

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

STEPHEN C. CULLINAN, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 896-2300

Location: 47 Main Street
Ellington,
Connecticut

Website: www.ellingtonschools.org

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: Tolland | Per Capita Income in 2000: \$27,766 |
| Town Population in 2000: 12,921 | Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.3% |
| 1990-2000 Population Growth: 15.4% | Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.5% |
| Number of Public Schools: 6 | 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): C 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 2,598
5-Year Enrollment Change 10.5%

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 | 122 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 28.7 |
| K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English | 23 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 5.4 |
| Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented* | 37 | 1.4 | 3.8 | 4.0 |
| PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District | 257 | 9.9 | 11.0 | 11.4 |
| Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart | 124 | 68.9 | 87.9 | 79.2 |
| Homeless | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week | 107 | 31.0 | 21.6 | 20.2 |

*70.3% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

| Student Race/Ethnicity | | |
|------------------------|--------|---------|
| Race/Ethnicity | Number | Percent |
| American Indian | 9 | 0.3 |
| Asian American | 72 | 2.8 |
| Black | 76 | 2.9 |
| Hispanic | 47 | 1.8 |
| White | 2,394 | 92.1 |
| Total Minority | 204 | 7.9 |

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.7%

Open Choice: 10 students attended this district as part of the Open Choice program. Open Choice brings students from urban areas to attend school in suburban or rural towns, and students from non-urban areas to attend city schools.

Non-English Home Language: 2.0% 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 18.

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.

Reducing racial, ethnic and economic isolation continues to be a challenge for the Ellington Public Schools due to its demographics. Ellington had ten (10) students enrolled in its schools through the Hartford Open Choice Program. Due to the size and configuration of our schools enrollment opportunities are limited. The district plans to expand this number to seventeen (17) in 2008-2009. In addition, some Ellington students do participate in magnet school programs such as the Connecticut International Baccalaureate Program, the Greater Hartford Academy of the Performing Arts, the Greater Hartford Academy of Math & Science, and the Great Paths program. Ellington High School did sponsor a foreign exchange student from Yemen for the entire school year and continued its Sister School Program through the CREC Pupil Partners grant.

Ellington students do participate in a variety of locally funded programs to increase awareness of the diversity of individuals and cultures. Ellington Middle School students participated in an Adopt a Student from Guatemala through Project Common Hope. The high school students participated in the Day of Silence which recognized world injustices. A highlight of the intermediate school curriculum is culminated in Immigration Day. The middle school students continue with a most impressive and important program by visiting nursing homes. Among the other varied activities that Ellington students participated in were: Exploring Diverse Cultures Workshop, African Dance Program, Pequot Museum field trip, Kids' Character Education, Use Another Word, Responsive Classroom, Making Diversity Count, Teaching Children to Care, Anti-Bullying program, Character and Respect assembly, Camp Jewel, PAWS, Civil war encampment and grade four pen pals. Support for a number of these programs comes from our PTOs.

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 | 64.2 | 52.0 | 58.3 |
| Writing | 77.2 | 63.4 | 69.3 |
| Mathematics | 79.2 | 60.0 | 80.4 |
| Grade 4 Reading | 71.1 | 55.9 | 70.3 |
| Writing | 84.0 | 62.9 | 88.7 |
| Mathematics | 78.0 | 60.3 | 77.4 |
| Grade 5 Reading | 80.0 | 62.2 | 77.2 |
| Writing | 83.4 | 64.5 | 84.0 |
| Mathematics | 80.5 | 65.9 | 69.1 |
| Science | 84.4 | 54.9 | 92.6 |
| Grade 6 Reading | 77.5 | 66.3 | 60.7 |
| Writing | 66.0 | 61.9 | 46.4 |
| Mathematics | 84.9 | 66.4 | 79.2 |
| Grade 7 Reading | 86.2 | 71.1 | 74.2 |
| Writing | 73.5 | 62.0 | 60.6 |
| Mathematics | 84.7 | 63.0 | 85.2 |
| Grade 8 Reading | 74.9 | 64.8 | 54.7 |
| Writing | 84.2 | 63.4 | 81.8 |
| Mathematics | 78.2 | 60.8 | 71.7 |
| Science | 77.3 | 58.6 | 68.6 |

