes an article to the town's quarterly newsletter the Ellington Connection. Parental workshops to assist parents in supporting their student were offered in a variety of venues. Family Reading Nights and Family Book Clubs, as well as Raising Readers have been a highlight this year.
