Connecticut State Department of Education

DISTRICT PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2013–14



Groton School District

Mr. Sean Mckenna, Superintendent • 860-572-2100 • http://www.groton.k12.ct.us

District Information

Grade Range	PK-12
Number of Schools	12
Enrollment	4,702
Per Pupil Expenditures ¹	\$15,184
Total Expenditures ¹	\$77,455,810

¹Expenditure data reflect the 2012-13 year.



Community Information

<u>CERC Town Profiles</u> provide summary demographic and economic information for Connecticut's municipalities

Related Reports/Publications

CT Reports (CMT/CAPT)

District and School Performance Reports

Special Education Annual Performance Reports

SAT®, AP®, PSAT® Report by High School (Class of 2014)

(2014® The College Board)

Contents

Students 1	
Educators2	
Instruction and Resources	
Performance4	
Narratives6	

Notes

Unless otherwise noted, all data are for 2013-14 and include all grades offered by the district.

In most tables, data are displayed only for the three major race/ethnicity categories. For additional race/ethnicity categories, please visit EdSight.

State totals are not displayed as they are not comparable to district totals.

Special Education tables reflect only students for whom the district is fiscally responsible.

* When an asterisk is displayed, data have been

suppressed to ensure student confidentiality. N/A is displayed when a category is not applicable for a district or school.

Students

October 1, 2013 Enrollment				
		District	State	
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)	
Female	2,286	48.6	48.3	
Male	2,416	51.4	51.6	
American Indian	44	0.9	0.2	
Asian	297	6.3	4.6	
Black or African American	485	10.3	12.9	
Hispanic or Latino	843	17.9	21.2	
Pacific Islander	11	0.2	0.0	
White	2,725	58.0	58.4	
Two or More Races	297	6.3	2.3	
English Language Learners	99	2.1	5.7	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	2,156	45.9	37.3	
Students with Disabilities ¹	737	15.7	12.8	

¹Students in this category are students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) only. This category does not include students with Section 504 Plans.

Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension/Expulsion

	Chronic		Suspension/	
	Absenteeism ²		Expulsion ³	
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	228	10.6	75	3.3
Male	295	13.0	242	10.0
Black or African American	55	12.2	70	14.9
Hispanic or Latino	142	17.4	89	10.1
White	255	10.1	124	4.6
English Language Learners	11	10.6	12	11.4
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	331	16.3	228	10.3
Students with Disabilities	135	20.1	118	14.1
District	523	11.8	317	6.7
State		10.8		7.4

Number of students in 2012-13 qualified as truant under state statute: 347

0590011 - Groton School District

²A student is chronically absent if he/she misses ten percent or greater of the total number of days enrolled in the school year for any reason. Pre-Kindergarten students are excluded from this calculation.

³The count and percentage of students who receive at least one in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension or expulsion.

Educators

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)1 Staff

	FTE
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	339.9
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	36.5
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	55.3
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	121.0
Administrators, Coordinators and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	7.0
School Level	24.2
Library/Media	
Specialists (Certified)	10.0
Support Staff	2.0
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers	12.0
Counselors, Social Workers and School Psychologists	26.4
School Nurses	10.0
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services/Support	233.5

¹In the full-time equivalent count, staff members working part-time in the school are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in a school contributes 0.50 to the school's staff count.

Educators by Race/Ethnicity

		District	State
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Asian	9	1.9	1.0
Black or African American	12	2.5	3.5
Hispanic	9	1.9	3.6
Native American	2	0.4	0.1
White	446	93.3	91.7

Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers²

	Percent of Total (%)	
District	99.9	
District Poverty Quartile: High		
State High Poverty Quartile Schools	97.8	
State Low Poverty Quartile Schools	99.5	

²Core academic classes taught by teachers who are fully certified to teach in that subject area.

