

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

FRANCIS A. BARAN, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 928-7453

Location: 147 Route 169
Woodstock,
Connecticut

Website: www.woodstockschoools.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: \$25,331
Town Population in 2000: 7,221	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.4%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 20.2%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.6%
Number of Public Schools: 2	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 96.1%

*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): E 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 926
5-Year Enrollment Change -4.1%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range PK- 8

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	101	10.9	11.1	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	11	1.2	0.6	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	112	12.1	3.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	84	9.1	11.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	80	90.9	85.5	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*94.6% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	10	1.1
Asian American	19	2.1
Black	7	0.8
Hispanic	33	3.6
White	857	92.5
Total Minority	69	7.5

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 10.

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.

A number of our efforts involve exposing our students to diverse geographical areas, as well as to students from a variety of cultural, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. To that end, some of our most effective activities in 2008-2009 included: During the 2008-2009 we continued our International Week, a program we have done now for five consecutive years. This year however, we did it in a different way, focusing on just one country school-wide: China. A website was built with resources and links for teachers to access to help them extend the learning in their classrooms. Specialists incorporated many of these ideas into their lessons in the weeks leading up to and during this week. Many classroom teachers did as well. For example, in some fourth grade classrooms, students did China research projects, and in first grade tai chi was taught as part of their "music and movement" themes that they focus on each Friday. The Enrichment Teacher, and the School Counselor set up a classroom as our VISIT CHINA area and made the room center-based with over twelve activities and displays for students and adults to rotate through. These included tangrams, using an abacus, eating rice with chopsticks, identifying Chinese games and inventions, brush writing of Chinese characters, using shadow puppets, and playing ping-pong. Community volunteers, including a Chinese exchange teacher from our local high school, came in and helped run these activities. All Woodstock Middle School students participated in a series of tolerance activities during the year. During the 08-09 school year WMS implemented the second year of a character education initiative. Basic good character traits such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship were emphasized throughout the year in classrooms and assemblies. During the summer of 09 a committee developed a plan to expand the two year old character initiative. In 08-09 activities again included tolerance education activities such as Mix-it-Up lunches where students sat with different groups of peers while they were engaged in guided discussions along with various sensitivity activities that could easily be transferred to diversity situations. As part of the social studies curriculum, every sixth grade student is required to do an in-depth research project and display on a foreign country. This culminates in an annual fair open to the school and the community. In eighth grade, all students take Spanish as part of their core course of study. Besides being exposed to the language, emphasis is also placed on many aspects of the cultures of Spain and Latin America. Every year, the fifth grade goes on a tour of the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and the eighth grade takes a five day trip to Washington, D.C. In the past three years WMS has collaborated with a local camp and a nearby private high school to immerse students into personal growth activities that challenge them to work together, reflect on their actions and be caring to those around them. Emphasis is often placed on the differences in people in the related activities. In the spring of 09 grade seven and eight students participated in a one day presentation along with related activities on the topic of bullying and acceptance of the differences in others.

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	64.5	54.6	56.6
Writing	57.3	62.5	24.5
Mathematics	70.2	62.8	50.3
Grade 4 Reading	61.0	60.7	33.7
Writing	64.7	64.2	37.0
Mathematics	63.1	63.6	34.1
Grade 5 Reading	76.4	66.0	61.5
Writing	67.4	66.5	36.4
Mathematics	76.4	68.8	53.7
Science	82.8	58.1	87.0
Grade 6 Reading	84.8	68.9	71.8
Writing	56.2	62.2	26.4
Mathematics	75.8	68.8	47.9
Grade 7 Reading	87.6	74.9	73.9
Writing	79.4	62.9	79.6
Mathematics	85.6	66.0	84.7
Grade 8 Reading	83.3	68.4	69.7
Writing	77.8	66.5	58.7
Mathematics	75.9	64.5	54.2
Science	77.8	60.6	69.7

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
	31.2	36.2	33.2

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		N/A	N/A	
Average Score	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Critical Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	N/A	N/A	N/A

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	N/A	N/A
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	N/A	N/A

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	56.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	19.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	5.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	34.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	2.60
School Level	3.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	1.40
School Nurses	2.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	37.07

