STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10

Groton School District

PAUL J. KADRI, Superintendent Location: 1300 Flanders Road

Telephone: (860) 572-2110 Mystic,
Connecticut

Website: www.groton.k12.ct.us

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: \$23,995

Town Population in 2000: 39,907
1990-2000 Population Growth: -11.6%
Number of Public Schools: 11

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 12.4%
Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.1%
District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.9%

District Reference Group (DRG): G 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

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2009 5,029 Grade Range PK - 12 5-Year Enrollment Change -10.0%

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	1,712	33.9	36.4	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	72	1.5	3.5	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	41	0.8	4.0	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	595	11.8	12.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	277	59.4	75.1	80.5
Homeless	19	0.4	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	89	13.8	14.8	13.6

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

^{*}To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity				
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent		
American Indian	95	1.9		
Asian American	387	7.7		
Black	707	14.1		
Hispanic	561	11.3		
White	3,279	65.1		
Total Minority	1,750	34.8		

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 7.0%

Non-English Home Language:

7.0% 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 30.

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 Groton Public School system continues to make a concerted effort to ensure that our students receive an educational experience that enables them to interact with teachers and students from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. During the 2009-2010 school year, a couple of cultural initiatives were developed. At Fitch Senior High School, with a generous donation from Pfizer, the school proudly displayed flags from countries that represent its students' heritages. This public recognition was supported by a consistent reinforcement of the importance of cultural awareness and tolerance. District-wide, Groton is a very diverse community. Its military base provides even greater diversity not found in non-military communities. Presently, students do not "come together" until ninth grade. Plans have been developed to create a single, state of the art, middle school that will allow students from different backgrounds to meet in seventh grade. It is the feeling of the district that this will allow a greater opportunity for an emphasis on diversity. In 2009-2010, 102 Groton students were enrolled in the Regional Multicultural Magnet School; 9 students participated in the Open Choice Program; 32 students attended the Science Magnet School; and 39 students attended the Ledyard Vo-Ag Program. Forty-two students from all elementary schools within the district were integrated into the Catherine Kolnaski Magnet School. Fitch High School's International Baccalaureate Program and advanced placement classes continue to incorporate studies to increase cultural awareness. The Groton School System has benefited from having outstanding community partnerships. The New London Naval Submarine Base, the Mystic Seaport, the Mystic Aquarium, Project Oceanology (at the University of Connecticut), Pfizer Corporation, Electric Boat, the Eastern Connecticut Symphony, and many others, provide opportunities for our students beyond what is found in the curriculum. In addition, the school district has just invested in a technology that allows distance learning to easily take place in any classroom. Finally, the district's plan for school construction, which will create a single middle school, will also require a redistricting that can allow the community to find strength in diversity. This belief was adopted by the Board as one of thirteen core tenants.

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.

Area	nd CMT Subject	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal	These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable
Grade 3	Reading	55.1	57.0	31.3	tests who were enrolled in the district at the
	Writing	54.2	58.3	27.0	time of testing,
	Mathematics	61.2	62.4	33.7	regardless of the length
Grade 4	Reading	55.9	59.9	28.3	of time they were enrolled in the district.
	Writing	54.9	63.6	18.8	Results for fewer than
	Mathematics	62.1	67.0	25.8	20 students are not
Grade 5	Reading	61.8	61.8	33.9	presented.
	Writing	65.7	68.2	28.3	
	Mathematics	76.9	72.4	44.0	
	Science	64.7	59.4	38.6	For more detailed CMT results, go to
Grade 6	Reading	74.8	74.9	33.7	www.ctreports.
	Writing	59.8	65.9	22.6	
	Mathematics	60.1	70.7	16.6	
Grade 7	Reading	77.2	77.4	31.8	To see the NCLB
	Writing	60.3	61.2	30.5	Report Card for this
	Mathematics	65.2	68.5	27.9	school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and
Grade 8	Reading	80.1	73.3	51.0	click on "No Child Left
	Writing	64.7	62.6	38.9	Behind."
	Mathematics	63.7	67.3	28.7	7
	Science	65.2	62.8	33.8	7

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	34.7	45.9	26.5
Writing Across the Disciplines	46.8	59.6	21.1
Mathematics	45.0	48.7	34.8
Science	33.1	45.3	22.7

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		% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	46.8	50.7	36.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tes	sted	73.9	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	507	508	45.7
	Critical Reading	502	503	40.3
	Writing	497	506	34.1

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 2009	96.7	91.3	66.2
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.9	3.0	34.6

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	77.3	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	14.4	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	360.70
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	50.78
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	55.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	132.90
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	20.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs District Central Office School Level	9.00 23.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	27.00
School Nurses	12.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	216.62

