

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**New London School District**

CHRISTOPHER P. CLOUET, Superintendent

Telephone: (860) 447-6000

Location: 134 Williams Street

New London,
Connecticut

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

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$18,437

Town Population in 2000: 25,671

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

1990-2000 Population Growth: -10.1%

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

Number of Public Schools: 8

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 89.1%

*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, 2008

3,086

5-Year Enrollment Change

-2.9%

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	2,172	70.4	82.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	673	22.1	13.9	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	90	2.9	2.1	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	426	13.8	12.7	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	158	65.3	62.1	79.7
Homeless	34	1.1	0.7	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	84	29.0	16.5	19.0

*98.9% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	65	2.1
Asian American	64	2.1
Black	992	32.1
Hispanic	1,409	45.7
White	556	18.0
Total Minority	2,530	82.0

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 19.7%

Non-English Home Language: 23.2% 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 17.

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 is considered to be one of the New London Public School's greatest strengths. Through community outreach efforts committees, made up of educators, parents, community members, faith-based organizations and health care providers, have been established and successfully brought together various constituents to identify, discuss and address the needs of our students and their families. Our fall and the spring community forums brings hundreds of parents, students and community members together. Student recognition is an integral part of these forums. Hope Week, which underpins the community's support of its youth, culminated in New London's third Hope Week Parade with over 1000 participants. This year the parade included a "Parade of Nations" section which featured students and community members representing 30 different countries wearing their native country's dress and proudly carrying the flag from their family's native country.

Our students, along with those from 16 other districts, attended the Science and Technology Magnet High School.

In June 200 of our students were enrolled in the Regional Multicultural Magnet School, 261 of our PreK - K students were enrolled in The Friendship School and approximately 65 of our students attended the Interdistrict School for Arts and Communication along with students from 11 other districts. Grade 6 and 7 students from New London and Waterford attended our Dual Language Arts Academy.

NLPS students participated in a variety of experiences with students from the surrounding school districts including satellite distance learning, field trips, workshops, art exhibits, attending performances at the Garde Arts Center, athletic events/competitions, school-to-career and service learning programs. .

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	16.7	54.6	1.3
Writing	34.4	62.5	3.1
Mathematics	17.0	62.8	0.6
Grade 4 Reading	31.7	60.7	5.5
Writing	44.3	64.2	7.3
Mathematics	25.1	63.6	1.2
Grade 5 Reading	36.0	66.0	5.0
Writing	42.4	66.5	6.8
Mathematics	34.2	68.8	3.1
Science	34.7	58.1	9.9
Grade 6 Reading	41.5	68.9	8.6
Writing	35.2	62.2	8.0
Mathematics	35.2	68.8	5.5
Grade 7 Reading	44.3	74.9	3.2
Writing	37.1	62.9	8.9
Mathematics	21.6	66.0	0.6
Grade 8 Reading	28.5	68.4	2.6
Writing	32.5	66.5	3.9
Mathematics	19.2	64.5	0.6
Science	16.7	60.6	2.6

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	12.3	47.4	5.3
Writing Across the Disciplines	18.4	55.0	5.3
Mathematics	15.2	47.8	9.9
Science	14.9	42.8	9.2

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
	19.6	36.2	10.5

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		48.9	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	384	507	3.1
	Critical Reading	392	503	3.1
	Writing	392	506	3.1

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 2008	81.1	92.1	5.3
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	14.2	6.6	6.6
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	2.7	2.5	16.8

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	55.6	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	15.8	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	189.02
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	31.14
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	46.87
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	45.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	5.60
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	7.80
School Level	14.41
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	6.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.20
School Nurses	7.20
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	126.83

