

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10**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: 94.1%

*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): 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, 2009 2,024
5-Year Enrollment Change -6.6%

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	256	12.6	13.4	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	42	2.1	2.3	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	118	5.8	4.8	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	261	12.9	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	131	88.5	85.6	80.5
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	64	21.7	15.5	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	2	0.1
Asian American	59	2.9
Black	28	1.4
Hispanic	134	6.6
White	1,801	89.0
Total Minority	223	11.0

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.4%

Non-English Home Language:

2.2% 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 7.

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 practice and experience an environment that is racially, ethnically, and economically diverse. Based on state data, none of the four minority racial/ethnic groups represented in our population is disproportionately represented in Special Education. In addition, 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 has taken a forward approach to exposing students to world language. The district is one of only 13 (10 if you don't count magnets and RESCs) 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 Spanish course. The Curriculum Renewal Team has realigned the K-6 portion of the curriculum to meet level 1 Spanish language expectations. Middle school students have an opportunity to choose to continue with Spanish or to explore French. The high school has been fortunate to be awarded two Department of State Grants as part of the Teachers of Critical Language Program (TCLP). This grant has allowed the district to continue to offer multiple levels of Chinese at the high school and to introduce Chinese at the middle school. The district hosted Chinese students and dignitaries, and a group of students and teachers visited China in the spring. 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 also received a grant to support early literacy and worked collaboratively with the regional adult education program (ERACE) to support English Language Learners (ELL) and their families. The programs were wildly successful with upwards of 60 participants. The Joel School again hosted several teachers-in-training from the University of Northern Switzerland for five weeks. 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	62.9	57.0	43.6
Writing	63.4	58.3	48.5
Mathematics	61.2	62.4	33.7
Grade 4 Reading	66.7	59.9	45.9
Writing	68.2	63.6	43.1
Mathematics	64.6	67.0	31.4
Grade 5 Reading	77.2	61.8	67.9
Writing	81.2	68.2	69.3
Mathematics	78.1	72.4	48.2
Science	70.5	59.4	47.6
Grade 6 Reading	83.1	74.9	54.6
Writing	71.2	65.9	49.4
Mathematics	65.0	70.7	23.9
Grade 7 Reading	85.6	77.4	48.7
Writing	70.1	61.2	51.9
Mathematics	69.7	68.5	35.7
Grade 8 Reading	89.0	73.3	80.9
Writing	74.7	62.6	59.9
Mathematics	83.3	67.3	72.6
Science	82.3	62.8	80.3

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	53.8	45.9	57.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	76.5	59.6	72.2
Mathematics	60.7	48.7	59.1
Science	55.1	45.3	57.6

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
	37.4	50.7	17.8

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		72.8	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	513	508	51.2
	Critical Reading	519	503	58.9
	Writing	539	506	78.3

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	89.3	91.3	17.7
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	4.1	3.0	11.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	85.4	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	12.6	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	146.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	8.36
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	25.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	44.15
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	6.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.50
School Level	7.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	3.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	11.60
School Nurses	3.72
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	83.23

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	16.0	14.4	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	79.4	77.1	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.4	17.2	18.5
Grade 2	20.6	18.9	19.7
Grade 5	20.3	20.9	21.1
Grade 7	21.8	20.3	20.8
High School	16.0	19.6	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	992	985	992
Middle School	1,065	1,025	1,018
High School	1,026	1,000	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*	3.7	3.5	3.2
Middle School	2.5	2.8	2.5
High School	2.1	2.8	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	\$18,905	\$9,071	\$7,819	\$7,408	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$945	\$454	\$274	\$280	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$845	\$406	\$474	\$389	\$459
Student Support Services	\$1,922	\$922	\$863	\$800	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$2,142	\$1,028	\$1,405	\$1,309	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,969	\$1,425	\$1,469	\$1,377	\$1,462
Transportation	\$1,487	\$658	\$701	\$641	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$971	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$299	\$143	\$163	\$169	\$162
Total	\$30,486	\$14,442	\$13,458	\$12,685	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$924	\$443	\$1,864	\$1,136	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,186,170	20.3	20.9	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	74.6	23.1	2.2	0.0
Excluding School Construction	75.0	22.7	2.3	0.0

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.

This year, given the economic constraints, the district leadership focused on maintaining core programs and minimizing the impact students. The process for refining the budget to keep it within the town's financial constraints led the administrative team to identify five unifying principles which became the driving force for decision making. 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. Building administrators, present their budget to the central office administrators who review and clarify each proposed budget. 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. The percent of the reimbursement is subject to federal allocations and state budgets.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	254
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.7%

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	14	0.7	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	109	5.5	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	6	0.3	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	18	0.9	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	44	2.2	2.4	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	44	2.2	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	19	1.0	0.9	0.9
Total	254	12.7	11.4	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	9.0	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	41.7	31.6	77.8	67.5
	Writing	23.9	19.6	71.4	63.3
	Mathematics	28.3	32.9	70.3	68.1
	Science	42.1	23.7	76.5	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	35.7	13.8	53.8	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	35.3	16.8	76.5	59.6
	Mathematics	35.7	16.7	60.7	48.7
	Science	25.0	13.0	55.1	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	11.6
	% With Accommodations	88.4
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	42.3
	% With Accommodations	57.7
% 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	12	4.7

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	183	72.0	76.7	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	50	19.7	13.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	21	8.3	9.5	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The economic conditions provided an opportunity for the district to reflect on key priorities. This led to an identification of five unifying principles that shape our work as a professional learning community: 1) Prepare independent and collaborative learners empowered to embrace the future; 2) Develop literacy in core disciplines to ensure quality learning experiences and achievement; 3) Embed the application of knowledge and skills in all learning experiences and new situations; 4) Develop and implement high-performing collaborative teams focused on improving teaching and learning; and 5) Provide a safe environment and modern, flexible facilities that support the district's educational mission. In addition, the district continues to refine its SRBI/RtI model for early intervention. 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. This past year math, language arts and social studies curriculum documents were completed and will begin implementation in 2010 -2011. The high school completed the accreditation process in May and has satisfactorily met the accreditation standards. The high school staff will be engaged in using the accreditation recommendations, the district high school of the future study, and the state's secondary school reform plan to outline improvement initiatives for the future. (Special Education Services) CPS 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. In addition, each level investigated and piloted intervention strategies for students not meeting success with the district curriculum. Programs ranged from an early literacy program for ELL students and families, to the Morning Blast at the middle school, to a math-science pilot program for 9th graders. A team of special education teachers and the special education director have been trained to provide training for paraprofessionals in the district using the Compass Learning Modules. The team will be providing specific training in general classroom management and instructional strategies, and workshops on specific learning challenges for student on the autism spectrum. (Engaging Parents) The district continues its efforts to engage parents in supporting school improvement including: the superintendent and assistant superintendent search processes; parent organizations, "friends of" groups and PTA; the High School of the Future Task Force; and Principal Hours. Participation in forums suggests a high level of interest. The Joel Elementary School wrote and received a second Family Learning Connection grant that was designed to work with parents and first grade students on developing home support for reading. The literacy staff conducted a series of afternoon and evening events to teach parents what they can do to support their children at home followed by time for parent to practice the techniques with guidance from the literacy staff.
