

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10**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: 7

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: 88.9%

*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, 2009 3,000
5-Year Enrollment Change -1.8%

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	2,845	93.8	86.4	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	645	21.4	15.0	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	107	3.5	2.2	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	410	13.5	13.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	141	70.9	67.7	80.5
Homeless	16	0.5	0.9	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	86	23.9	10.4	13.6

*97.2 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	51	1.7
Asian American	58	2.0
Black	966	31.8
Hispanic	1,388	45.8
White	537	18.7
Total Minority	2,463	82.1

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 19.3%

Non-English Home Language:

24.7% 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 15.

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. Our annual fall forum, which focuses on health and wellness, and our spring forum, which focuses on the arts and sciences, brings hundreds of parents, students and community members together. Student recognition is an integral part of these forums. During Hope Week, which underpins the community's support of its youth, we hosted the annual Intergenerational Dance and the Hope Week Parade. One of the highlights of this parade is the "Parade of Nations" section which features students and community members representing over 30 different countries. Students from 18 other districts attend our Science and Technology Magnet High School. Our 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 2009-2010, 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 New London Historical Society, the New London Maritime Custom House, Kente Cultural Center and Centro de la Comunidad.

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	27.2	57.0	3.7
Writing	38.7	58.3	8.6
Mathematics	32.4	62.4	3.1
Grade 4 Reading	21.4	59.9	1.3
Writing	34.8	63.6	2.5
Mathematics	28.0	67.0	2.5
Grade 5 Reading	36.6	61.8	7.9
Writing	58.0	68.2	15.1
Mathematics	51.6	72.4	7.8
Science	37.3	59.4	9.6
Grade 6 Reading	52.4	74.9	8.0
Writing	34.8	65.9	3.7
Mathematics	28.4	70.7	2.5
Grade 7 Reading	52.1	77.4	5.8
Writing	35.6	61.2	6.5
Mathematics	24.9	68.5	1.9
Grade 8 Reading	43.7	73.3	5.7
Writing	32.3	62.6	7.6
Mathematics	27.2	67.3	2.5
Science	22.0	62.8	2.5

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	15.7	45.9	6.1
Writing Across the Disciplines	26.1	59.6	4.5
Mathematics	19.0	48.7	7.6
Science	21.8	45.3	11.4

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
	34.9	50.7	15.2

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		71.7	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	392	508	5.4
	Critical Reading	390	503	3.9
	Writing	386	506	3.9

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 2009	89.5	91.3	19.2
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	2.1	3.0	29.4

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	61.4	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	20.0	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	185.92
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	36.79
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	41.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	33.29
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.20
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	4.41
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	7.00
School Level	14.88
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.80
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	16.80
School Nurses	6.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	127.91

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	14.0	12.9	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	71.6	73.3	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.0	21.1	18.5
Grade 2	21.0	21.6	19.7
Grade 5	18.2	21.8	21.1
Grade 7	15.7	22.8	20.8
High School	17.7	19.6	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,041	1,004	992
Middle School	1,023	998	1,018
High School	1,005	1,002	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	2.8	3.2
Middle School	2.2	2.5	2.5
High School	1.7	2.0	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	\$26,067	\$8,449	\$7,819	\$8,202	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,074	\$348	\$274	\$316	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,748	\$566	\$474	\$557	\$459
Student Support Services	\$3,122	\$1,012	\$863	\$777	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$5,386	\$1,746	\$1,405	\$1,528	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,434	\$1,762	\$1,469	\$1,497	\$1,462
Transportation	\$2,690	\$743	\$701	\$896	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,332	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$400	\$130	\$163	\$158	\$162
Total	\$49,250	\$13,624	\$13,458	\$14,300	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$4,399	\$1,426	\$1,864	\$3,292	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$12,425,844	25.2	21.6	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	24.8	67.0	7.4	0.8
Excluding School Construction	34.8	56.3	8.0	0.9

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 NLPS believes that the school budget is the basic mechanism for developing and carrying out its educational plan. We utilize a site-based budgetary process which puts control of the educational dollar where it is spent and where the results will be most obvious. This ensures that each student will get the benefits of equal resources since the decisions about program and resource allocations are made as close to the people being served as possible. The district and school budgets are developed under the umbrella of the District Improvement Plan which focuses on improving student achievement and increasing our graduation rate. School budgets are developed around improving student achievement and school climate. Our budgeting system requires each school in the district to establish an individual budget and educational priorities within the confines of the total system. Principals/directors and teachers, with input from parents, establish their individual school/program budget within the budgetary parameters set by the BOE. If there are no budgetary parameters, principals/directors submit 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 and collaboratively they review the budgets for final submission to the BOE's Finance Committee who, in turn, reviews the Superintendent's recommendations – modifies as they deem appropriate – and submits a final budget to the full Board.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	491
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	14.6%

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	46	1.4	0.9	1.0
Learning Disability	136	4.0	5.0	3.9
Intellectual Disability	26	0.8	0.8	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	39	1.2	1.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	116	3.4	2.4	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	104	3.1	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	24	0.7	1.2	0.9
Total	491	14.6	14.0	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	76.9	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	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	8.3	31.6	38.4	67.5
	Writing	4.3	19.6	39.3	63.3
	Mathematics	5.6	32.9	32.3	68.1
	Science	11.1	23.7	30.0	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	8.3	13.8	15.7	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	4.3	16.8	26.1	59.6
	Mathematics	18.2	16.7	19.0	48.7
	Science	10.3	13.0	21.8	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	25.8
	% With Accommodations	74.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	47.5
	% With Accommodations	52.5
% 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	48	9.8
Private Schools or Other Settings	40	8.1

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	311	63.3	67.6	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	70	14.3	17.1	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	110	22.4	15.3	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2009-2010 curriculum committees revised the mathematics and literacy curriculum based on the state curriculum standards. Pacing Guides were also developed for literacy K-12. Standards based report cards were implemented K-5. Professional Learning Communities K-5 focused on developing strategies among elementary teachers on how to more effectively teach mathematics and a new core mathematics program was implemented. A committee also revised the teacher evaluation system for the New London Public Schools with a focus on defining and developing effective instructional practice and linked to student achievement outcomes. The district data team, DELTA met twice a month. This team wrote and made revisions to 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.
