

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11**Clinton School District**

JOHN F. CROSS, III, Superintendent

Location: 137-b Glenwood Circle
Clinton,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 664-6500

Website: sites.google.com/a/clintonpublic.net/district/

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: Middlesex

Town Population in 2000: 13,094

1990-2000 Population Growth: 2.6%

Number of Public Schools: 4

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$26,080

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.4%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.1%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 93.2%

*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): 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, 2010 2,029
5-Year Enrollment Change -6.4%

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	276	13.6	13.8	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	34	1.7	2.3	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	135	6.7	4.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	248	12.2	11.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	166	89.7	85.1	80.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	47	21.4	17.2	13.2

*1.5 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	8	0.4
Asian American	48	2.4
Black	13	0.6
Hispanic	159	7.8
Pacific Islander	5	0.2
White	1,752	86.3
Two or more races	44	2.2
Total Minority	277	13.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.5%

Non-English Home Language:

3.0% 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 11.

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 town of Clinton is fortunate that the community reflects racial, ethnic, and economic diversity. With nearly ten percent of our population being members of minority groups, our schools provide wonderful opportunities for students and the community-at-large to learn in an environment that is both racially and economically diverse. The percentage of our Special Education students who spend time with non-disabled peers continues to improve and is on par when compared to both our DRG and the state percentages. Clinton continues to advance and support second language acquisition, offering courses in French, Spanish and Chinese at the high school level and is proud of advances in the K-12 Spanish program. The district is one of only 13 districts statewide to have a K-12 World Language Program. The program is designed to provide all students, kindergarten through grade 8, with the opportunity to enter high school prepared to take a level 3 course in Spanish. The high school Chinese program has benefited by two Department of State Grants as part of the Department of State's Teachers of Critical Languages Program (TCLP). In addition, the district has taken advantage of French Fulbright Exchange Teachers for several years. Both programs have allowed the district to continue to offer multiple levels of Chinese and French at the high school and to introduce Chinese at the middle school. The district continues to maintain relationships with a sister school in China affording opportunities for ongoing exchange programs. Each year the Joel Elementary School hosts several teachers-in-training from the University of Northern Switzerland for five weeks. Clinton students continue to have an opportunity to participate in the inter-district magnet school in New Haven, the regional technical school, and the vocational-agricultural school in Middletown. The district continued its collaborative arrangement with the regional adult education program (ERACE) and the YMCA to provide literacy support for adult English Language Learners in the community. The program enrolled more than 60 participants. Once again, nearly every student in the district was involved in at least one locally funded intradistrict program designed to reduce isolation, increase awareness of diversity of individuals and cultures, to reduce/eliminate harassment, and/or to respect others.

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	63.2	58.4	43.8
Writing	73.8	61.1	65.2
Mathematics	66.3	63.0	44.1
Grade 4 Reading	68.8	62.5	48.5
Writing	71.4	65.5	46.3
Mathematics	74.7	67.0	51.8
Grade 5 Reading	72.8	61.4	57.1
Writing	77.5	66.8	58.3
Mathematics	81.9	72.5	60.1
Science	69.1	59.9	48.5
Grade 6 Reading	82.4	76.0	47.6
Writing	69.4	65.2	48.2
Mathematics	62.2	71.3	16.7
Grade 7 Reading	88.8	77.8	66.9
Writing	74.8	58.9	67.1
Mathematics	63.7	68.4	30.1
Grade 8 Reading	80.7	74.7	43.3
Writing	70.1	64.8	41.4
Mathematics	74.6	66.6	45.9
Science	72.9	63.1	46.5

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	57.0	44.7	62.1
Writing Across the Disciplines	74.2	61.2	62.4
Mathematics	53.8	49.5	45.9
Science	52.2	47.0	48.9

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
	41.3	51.0	27.0

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		74.5	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	490	510	30.5
	Critical Reading	501	505	42.7
	Writing	521	510	58.8

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 2010	83.6	81.8	29.0
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.7	2.8	59.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	88.3	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	11.7	9.1

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	140.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	7.40
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	26.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	43.02
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	5.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.50
School Level	7.90
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	9.50
School Nurses	3.72
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	82.80

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	17.0	14.6	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.1	79.0	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	20.6	17.5	18.4
Grade 2	21.3	19.2	19.9
Grade 5	21.7	21.7	21.2
Grade 7	20.3	20.7	20.6
High School	20.0	19.8	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	992	984	992
Middle School	1,072	1,025	1,017
High School	1,026	1,004	1,010

*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*	3.7	3.2	3.1
Middle School	2.5	2.5	2.4
High School	2.0	2.6	2.2

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2009-10

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	\$19,348	\$9,559	\$8,232	\$7,875	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$731	\$361	\$299	\$267	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$943	\$466	\$477	\$387	\$463
Student Support Services	\$2,015	\$995	\$875	\$828	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$2,490	\$1,230	\$1,433	\$1,339	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,815	\$897	\$1,421	\$1,322	\$1,410
Transportation	\$1,515	\$689	\$701	\$641	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$226	\$112	\$161	\$159	\$159
Total	\$30,183	\$14,745	\$13,878	\$13,136	\$13,780
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$460	\$227	\$1,622	\$1,432	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,503,939	21.5	21.7	21.5

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	74.7	19.7	5.5	0.1
Excluding School Construction	74.5	19.9	5.6	0.1

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.

