

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10**East Hampton School District**

JUDITH A. GOLDEN, Superintendent

Location: 94 Main Street

Telephone: (860) 365-4000

East Hampton,
ConnecticutWebsite: www.easthamptonps.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: Middlesex

Town Population in 2000: 13,352

1990-2000 Population Growth: 28%

Number of Public Schools: 4

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$22,769

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.5%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 95.7%

*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): D 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, 2009 2,026
5-Year Enrollment Change -4.3%

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	185	9.1	13.4	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	11	0.6	2.3	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.8	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	164	8.1	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	135	88.8	85.6	80.5
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	58	20.9	15.5	13.6

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	2	0.1
Asian American	45	2.2
Black	32	1.6
Hispanic	62	3.1
White	1,885	93.0
Total Minority	141	7.0

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.7%

Non-English Home Language:

2.1% 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.

Over the last ten years, the East Hampton Public School System has developed partnerships with communities of greater racial, ethnic, and economic diversity. This past year, each of the four schools in East Hampton expanded opportunities for students and staff to interact with a more diverse population. Memorial Elementary School focused on acknowledging and respecting the many varying backgrounds of American people and the world. The Responsive Classroom (RC) program helped Memorial Elementary School to start each morning recognizing and celebrating the diversity in the classroom, school, community and country. Teachers taught units that emphasize different cultures. Classes developed partnerships with different schools in Connecticut, Florida, Haiti and Iraq. Center Elementary School and Wintergreen Inter-district Magnet School in Hamden have collaborated to bring students from diverse backgrounds together for twelve years. This year the exchange involved the fourth grade band members. Students from Wintergreen traveled to Center Elementary School, spending time within fourth grade classrooms and pairing up with fourth grade band members. Students prepared ahead for each event by learning musical selections, providing them with a base on which to begin their dialogue and interactions. They joined in a variety of getting-to-know you activities, and had time to practice their musical selections together. Students made new friends and connections through music. East Hampton Middle School students and staff make use of every available opportunity to develop and participate in activities that will generate a greater appreciation of and positive attitude toward other racial and ethnic groups. A two-week Inter-district Magnet Summer School program continues to draw a large number of the students as well as students from surrounding towns and cities. A number of students participate throughout the year in a mathematics and technology academy with students from a number of area towns. East Hampton High School participates in programs that enable the students to interact with diverse populations. Two of the students attended The Greater Hartford Academy of Arts, an inter-district magnet school. Fourteen students attend various magnet schools in the Hartford area. Students attended various programs including Boys' and Girls' State, Model United Nations, Connecticut Youth Forums, the Hugh O'Brien Leadership Conference and the Middlesex Consortium Diversity Conference. In living the mission of EHHS, the school undertook projects to provide relief for Haiti hurricane relief. The French club continues to raise funds for the Root of Development organization to purchase goats for people in Haiti. Over 100 students participated in the Interact Club, a community service organization and 20 students attended the Diversity Conference sponsored by the Middlesex Consortium.

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.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	65.5	57.0	50.9
Writing	68.7	58.3	62.6
Mathematics	76.6	62.4	69.9
Grade 4 Reading	69.3	59.9	54.7
Writing	73.8	63.6	54.4
Mathematics	72.4	67.0	44.7
Grade 5 Reading	73.9	61.8	61.8
Writing	79.0	68.2	60.2
Mathematics	85.4	72.4	69.3
Science	75.8	59.4	63.3
Grade 6 Reading	86.0	74.9	64.4
Writing	74.7	65.9	54.3
Mathematics	85.0	70.7	66.9
Grade 7 Reading	90.2	77.4	71.4
Writing	81.0	61.2	79.2
Mathematics	79.5	68.5	59.1
Grade 8 Reading	83.7	73.3	61.1
Writing	77.1	62.6	68.8
Mathematics	81.2	67.3	67.5
Science	81.7	62.8	75.2

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 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	59.5	45.9	66.7
Writing Across the Disciplines	74.2	59.6	66.2
Mathematics	59.9	48.7	57.6
Science	58.3	45.3	65.2

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
	50.2	50.7	47.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		71.5	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	507	508	45.7
	Critical Reading	510	503	48.8
	Writing	513	506	48.1

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	98.1	91.3	79.2
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.3	3.0	89.7

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	93.4	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	6.0	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	124.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	12.91
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	22.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	46.95
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.60
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	6.30
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	11.00
School Nurses	5.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	98.60

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	16.0	14.4	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	84.2	77.1	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.0	17.2	18.5
Grade 2	19.8	18.9	19.7
Grade 5	21.1	20.9	21.1
Grade 7	22.6	20.3	20.8
High School	19.9	19.6	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,004	985	992
Middle School	1,002	1,025	1,018
High School	999	1,000	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*	5.6	3.5	3.2
Middle School	3.3	2.8	2.5
High School	2.9	2.8	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	\$15,619	\$7,601	\$7,819	\$7,408	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$483	\$235	\$274	\$280	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$693	\$337	\$474	\$389	\$459
Student Support Services	\$1,705	\$829	\$863	\$800	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$2,664	\$1,296	\$1,405	\$1,309	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,065	\$1,491	\$1,469	\$1,377	\$1,462
Transportation	\$1,470	\$677	\$701	\$641	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$879	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$19	\$9	\$163	\$169	\$162
Total	\$26,597	\$12,793	\$13,458	\$12,685	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,534	\$747	\$1,864	\$1,136	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,211,551	23.4	20.9	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	65.0	33.0	1.9	0.1
Excluding School Construction	65.4	32.5	2.0	0.1