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 | 73.8 | 45.5 | 86.9 |
| Writing Across the Disciplines | 77.4 | 57.9 | 74.6 |
| Mathematics | 74.1 | 50.1 | 82.3 |
| Science | 68.6 | 46.3 | 76.2 |

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 |
|--|----------|-------|---|
| | 44.5 | 36.1 | 72.7 |

| SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007 | | District | State | % of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores |
|---|------------------|----------|-------|--|
| % of Graduates Tested | | 85.3 | 77.6 | |
| Average Score | Mathematics | 529 | 504 | 71.5 |
| | Critical Reading | 512 | 502 | 60.0 |
| | Writing | 508 | 503 | 53.8 |

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 | 98.0 | 92.6 | 70.8 |
| Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007 | 1.9 | 6.2 | 69.9 |
| 2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 77.0 |

| Activities of Graduates | District | State |
|--|----------|-------|
| % Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs) | 87.3 | 83.4 |
| % Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services) | 9.3 | 12.3 |

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

| Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff | |
|---|--------|
| General Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 154.30 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants | 10.55 |
| Special Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 22.60 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants | 39.95 |
| Library/Media Specialists and Assistants | 7.40 |
| Staff Devoted to Adult Education | 0.00 |
| Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs | |
| District Central Office | 4.00 |
| School Level | 6.40 |
| Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists) | 7.20 |
| Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists | 12.10 |
| School Nurses | 5.00 |
| Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support | 109.81 |

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 | 15.4 | 14.3 | 13.6 |
| % with Master's Degree or Above | 76.4 | 75.5 | 75.6 |

| Average Class Size | District | DRG | State |
|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| Grade K | 20.0 | 17.1 | 18.1 |
| Grade 2 | 21.2 | 18.6 | 19.3 |
| Grade 5 | 26.1 | 20.4 | 20.9 |
| Grade 7 | 19.4 | 19.9 | 20.5 |
| High School | 18.5 | 17.8 | 18.6 |

| Hours of Instruction Per Year* | Dist | DRG | State |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Elementary School | 992 | 993 | 987 |
| Middle School | 1,048 | 1,032 | 1,017 |
| High School | 1,022 | 1,021 | 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* | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.4 |
| Middle School | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| High School | 3.1 | 2.2 | 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 | \$16,610 | \$6,552 | \$7,153 | \$6,737 | \$7,159 |
| Instructional Supplies and Equipment | \$505 | \$199 | \$262 | \$287 | \$266 |
| Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services | \$673 | \$266 | \$443 | \$395 | \$429 |
| Student Support Services | \$1,148 | \$453 | \$764 | \$713 | \$761 |
| Administration and Support Services | \$2,130 | \$840 | \$1,256 | \$1,267 | \$1,271 |
| Plant Operation and Maintenance | \$2,861 | \$1,129 | \$1,329 | \$1,295 | \$1,322 |
| Transportation | \$1,477 | \$583 | \$605 | \$605 | \$601 |
| Costs for Students Tuitioned Out | \$753 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other | \$317 | \$125 | \$147 | \$130 | \$145 |
| Total | \$26,475 | \$10,419 | \$12,203 | \$11,824 | \$12,151 |
| Additional Expenditures | | | | | |
| Land, Buildings, and Debt Service | \$2,219 | \$875 | \$1,875 | \$1,979 | \$1,882 |

| Special Education Expenditures | |
|--|-------------|
| Total Expenditures | \$5,122,827 |
| Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education | 19.3% |

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 | 66.7 | 31.1 | 1.9 | 0.2 |
| Excluding School Construction | 65.0 | 32.6 | 2.1 | 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 budget process for the 2007-2008 school year was most successful in making restorations across all schools in library/media resources, equipment, as well as student activities and athletics. All three areas had been reduced in the previous budget and thus approximately \$120,000 was restored to these areas positively benefiting all schools in the district. A few important staff positions were also restored. Among the restorations was a social studies position at Ellington Middle School and a part-time K-8 Language Arts Coordinator. The 2007-2008 budget also included an additional guidance counselor, part-time social studies and technology education positions at the high school. Increased funds for curriculum writing and professional development at all grade levels were also included. The district closely monitors class size so as to maintain an equitable allocation across the district. Appropriate staffing levels have always been a prime focus for the district and the needs of each individual school are thoroughly analyzed and considered. In addition, each school develops and maintains a list of students in need of support or intervention and lists the corresponding support provided. This process focuses the administration and staff to appropriately prioritize available resources based upon student need. Prioritization of budget requests and any subsequent reductions are made by building principals for their respective schools.