Classroom Teacher Attendance: 2012-13

	District	State
Average Number of FTE Days Absent Due to Illness or Personal Time	10.1	9.3

Instruction and Resources

11th and 12th Graders Who Enrolled in at Least Two Advanced Placement® or International Baccalaureate® Courses during High School³

	11th		12th	
	Count			Rate (%)
Black or African American	*	*	10	27.0
Hispanic or Latino	8	20.0	*	*
White	68	43.0	83	45.1
English Language Learners	0	0	0	0
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	15	16.1	24	21.4
Students with Disabilities	0	0	*	*
District	95	36.3	117	38.1
State		14.2		26.8

³Effective 2014-15, this calculation will also include students who participate in dual enrollment courses and two or more courses within a career and technical education (CTE) concentration.

Students with Disabilities Who Spend 79.1 to 100 Percent of Time with Nondisabled Peers⁴

	Count	Rate (%)
Autism	49	46.7
Emotional Disturbance	36	43.9
Intellectual Disability	16	45.7
Learning Disability	189	90.0
Other Health Impairment	85	78.0
Other Disabilities	13	37.1
Speech/Language Impairment	86	93.5
District	474	71.0
State		69.2

⁴Ages 6-21

Students with Disabilities by Primary Disability¹

	Dis	State	
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Autism	108	2.2	1.4
Emotional Disturbance	82	1.7	1.0
Intellectual Disability	35	0.7	0.4
Learning Disability	210	4.3	4.2
Other Health Impairment	109	2.2	2.5
Other Disabilities	73	1.5	1.0
Speech/Language Impairment	111	2.3	1.9
All Disabilities	728	15.0	12.4

Students with Disabilities Placed Outside of the District²

	District		State
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Public Schools in Other Districts	28	3.8	2.8
Private Schools or Other Settings	61	8.3	8.1

²Grades K-12

Overall Expenditures: 2012-13

		Per Pupil		
	Total (\$)	District (\$)	State (\$)	
Instructional Staff and Services	43,425,972	9,089	8,769	
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	2,270,619	475	275	
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	2,298,759	481	487	
Student Support Services	5,520,000	1,155	965	
Administration and Support Services	7,974,144	1,669	1,600	
Plant Operation and Maintenance	7,267,689	1,521	1,472	
Transportation	4,870,087	933	786	
Costs of Students Tuitioned Out	3,828,540	N/A	N/A	
Other	0	0	178	
Total	77,455,810	15,184	14,642	
Additiona	I Expenditures			
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	2,821,173	590	1,434	

³Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources.

Special Education Expenditures: 2012-13

	Dist	State	
	Total (\$)	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Certified Personnel	6,457,670	39.0	35.6
Noncertified Personnel	2,533,578	15.3	14.5
Purchased Services	1,408,859	8.5	5.0
Tuition to Other Schools	2,947,166	17.8	21.4
Special Ed. Transportation	1,608,900	9.7	8.5
Other Expenditures	1,601,109	9.7	14.9
Total Expenditures	16,557,282	100.0	100.0
PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Educ	21.4	21.9	

Expenditures by Revenue Source:⁴ 2012-13

	Percent of Total (%)					
	Including	Excluding				
	School	School				
	Construction	Construction				
Local	63.4	62.0				
State	34.3	35.6				
Federal	2.3	2.4				
Tuition & Other	0.0	0.0				

⁴Revenue 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 Correction).

¹Grades K-12

Performance

District Performance Index (DPI)

A District Performance Index (DPI) for the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) and the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) is the test performance of all subjects tested in the respective assessment for all students in the district. The DPI ranges in value from 0 to 100 points. Connecticut's ultimate target for a DPI is 88 because in a district with a DPI of 88 or above, students will have performed at or above the 'goal' level on the majority of tests. Detailed reports of CMT and CAPT assessment results are available at www.ctreports.com. School and District Performance Reports produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) are also available online.