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	15.9	14.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	85.2	77.2	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.6	15.8	18.3
Grade 2	16.7	17.5	19.3
Grade 5	21.3	19.6	21.0
Grade 7	19.8	19.5	20.5
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	992	993	988
Middle School	991	1,010	1,016
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*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*	3.0	2.7	3.3
Middle School	2.0	2.1	2.6
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*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	Elementary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$6,174	\$6,540	\$7,411	\$7,032	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$362	\$383	\$332	\$303	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$159	\$168	\$232	\$409	\$446
Student Support Services	\$635	\$673	\$796	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$808	\$856	\$1,508	\$1,365	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,035	\$1,096	\$1,249	\$1,339	\$1,377
Transportation	\$974	\$660	\$610	\$671	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$431	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$20	\$21	\$87	\$158	\$151
Total*	\$10,597	\$11,039	\$12,897	\$12,486	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$955	\$1,012	\$1,185	\$1,677	\$1,759

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$15,516; Tuition Costs, \$5,349.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$10,888.

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$2,601,177	16.8	19.0	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	61.0	35.8	2.8	0.4
Excluding School Construction	61.2	35.4	3.0	0.4

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 essence of the budget development process in Woodstock is the equitable distribution of the available resources. The foundation budget is developed each year through the collaboration of the Superintendent, the two principals, the director of special education, and the district curriculum coordinators. Department heads also present a list of needs/priorities for discussion and review. District priorities are set at that time according to the instructional, programmatic, and physical needs of the district as determined by staff discussions at each school. School board discussions also determine key priorities of the district. Following School Board discussion is a thorough review of the budget at public meetings of the Woodstock Board of Finance. Finally, the budget is presented at a public forum of the Town Meeting. One of the first budget allocations is an equal allowance per student system wide for general supplies; then, funds are allocated for various programs, including texts, equipment, and other resources. This is accomplished through a yearly needs assessment process which takes place at each school. As a result of these multiple levels of communication from various constituencies, yearly and long term priorities and needs are identified and discussed at length. Since there is a constant discussion and budget collaboration among the Superintendent, both principals, the director of special education, and the district curriculum coordinators available funds are directed to the areas of greatest need. These areas may change yearly depending upon our student population.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	115
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	8.3%

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	14	1.0	0.8	0.8
Learning Disability	53	3.8	3.7	3.9
Intellectual Disability	7	0.5	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	2	0.1	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	28	2.0	2.9	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	9	0.6	1.8	2.1
Other Disabilities**	2	0.1	0.7	0.9
Total	115	8.3	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	45.9	30.2	77.3	65.7
	Writing	27.1	19.5	66.8	64.1
	Mathematics	37.2	30.7	74.8	65.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	80.1	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		15.8

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	4	3.5
Private Schools or Other Settings	9	7.8

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	69	60.0	75.5	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	37	32.2	18.1	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	9	7.8	6.4	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Since the 2005-2006 school year we have published and placed on the district web site a school district improvement plan. The basis for this plan has been an analysis of the Connecticut Mastery Test scores from both our elementary and middle schools. The disaggregated data garnered from this analysis are used to establish improvement targets across each of the grade levels tested in mathematics, reading and writing. The improvement target goals are shared, by the curriculum content coordinators, with the grade level teachers, who refine the goals and design classroom activities and strategies designed to focus instruction in the areas identified by the data analysis. At the end of the school year teachers, using curriculum standards based information, meet in grade level teams and across grade levels to identify and discuss curricular areas in need of strengthening for the upcoming school year. The district offers full day kindergarten as an option for all parents, with kindergarten age children. We employ, at the middle school, a remedial mathematics tutor position to assist those students identified as performing below proficiency on the Connecticut Mastery Test. Prior to the opening of school our special education staff meets with each grade level team to go over the Individual Education Plans (IEP's) for each student in their case load for the purpose of identifying strategies to best assist these students to meet with academic success. During the 07-08 School Year we initiated a "Kindergarten Improvement Plan" (KIP) which focused on intensive reading instruction for all Kindergarten students. We are engaged in a process to insure that classroom lessons are driven by the standards identified in the Connecticut Frameworks for each curriculum area. Teachers at all grade levels are tasked with identifying, in their daily lesson plans, those standards from the district curriculum guides and the Connecticut Frameworks which are the focus for each lesson. At the end of the school year, teachers at the various grade levels and across grade levels, meet to identify those standards which need greater focus in the upcoming school year.