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 | 9.8% |

| 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 | 12 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Learning Disability | 117 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.0 |
| Intellectual Disability | 6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Emotional Disturbance | 25 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| Speech Impairment | 41 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Other Health Impairment* | 24 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| Other Disabilities** | 29 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Total | 254 | 9.8 | 10.7 | 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 | 84.6 | 77.2 |
| 2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21 | 1.3 | 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 | 29.4 | 20.4 | 75.6 | 62.1 |
| | Writing | 29.4 | 19.3 | 78.1 | 63.0 |
| | Mathematics | 35.0 | 22.6 | 80.9 | 62.7 |
| | Science | 40.0 | 22.2 | 80.9 | 56.8 |
| CAPT | Reading Across the Disciplines | N/A | N/A | 73.8 | 45.5 |
| | Writing Across the Disciplines | N/A | N/A | 77.4 | 57.9 |
| | Mathematics | N/A | N/A | 74.1 | 50.1 |
| | Science | N/A | N/A | 68.6 | 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 | 19.8 |
| | % With Accommodations | 80.2 |
| CAPT | % Without Accommodations | 20.0 |
| | % With Accommodations | 80.0 |
| % Assessed Using Skills Checklist | | 9.9 |

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 | 15 | 5.9 |

| 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 | 151 | 59.4 | 71.7 | 71.6 |
| 40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time | 79 | 31.1 | 21.8 | 16.6 |
| 0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time | 24 | 9.4 | 6.5 | 11.8 |

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

For the second consecutive year, the Ellington Public Schools continued with its ambitious and highly focused process to address improved student achievement through the development of both district and school instructional plans. In August, the administrative team again analyzed school and district student achievement results to develop district goals in 1) reading, 2) mathematics, and 3) community involvement. Each district and school goal is supported by multiple actions, strategies, and interventions with corresponding timelines, means of evaluation and person or persons responsible.

School goals are aligned with the District Instructional Plan and at least one professional growth objective for each administrator and teacher is aligned to the school focus goals. Each school now produces a monthly instructional report that provides detailed information on the 1) status of initiatives, 2) next steps, and 3) recognitions. The superintendent produces a similar report each month for the entire district that is presented to the Board of Education and is published on the district website. The recognitions section contains information of excellent work completed by students, staff and parents.

The plans are grounded in the research of Douglas Reeves and have been supported by significant professional development activities. This year, an additional 75 certified staff members were trained in the Center for Learning and Leading module, Data Driven Decision Making/Data Teams. This training was completed by district staff that have been certified as trainers. For the first time, the district was able to provide common planning time for all staff, either by grade level, or by department, so as to be able to implement the Data Driven Decision Making/Data Team model. For the second consecutive June, 31 Ellington educators attended a four-day workshop sponsored by the Teachers College Reading & Writing Project. A number of staff members also attended workshops on Common Formative Assessments and the results of this professional development are starting to be seen in classrooms. The district also provided training to teachers in grade 1-6 in First Steps Mathematics.

Significant focus was given to the achievement of special education students as well as all students performing below expectation in reading and mathematics. Special workshops relating to CMT and CAPT skills were presented to special educators. Study groups of special educators to support our initiatives were formed at each building. The process of reviewing IEPs to ensure that objectives were aligned with CMT/CAPT objectives continued.

The district as well as each school had one of their three goals focused upon community involvement. The superintendent continued to meet monthly with officers of all school PTO's. One major focus was to develop ways in which the central office can support the works of parents as well as PTO members. At the request of this group, the district has made a concerted effort to expand its use of e-mails to convey important information. The use of the district website to publish pertinent information for parents continued. This included publication of the Superintendent's Monthly Report as well as all documents related to the development of the budget. The Director of Educational Services, along with our mathematics coordinator, developed and presented parent workshops to assist parents in supporting their student(s). The district organized and hosted four literacy workshops for parents of preschool students and preschool providers. The district collaborated with the local library staff to provide dinner and child care so that parents could attend these workshops. This initiative was well received and highly praised by all participants who requested that further workshops be planned and presented by the district. Ellington Middle School initiated a Family Book Club and a literacy workshop for parents of grade one students was also provided.