CMT	DPI			2013-14			Note: If no		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Count	DPI	Target	Achieved	data are displayed for
Black or African American	64.8	67.0	69.3	66.6					2013-14, the
Hispanic or Latino	70.0	68.2	67.6	67.2					district
English Language Learners	66.2	47.2	45.0	34.3					implemented the Smarter
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	68.8	68.0	67.6	69.0					Balanced Field
Students with Disabilities	45.7	49.2	48.0	49.7					Test.
High Needs	65.5	65.8	65.3	66.9					_
District	78.2	79.0	78.3	78.4					

САРТ	DPI			2013-14			Note: If no		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Count	DPI	Target	Achieved	data are
Black or African American	51.4	60.1	60.0	61.3					displayed for 2013-14, the
Hispanic or Latino	54.4	56.8	53.7	60.4					district
English Language Learners									implemented the Smarter
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	52.9	59.3	56.2	60.4					Balanced Field
Students with Disabilities	27.9	31.2	26.6	31.7					Test.
High Needs	49.5	53.9	52.3	55.4					_
District	68.6	70.8	69.7	71.0					

2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Percent At or Above Proficient¹

READING	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	43%	45%	50%
National Public	34%	34%	36%
MATH	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12
Connecticut	45%	37%	32%
National Public	41%	34%	25%

¹NAEP is often called the "Nation's Report Card." It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. This table compares Connecticut's performance to that of national public school students. Performance standards for state assessments and NAEP are set independently. Therefore, one should not expect performance results to be the same across CMT/CAPT and NAEP. Instead, NAEP results are meant to complement CMT/CAPT results.

Physical Fitness Tests: Students Reaching Health Standard²

	Percent	of Stude	All Teste	ed Grades		
	4	6	8	10	Count	Rate (%)
Sit & Reach	81.5	77.0	76.2	91.0	1,191	80.9
Curl Up	85.9	76.1	75.9	88.5	1,191	81.3
Push Up	68.6	71.1	69.5	83.3	1,191	72.4
Mile Run/PACER	66.0	79.3	70.7	62.8	1,191	70.0
All Tests - District	44.6	47.9	43.4	56.8	1,191	47.5
All Tests - State	50.2	50.7	50.3	53.9		51.1

²The Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment (CPFA) is administered to all students in Grades 4, 6, 8 and 10. The health-related fitness scores gathered through the CPFA should be used to educate and motivate children and their families to increase physical activity and develop lifetime fitness habits.

³Only students assessed in all four areas are included in this calculation.

Cohort Graduation: Four-Year¹

		2013-14			
	Cohort Count ²	Rate (%)	Target³ (%)	Target Achieved	Target³ (%)
Black or African American	49	79.6	80.2	No	81.6
Hispanic or Latino	36	75	72.8	Yes	74.9
English Language Learners	*	*			
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	116	73.3	68.5	Yes	71.0
Students with Disabilities	47	57.4	57.3	Yes	61.0
District	327	82.3	82.8	No	83.9
State ⁴		85.5			

¹The four-year cohort graduation rate represents the percentage of first-time 9th graders who earn a standard high school diploma within four years. Statewide, district and school results for cohorts of 2010 through 2013 are <u>available online</u>.

11th and 12th Graders Meeting Benchmark on at Least One College Readiness Exam⁵

	Participation ⁶	Meeting E	Benchmark
	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	75.9	106	37.1
Male	63.3	91	32.2
Black or African American	61.2	10	14.9
Hispanic or Latino	52.3	10	11.6
White	74.0	147	43.0
English Language Learners	*	0	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	54.1	32	15.6
Students with Disabilities	*	*	*
District	69.6	197	34.6
State	72.9		37.6

⁵College readiness exams and benchmark scores are as follows:

- SAT® composite score of 1550 or higher
- ACT® meets benchmark score on 3 of 4 exams (benchmark score varies by subject)
- AP® 3 or higher on any one AP® exam
- IB® 4 or higher on any one IB® exam

⁶Participation Rate equals the number of test-takers in 11th and 12th grade divided by the number of students enrolled in those grades, as a percent.

Sources:

SAT® and AP® statistics derived from data provided by the College Board.

Copyright © 2014 The College Board. www.collegeboard.org

ACT® statistics derived from data provided by ACT, Inc.