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 Board of Education policy regarding the setting of budget priorities states that the administration should give special consideration when developing the budget and distributing the financial resources therein to: 1. Staff, instructional supplies and equipment for current programs 2. Maintenance of current facilities 3. Equipment and supplies to improve current programs, and 4. Efficient use of staff without causing any employees to lose their jobs. Each year, emphasis is also placed on staff and student priorities which change from year to year such as: fluctuations in the student population between buildings necessitating additional staff, supplies and equipment; textbook adoptions, and funding to meet re-accreditation standards and special education student needs. Staff members conduct an annual needs assessment process to determine the overall need of each school. Based on this assessment, resources are allocated to particular schools to ensure equity and address needs. Funding provided by the budget allowed the district to support an at home summer program for students with support for their parents with take home materials and on site support as needed. Professional development in the teaching of reading and curriculum writing took place in the summer and were supported by Consolidated Education grant funds and the Board of Education budget.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	164
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	8.2%

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	23	1.1	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	46	2.3	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	5	0.2	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	13	0.6	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	40	2.0	2.4	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	27	1.3	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	10	0.5	0.9	0.9
Total	164	8.2	11.4	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	92.3	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	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 Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	34.1	31.6	78.6	67.5
	Writing	20.0	19.6	75.9	63.3
	Mathematics	30.8	32.9	80.4	68.1
	Science	42.9	23.7	78.7	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	59.5	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	74.2	59.6
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	59.9	48.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	58.3	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	24.4
	% With Accommodations	75.6
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	41.7
	% With Accommodations	58.3
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.2

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	0.6
Private Schools or Other Settings	11	6.7

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	111	67.7	76.7	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	40	24.4	13.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	13	7.9	9.5	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The major focus at Memorial Elementary School (MES) continued to be reading. Data Teams enabled teachers to provide students an intervention that addressed specific skills. There was over a 9% increase in students meeting goal in reading over 2009 CMT scores and almost 5% increase in reaching the math goal. Teachers continuously assessed students throughout the year and made sure the students were being taught on their instructional level in a guided reading group. Additional reading and writing services were provided by classroom teachers and our support staff for any student needing intervention. Over 95% of third grade students reached proficiency or better in math. Kindergarten teachers and the language art department received ongoing professional development from LiteracyHow in an effort to improve reading instruction and student learning. Center Elementary School staff has worked to improve reading instruction through the implementation of the reader's workshop. Teachers assess students on a regular basis and students are taught on their instructional level in guided reading groups. Students are taught reading within the classroom with additional services provided by our support staff including reading and special education teachers. Professional development for teachers included working with a reading consultant throughout the year to develop strategies for best practice. Work with a reading consultant will continue next year on best practices within the reader's workshop. In mathematics, efforts were placed on aligning Everyday Math to the 4th generation CMT. This year, focused attention in grade 4 will be on four math strands identified on the CMT as needing improvement. These strands will be targeted through the development of specific daily oral math activities and continued emphasis on alignment of Everyday Math to the CMT. East Hampton Middle School has continued its emphasis on improving our reading program. This year we implemented a block schedule format that provided the time periods necessary for implementing a reader's workshop model in the sixth grade and allowing for more in-depth reading instruction in the seventh and eighth grade. We added supplemental reading classes at all grade levels for students requiring that level of support and employed an improved progress monitoring system to provide the data to drive instruction for those students. We continued our focus on teaching content literacy and the implementation of reading activities across curricular areas. In addition to improving our general instruction, we identified reading strand areas on the CMT where we were in need of improvement and focused instruction in those areas. In the area of mathematics we continued to rework questions in our Daily Oral Math program to consistently align with the Fourth Generation CMT. The middle school was in the third year of being a school in need of improvement. This year, not only did the school reach safe harbor but because of the many interventions had significant improvement in the achievement of all students. The 2009-2010 high school improvement plan was centered around collecting, organizing, analyzing, and reporting on data from a variety of performance measures including formative assessments ("snapshots"), common, summative assessments, and CAPT, PSAT, SAT, and AP assessments. To promote a broad faculty participation and investment in the process, all teachers served on one of four school improvement committees directly related to the school improvement plan in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and climate. Their work directly informed the school administration on decisions of professional development and allocation of resources. The objective of our work was to demonstrate consistency and equity for all students across multiple objective measures of achievement. This information was used to investigate the relationship between the objective measures of student achievement and high academic standards and student ability. AP examination results showed 20 students who achieved awards for high scores and participation rates were up. The number of students at goal in reading and writing also increased significantly on the CAPT assessment.
