

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**Griswold School District**

ELIZABETH M. OSGA, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 376-7600

Location: 267 Slater Avenue
Griswold,
Connecticut

Website: griswold.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: \$21,196
Town Population in 2000: 10,807	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 17.3%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 4.1%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.2%
Number of Public Schools: 3	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 96.3%

*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, 2007 2,137
5-Year Enrollment Change -2.2%

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	546	25.5	20.0	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	17	0.8	1.9	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	62	2.9	2.5	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	262	12.3	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	111	82.8	78.3	79.2
Homeless	6	0.3	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	64	20.6	22.7	20.2

*33.9% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	33	1.5
Asian American	37	1.7
Black	47	2.2
Hispanic	59	2.8
White	1,961	91.8
Total Minority	176	8.2

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 0.5%

Non-English Home Language: 2.3% 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 14.

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 geographical location of Griswold poses some limits on program opportunities for reducing racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Students have participated in various options through EASTCONN as well as regionally arranged activities in music, drama, and athletics. Student enrollment in the Virtual High School increased this year. Efforts to bring more diversity into our staff are challenging. We feel fortunate to have at least some ethnic diversity on our administrative staff and in our support staff.

There is growing diversity within the schools and community. The casinos have attracted many new families with a variety of first languages and international cultures. The valuing and welcoming of these families has helped to bring comfort to their transition and positive influence to the rest of our community.

Meanwhile, each school continues to integrate multi-cultural strands into its curriculum. Teachers are sensitive and aware of the importance of using daily curriculum to promote broadening understandings. Students experience a seamless approach to racial, ethnic and economic diversity.

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	43.8	52.0	18.4
Writing	56.9	63.4	18.4
Mathematics	54.0	60.0	20.2
Grade 4 Reading	49.6	55.9	24.7
Writing	59.5	62.9	25.8
Mathematics	53.4	60.3	26.4
Grade 5 Reading	65.4	62.2	38.9
Writing	72.4	64.5	52.5
Mathematics	60.3	65.9	23.5
Science	66.7	54.9	51.9
Grade 6 Reading	62.7	66.3	22.0
Writing	52.6	61.9	19.6
Mathematics	54.7	66.4	16.1
Grade 7 Reading	73.0	71.1	33.5
Writing	52.7	62.0	18.1
Mathematics	62.5	63.0	32.9
Grade 8 Reading	62.4	64.8	30.2
Writing	61.2	63.4	30.8
Mathematics	66.1	60.8	40.9
Science	61.6	58.6	36.5

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 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	33.2	45.5	23.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	49.2	57.9	24.6
Mathematics	50.5	50.1	36.2
Science	39.0	46.3	31.5

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
	27.2	36.1	19.8

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		72.4	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	499	504	39.2
	Critical Reading	488	502	30.0
	Writing	498	503	38.5

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 2007	87.9	92.6	12.3
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	11.0	6.2	10.5
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	2.7	1.7	11.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	74.1	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	25.9	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	133.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	9.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	25.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	32.00
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	5.25
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	5.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	13.50
School Nurses	3.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	117.15

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	16.2	13.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	68.3	71.0	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.9	16.0	18.1
Grade 2	20.4	17.8	19.3
Grade 5	21.0	19.7	20.9
Grade 7	23.2	19.7	20.5
High School	16.7	18.8	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	966	996	987
Middle School	1,001	1,025	1,017
High School	1,013	1,004	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*	4.2	3.8	3.4
Middle School	1.8	2.9	2.7
High School	2.0	2.7	2.7

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2006-07

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	\$13,084	\$5,907	\$7,153	\$6,567	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$971	\$438	\$262	\$282	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$362	\$164	\$443	\$246	\$429
Student Support Services	\$861	\$389	\$764	\$662	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$2,960	\$1,336	\$1,256	\$1,231	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,794	\$1,262	\$1,329	\$1,282	\$1,322
Transportation	\$1,467	\$691	\$605	\$632	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$626	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$585	\$264	\$147	\$166	\$145
Total	\$23,711	\$10,652	\$12,203	\$11,296	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,000	\$903	\$1,875	\$2,587	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$5,360,178
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	22.6%

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	41.9	45.7	3.4	9.1
Excluding School Construction	42.4	44.2	3.6	9.8

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 budget development and management processes in the Griswold Public Schools help to ensure that there is an equitable allocation of resources among district schools. Any identifiable inequities that have emerged naturally in the system are addressed and corrections outlined. An annual staffing proposal is developed by administration and approved by the Board of Education. It includes adjustments based on enrollment or special needs.

It is recognized that program costs do vary from level to level. However, given that the district has only one school at each level, there are no horizontal inequities.

Perhaps the most challenging areas for us in resource distribution are space and staff. A \$70 million dollar building project was approved in June 2007. The project is slated to get underway during the summer of 2008. When completed, we will approach an even higher level of access and equity for all Griswold students.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	238
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	8	0.4	0.6	0.7
Learning Disability	84	4.5	3.8	4.0
Intellectual Disability	6	0.3	0.5	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	32	1.7	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	52	2.8	2.3	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	46	2.4	2.0	2.1
Other Disabilities**	10	0.5	0.8	0.9
Total	238	12.7	11.2	11.5

*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 2006-07 with a Standard Diploma	83.3	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	6.4	2.8

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	13.4	20.4	59.8	62.1
	Writing	14.4	19.3	59.1	63.0
	Mathematics	18.6	22.6	58.8	62.7
	Science	24.3	22.2	63.8	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	4.3	11.4	33.2	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	20.8	16.3	49.2	57.9
	Mathematics	8.7	14.7	50.5	50.1
	Science	4.2	14.4	39.0	46.3

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	17.3
	% With Accommodations	82.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	14.3
	% With Accommodations	85.7
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.1

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	0.4
Private Schools or Other Settings	12	5.0

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	175	73.5	70.9	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	41	17.2	18.2	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	22	9.2	10.9	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Board of Education annually adopts goals for the improvement of its programs and operations. The process includes a review of previous goals and progress with an eye toward identifying the next level of work. The administrative staff produces the initial goal draft. This draft is then shared with focus groups of parents and teachers. Once their input has been factored into the process, the Board of Education reviews, modifies, and adopts a set of goals. These are widely distributed through web access and in newsletters. Detailed action plans are developed during the summer and shared with all administrators during summer workshops. Aligned staff development activities are planned.

Major goal areas for 2008-09 will be in school construction, improvement of achievement through better analysis and use of data; increased efficiencies in resource use; NEASC accreditation; expanded parent communication; and policy development.

Data on special education programs that is gathered from state reports and from campus walk throughs is reviewed periodically. Progress checks against indicators are regularly accomplished and help to direct resource allocation and adjustment.
