

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**Thompson School District**

MICHAEL W. JOLIN, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 923-9581

Location: 785 Riverside Drive
North Grosvenorda,
Connecticut

Website: www.thompson.ctschool.net

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: Windham	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$21,003
Town Population in 2000: 8,878	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 20.5%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 2.4%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.3%
Number of Public Schools: 3	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 91.4%

*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): F 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 1,389
5-Year Enrollment Change -3.7%

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	341	24.6	22.6	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	5	0.4	2.0	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	9	0.6	2.7	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	123	8.9	11.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	37	44.0	79.7	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	32	20.6	20.0	19.0

*0.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	19	1.4
Asian American	17	1.2
Black	20	1.4
Hispanic	37	2.7
White	1,296	93.3
Total Minority	93	6.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.7%

Non-English Home Language: 0.7% 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 6.

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.

Connecticut law requires that school districts provide educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. This may occur through magnet school programs, public school choice programs, charter schools, minority staff recruitment, inter- or intra-district programs and projects, distance learning, or other experiences. Below is the description submitted by this school district of how it provides such experiences.

Thompson's Public Schools had a particularly eventful year as we attempted to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. We were fortunate to have our State of Connecticut Grant renewed to improve student attendance, reduce court referrals, and reduce chronic absenteeism. In addition, we collaborated with the New London Public Schools and held an all day forum to help improve the appreciation of racial diversity among the students, parents, and staff who attended. Special attention was placed on helping participants to avoid racial stereotyping.

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	39.2	54.6	15.7
Writing	46.5	62.5	11.3
Mathematics	51.0	62.8	17.0
Grade 4 Reading	64.5	60.7	39.9
Writing	61.7	64.2	27.9
Mathematics	62.8	63.6	33.5
Grade 5 Reading	55.9	66.0	18.0
Writing	74.3	66.5	54.3
Mathematics	57.7	68.8	15.4
Science	66.7	58.1	44.4
Grade 6 Reading	68.8	68.9	29.4
Writing	69.4	62.2	49.1
Mathematics	70.6	68.8	35.6
Grade 7 Reading	60.2	74.9	11.5
Writing	48.3	62.9	14.6
Mathematics	52.5	66.0	15.3
Grade 8 Reading	56.9	68.4	18.7
Writing	49.6	66.5	12.9
Mathematics	51.3	64.5	17.4
Science	62.2	60.6	32.9

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 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	39.1	47.4	28.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	53.8	55.0	39.7
Mathematics	37.0	47.8	26.0
Science	39.8	42.8	37.4

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
	18.5	36.2	8.4

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		54.5	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	477	507	24.0
	Critical Reading	496	503	36.4
	Writing	489	506	29.5

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	89.8	92.1	22.1
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	10.4	6.6	13.9
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.5	2.5	10.2

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	72.7	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.5	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	93.75
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	12.90
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	8.25
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	13.96
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	3.14
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	5.65
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	6.00
School Nurses	3.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	66.30

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	14.2	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	65.0	74.0	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.6	16.3	18.3
Grade 2	17.7	18.4	19.3
Grade 5	21.2	20.6	21.0
Grade 7	22.0	19.6	20.5
High School	15.3	19.1	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	954	999	988
Middle School	1,017	1,032	1,016
High School	1,064	999	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*	3.5	3.5	3.3
Middle School	2.7	2.5	2.6
High School	1.7	2.2	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	\$7,929	\$5,372	\$7,521	\$6,983	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$411	\$278	\$267	\$294	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$318	\$216	\$461	\$273	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,055	\$715	\$808	\$695	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$2,448	\$1,658	\$1,351	\$1,317	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,890	\$1,280	\$1,382	\$1,310	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,004	\$637	\$649	\$670	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,153	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$300	\$203	\$152	\$184	\$151
Total	\$16,508	\$11,169	\$12,869	\$11,955	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$12,854	\$8,709	\$1,791	\$2,326	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$2,754,204	16.7	19.8	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	26.6	71.4	1.8	0.2
Excluding School Construction	44.4	52.0	3.3	0.3

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 Thompson Board of Education has sought to continually ensure that all class sizes are at optimum levels and to provide diverse course offerings. With increasing curriculum demands, this has been challenging. Pressures on the budget from items such as health insurance have made this a difficult task.

The budgetary process has each cost center discussed in cooperation with the Boards of Education and Finance. This process makes the community aware of each of the cost centers, and provides a forum to review budget increases and additional programming.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	142
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.3%

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	5	0.4	0.8	0.8
Learning Disability	25	1.8	3.7	3.9
Intellectual Disability	5	0.4	0.5	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	13	0.9	1.1	1.0
Speech Impairment	38	2.7	2.3	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	46	3.3	1.9	2.1
Other Disabilities**	10	0.7	0.9	0.9
Total	142	10.3	11.1	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	N/A	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	13.3	30.2	58.0	65.7
	Writing	13.6	19.5	58.1	64.1
	Mathematics	14.8	30.7	57.6	65.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	64.3	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	39.1	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	53.8	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	37.0	47.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	39.8	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	54.3
	% With Accommodations	45.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	50.0
	% With Accommodations	50.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		6.0

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	1	0.7
Private Schools or Other Settings	17	12.0

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	101	71.1	74.5	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	20	14.1	15.3	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	21	14.8	10.3	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Below is a summary, submitted by this school district, of the major trends in student performances and accomplishments that indicate sustained improvement over time. Also areas of need are identified and plans to address these needs are presented.

Thompson's 2008 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) scores continue to indicate the need for improvement especially at the middle school level in the area of reading. However, it is important to note the following:

- In terms of Annual Yearly Progress (AYP), we are pleased to note that our High School achieved AYP. In addition, our Middle School achieved AYP in mathematics, but missed AYP in reading by .4%. The Elementary School fell short in reading by 3%.
 - In an innovative process, the Thompson Board of Education and Association of School Administrators have agreed to explore the concept of Performance Based Compensation and are in the process of productive negotiations. The goal is to improve student performance through increased shared accountability.
-