Expanding access to technology, sustaining curriculum renewal, and maintaining core programs like all-day kindergarten and K-12 World Language have been priorities in allocation of resources. With economic constraints and pressures the district leadership has looked to a number of sources for containing costs and reducing expenses. The basic budget process entails four critical steps; 1) open budget hearings, 2) cost center/building-level budget preparation, 3) district budget development, and 4) budget presentations. Prior to developing the annual budget, the Board of Education holds a community-wide budget forum to solicit input, concerns, and priorities regarding the district programming. Following the forum, building administrators and their leadership teams build a “need-driven” operational budget. The budgets are specifically designed to support building goals that in turn support district goals. The superintendent then develops an overall preliminary budget for the Board of Education to review and provide feedback. Embedded in this process is an annual update of a ten-year plan for capital improvements that also includes funds for equipment, furniture and technology. The Board receives additional monies from both State and Federal sources (which are subject to fluctuations) to help finance remedial programs and special education programs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	248
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	19	0.9	1.2	1.1
Learning Disability	95	4.7	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	6	0.3	0.4	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	19	0.9	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	42	2.1	2.3	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	46	2.3	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	21	1.0	0.9	0.9
Total	248	12.3	11.3	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 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma	60.7	62.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	3.9

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	37.8	33.0	76.2	68.6
	Writing	25.5	19.3	72.8	63.7
	Mathematics	32.3	33.4	70.6	68.2
	Science	15.4	21.2	71.1	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	46.2	14.1	57.0	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	31.2	17.3	74.2	61.2
	Mathematics	30.8	15.8	53.8	49.5
	Science	41.2	13.1	52.2	47.0

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	11.8
	% With Accommodations	88.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		6.5

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	0	0.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	16	6.5

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	168	67.7	77.0	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	53	21.4	13.9	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	27	10.9	9.1	11.0

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The district has embarked on several system-wide improvement initiatives including the development of district-wide learning expectations, implementation of a systemic curriculum renewal process, refinement of the Scientific Research-Based Intervention support model, and a complete overhaul of the teacher evaluation process. The district-wide learning expectations, Foundation Skills and Competencies, are designed to integrate multiple disciplines with a focus on application and demonstration of skills and knowledge beyond quizzes and tests. The eleven Foundation Skills and Competencies will serve to raise student performance expectations by increasing the level of student responsibility and engagement in evaluating their own performance. These skills and competencies will be assessed through a Junior Exhibition and ultimately be incorporated as an expectation for graduation. Work is being done to identify and refine how each grade level supports the eleven skills and competencies, building toward proficiency at graduation. Curriculum renewal has been a major focus of district improvement for the last three years. The district K-12 curriculum renewal process is designed to engage teachers from all levels in identifying core-learning expectations. The district has committed to an ambitious schedule of renewal and implementation of all subject areas. Three core disciplines, language arts, math and social studies were completed and implementation initiated in 2010 -2011. While only in the first year of implementation, assessment results, particularly at the elementary level, indicate that the new curriculum model is having positive results. Work was also completed in World Language with a dramatic shift in expectations based on levels of proficiency. The fruits of a K-12 Spanish program are beginning to become evident as incoming 9th grade students are prepared to start at a level 3 language course. The district continues to refine its SRBI/RtI model for early intervention. Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs have been developed at each level to provide focused support for students not meeting expected proficiency levels. Using the state's updated teacher expectations and current research on constructive support and evaluation the district completed a comprehensive overhaul of the teacher evaluation system. The plan adds two key elements to the process, engaging teachers in evidence collection and reflection on practice. (Special Education Services) The district continued its focus on supporting the inclusion of students with disabilities with their non-disabled peers. Training in differentiated instruction and reading intervention programs was a primary focus for expanding the skill set for the special education staff in their efforts to support students in the classroom and provide teachers with additional intervention strategies. Work continues on developing and implementing universal screens and common assessments to assess and monitor student progress. A team of special education teachers and the special education director continued to expand the use Compass Learning Modules to provide instructional assistants training in classroom management, instructional strategies, and specific learning challenges for student on the autism spectrum.(Engaging Parents) The district continues its efforts to engage parents in supporting school improvement including: teacher search processes; parent organizations, "friends of" groups and PTA; budget forums; BOE sub-committees; and Principal Hours. Participation in forums suggests a high level of interest.