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	14.8	12.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	72.2	72.7	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	22.0	20.5	18.3
Grade 2	22.5	21.0	19.3
Grade 5	22.5	22.0	21.0
Grade 7	17.3	21.7	20.5
High School	19.8	18.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,030	989	988
Middle School	1,039	996	1,016
High School	993	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*	3.6	2.9	3.3
Middle School	2.0	2.4	2.6
High School	1.5	2.3	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	\$25,245	\$8,666	\$7,521	\$8,050	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$907	\$311	\$267	\$320	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,024	\$695	\$461	\$541	\$446
Student Support Services	\$3,139	\$1,078	\$808	\$743	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$5,304	\$1,821	\$1,351	\$1,465	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,517	\$1,894	\$1,382	\$1,456	\$1,377
Transportation	\$2,586	\$723	\$649	\$787	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,891	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$484	\$166	\$152	\$153	\$151
Total	\$48,095	\$13,808	\$12,869	\$13,885	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$8,496	\$2,916	\$1,791	\$3,166	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$12571378	26.1	21.6	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	32.9	60.7	5.8	0.6
Excluding School Construction	36.8	55.6	6.9	0.7

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 mission statement affirms that the New London Public Schools shall provide an equitable, relevant and quality education which enables students in a diverse community to make a responsible impact on society. In order to accommodate the needs of our students, the New London Public Schools has in place a site-based budgeting process. Our classroom teachers develop a list of their students' academic needs for the upcoming school year. Each principal and/or director reviews the various requests from his/her teachers, department heads and/or the administration and determines what is necessary to run his/her school or department. During budget deliberations, the principal/director provides the Director of Business and Finance with a requested budget for the next fiscal year. The requested budget is submitted within the budgetary parameters established by the BOE. If there are no budgetary parameters, then each principal/director submits a comprehensive budget according to their needs. Projected enrollments are reviewed to assess the need for additional staff within a building. The Director of Business and Finance submits the total budget to the Superintendent who, in collaboration with her, will review the various budgets for final submission to the Board's Budget Committee. The Board's Finance Committee will review the Superintendent's recommendations – modify as they deem appropriate – and submit a final budget to the full Board.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	487
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	14.2%

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	33	1.0	0.8	0.8
Learning Disability	145	4.2	5.0	3.9
Intellectual Disability	27	0.8	0.8	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	39	1.1	1.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	108	3.2	2.4	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	106	3.1	2.0	2.1
Other Disabilities**	29	0.8	1.1	0.9
Total	487	14.2	13.7	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	66.7	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	11.0	30.2	33.2	65.7
	Writing	6.7	19.5	37.9	64.1
	Mathematics	7.3	30.7	25.4	65.7
	Science	1.6	23.8	26.5	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	0.0	14.1	12.3	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	3.4	13.6	18.4	55.0
	Mathematics	3.7	15.4	15.2	47.8
	Science	3.2	10.6	14.9	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	23.6
	% With Accommodations	76.4
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	47.8
	% With Accommodations	52.2
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		10.7

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	51	10.5
Private Schools or Other Settings	24	4.9

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	294	60.4	67.4	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	110	22.6	16.9	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	83	17.0	15.7	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2008-2009 curriculum committees continued to revise the mathematics and literacy curriculum based on the state curriculum standards. We are in our second year of implementation of our core literacy program in all of the elementary schools. The Literacy Curriculum Committee selected two new programs. The first is a core Spanish language reading program to better meet the needs of our English Language Learners in Dual Language Programs. The second program, Read 180, is an intervention program for middle school to address all students that scored below basic or basic on the Connecticut Mastery Test. Given our focus on literacy, we also placed literacy coaches in all elementary schools and in the middle school.

The District Teaching and Learning Committee continues to support advances in student learning through improvements in teaching and sets the tone for systematic change in our district. The district data team, DELTA, was formed and met twice a month. This team wrote the District Improvement Plan. At the building level Data Teams have been established to use formative and summative data to regularly monitor and measure their professional practices and their impact on student learning. The district also had many partners who worked directly with staff at the building level to develop School Improvement Plans and further develop the effectiveness of data teams.

.