Copyright © 2015 ACT, Inc. www.act.org

IB® statistics derived from data provided by the International Baccalaureate Organization.

Copyright © International Baccalaureate Organization 2014

College Entrance and Persistence

	Class of 2013	Class of 2012
	Entrance ⁷	Persistence ⁸
	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Female	76.4	86.0
Male	61.1	87.1
Black or African American	61.0	76.2
Hispanic or Latino	66.7	*
White	71.1	87.9
English Language Learners	*	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	57.3	78.9
Students with Disabilities	51.4	*
District	69.3	86.5
State	72.7	88.5

⁷College entrance refers to the percent of high school graduates from the year who enrolled in college any time during the first year after high school.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse

²Cohort count includes all students in the cohort as of the end of the 2012-13 school year.

³Targets are calculated when there are at least 20 students in a cohort in the base year (i.e., 2010-11).

⁴Targets are not displayed at the state level.

⁸College persistence refers to the percent of students who enrolled in college the first year after high school and returned for a second year (Freshman to Sophomore persistence).

Narratives

School District Improvement Plans and Parental Outreach Activities

Groton Public Schools continues to focus on quality instruction and student achievement, which are inherent in our new district Theory of Action. We continue to use MAP testing as part of our yearly assessment calendar to drive instruction. The MAP test was issued three times this year, and this data point, along with other assessments, allowed teachers to inform their teaching and design classroom practices that were aligned to our new curriculum that emphasizes unit design, multi-modal approaches, and the six facets of literacy: reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting. At the elementary level, teachers worked with a Literacy Coach who would pinpoint Tier 1 practice to case a wide net on student learners. At the middle and high school levels, data teams of teachers discussed student performance, assessment results, and learning styles. In the area of special education, we focused on re-calibrating a true co-teaching model at both the middle and high school levels. Many of our pupil personnel staff attended workshops on progress monitoring to fine tune this particular practice. Elementary teachers continued to zero in on differentiation practices, to attend workshops on differentiation, and to adjust their teaching accordingly. The high school pupil personnel staff spent a great deal of time focusing on transition planning from middle school to high school and from high school to future endeavors. We continue with our PBIS implementation at various schools throughout the district. Our district data team revised our district improvement plan. Each individual school, and thus each individual school data team and SIT team, revised their own school improvement plan which was aligned to the district improvement plan. We have several district committees to cultivate greater systemic coherence. To that end, our district safe school climate and wellness committees assisted the district with positive school climate. We have been successful with hosting a series of "Parent Information Nights" at each individual school during the early evening hours to further promote community outreach and parental involvement. In addition to the conventional open house nights, our school system frequently hosted such events as "news and views of the principal", a monthly book discussion series, and special content driven events such as "math nights" at our elementary schools, and IB and AP informational sessions at the middle and high schools. The district provided training to prepare students for the SBAC Field Tests.

Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic and Economic Isolation

The Groton Public School System continues to make a concerted effort to ensure that our students receive an educational experience which enables them to interact with teachers and students from diverse racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds.

During the 2013-14 school year, teachers from one of our most socio-economically challenged elementary schools, along with staff from our high school, received extensive professional development training from The National Urban Alliance. The National Urban Alliance training presents educators with specific instructional strategies that are anchored in cognitive research and that also promote positive classroom environments to cast a wide net on different learners. Our students benefited from engaging, rigorous instruction that is anchored in cognitive brain research and that promotes a positive classroom environment.

At one of our middle schools which is predominately free and reduced lunch, we implemented an iPad initative in the sixth grade which allowed for each student to have available for his/her classroom and home use an individual iPad. The majority of these students would not normally have access to such a technology device.

Other opportunities to offer enriching and diverse experience for our student population included student trips to the Mystic Seaport, the Mystic Aquarium, Project Oceanology, and the Eastern Connecticut Symphony Orchestra, to name a few, as well as our continued partnering with the U.S. Naval Submarine Base and use of its resources.

0590011 - Groton School District

Equitable Allocation of Resources among District Schools

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