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	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	85.0	78.5	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.6	18.2	18.5
Grade 2	21.6	18.9	19.7
Grade 5	20.5	20.7	21.1
Grade 7	16.5	19.9	20.8
High School	19.4	19.8	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,001	982	992
Middle School	1,020	1,000	1,018
High School	1,087	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*	2.5	3.7	3.2
Middle School	1.7	2.6	2.5
High School	1.4	2.3	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	\$40,818	\$7,951	\$7,819	\$7,898	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$2,363	\$460	\$274	\$242	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$3,208	\$625	\$474	\$380	\$459
Student Support Services	\$6,229	\$1,213	\$863	\$900	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$7,332	\$1,428	\$1,405	\$1,379	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$8,169	\$1,591	\$1,469	\$1,492	\$1,462
Transportation	\$3,870	\$707	\$701	\$693	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,873	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$3	\$1	\$163	\$176	\$162
Total	\$74,865	\$14,094	\$13,458	\$13,462	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$10,154	\$1,978	\$1,864	\$2,044	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$15,660,954	20.9	22.3	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	59.8	37.6	2.4	0.2
Excluding School Construction	60.7	36.4	2.7	0.2

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 Groton Board of Education's policy concerning the annual distributuion of resources ensures that each of the eleven schools in the district receives an adequate level of material, supplies, and personnel to implement and excute educational programs. Funding is based on student enrollment, district-wide education programs, and the unique needs of its students, commensurate with district goals and available resources to ensure equity and address needs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible 595
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities 11.9%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities						
Disability Count District Percent DRG Percent						
Autism	67	1.3	1.0	1.0		
Learning Disability	174	3.5	3.9	3.9		
Intellectual Disability	41	0.8	0.5	0.5		
Emotional Disturbance	51	1.0	1.1	1.0		
Speech Impairment	123	2.5	2.5	2.2		
Other Health Impairment*	68	1.4	2.3	2.1		
Other Disabilities**	71	1.4	1.1	0.9		
Total	595	11.9	12.4	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	95.8	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.7	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	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	25.5	31.6	67.1	67.5
	Writing	17.2	19.6	59.8	63.3
	Mathematics	30.3	32.9	64.8	68.1
	Science	25.5	23.7	65.0	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	5.9	13.8	34.7	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	46.8	59.6
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	45.0	48.7
	Science	6.7	13.0	33.1	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	22.2		
	% With Accommodations	77.8		
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	0.0		
% With Accommodations 100.0				
% Assessed U	sing Skills Checklist	8.5		

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	6	1.0		
Private Schools or Other Settings	43	7.2		

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	484	81.3	70.1	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	62	10.4	15.3	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	49	8.2	14.6	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

This year we implemented Year Three of our three-year District Improvement Plan, which focuses the entire district's efforts on improving student achievement for all students in the core areas of reading, writing and math. To build upon the work done in the previous academic year of 2008-2009 teachers continued to participate in regularly scheduled, collaborative and structured meetings, following the five step Data Team process to review student achievement results as measured by state tests and district common formative assessments. Due to the increasing need for the strategic use of a data in the decision-making process the PowerSchool Student Information System was launched and training provided to allow educators to easily store and retrieve student data. In response to the Connecticut State Department of Education's release of the Scientifically Research-Based Interventions (SRBI) Framework in August of 2008 professional development across the district emphasized the use of educational technologies including Promethean Boards, Discovery Education and Atomic Learning to strengthen core instruction at all grade levels and in all content areas. The Math Expressions program was piloted in the elementary grades to improve student performance in mathematics. Special education teachers at the elementary level joined the general education teachers in professional development on the Math Expressions program which will be fully implemented in the 2010-2011 school year. The structure of the program when implemented with fidelity will ensure consistency in math instruction and assessment for all students among the elementary schools. Remedial reading teachers created a crosswalk between the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum and the Grade Level Learning Expectations at the elementary level. A pacing guide was also developed to assist teachers as they plan and implement the core reading program. In the area of special education, the district expanded the continuum of placement options for students with disabilities with the addition of the Elementary Learning Skills program at Northeast Academy and the Applied Behavior Analysis program at Cutler Middle School. Both programs offer students with disabilities a small highly structured classroom environment with an emphasis on behavior modification, augmentative communication, and individualized instruction. The district received an extension for the implementation of the Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities so that a district-wide SRBI Framework would be developed which would ensure that adequate and appropriate intervention is provided to all children when they need it. In the area of school climate and student behavioral health, the pupil personnel department participated in a review of the district's recently revised bullying policy. As a result of this review a Committee on Student Behavioral Health was formed to study the extent bullying occurs within the district and to advise the Superintendent and district leadership about strategies to decrease the incidents of bullying. This entity oversees the continuing rollout of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) with Pleasant Valley School, Mary Morrison and Charles Barnum entering year the first year of implementation in the academic year 2010-2011 joining already participating schools: Claude Chester, Fitch Middle School and Catherine Kolnaski. We also assisted in the implementation of the policy through the development of a district-wide Bullying Reporting Form which may be used by anyone in the school community to report an alleged act of bullying along with a follow up Reporting of Findings form which summarizes the investigation conducted by the building administrator in response to an alleged act of bullying. To address the increasing need to involve families as partners in the educational process district wide professional development was delivered in Schoolwires to improve communication with parents/families and students about district, school and classroom level policies, programs and practices. The new district website continues to provide unlimited opportunities for communication with all members of the educational community. We continue to study what schools can do to help parents support their children's learning through our partnership with the Connecticut Parent Information Resource Center and the National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS). Parents were surveyed to gather feedback from families about the quality and quantities of meaningful opportunities for parent engagement at the school level. Results were shared with the School Improvement Teams. Parent-family engagement continues to be a high priority for Groton Public Schools.