STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12

Groton School District

PAUL J. KADRI, Superintendent Location: 1300 Flanders Road

Telephone: (860) 572-2110 Mystic,
Connecticut

Website: www.groton.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: \$23,995

Town Population in 2000: 39,907
1990-2000 Population Growth: -11.6%
Number of Public Schools: 11

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 12.4%
Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.1%
District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.7%

District Reference Group (DRG): G 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

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2011 4,947 5-Year Enrollment Change -5.6%

Grade Range PK - 12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	1,749	35.4	42.1	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	97	2.1	3.8	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	48	1.0	3.9	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	680	13.7	12.6	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	408	82.9	77.0	79.8
Homeless	14	0.3	0.3	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	50	7.7	12.0	13.0

^{*0.0 %} of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

^{*}To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity				
Race/Ethnicity	Percent			
American Indian	81	1.6		
Asian American	332	6.7		
Black	587	11.9		
Hispanic	768	15.5		
Pacific Islander	9	0.2		
White	2,975	60.1		
Two or more races	195	3.9		
Total Minority	1,972	39.9		

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 6.2%

Non-English Home Language:

8.1% 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 35.

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 Groton Public Schools services approximately 4,800 students. A district marked by transition, our school system includes economic, ethnic, and geographic diversity because of the different areas that the school system serves and because of the US Naval Submarine Base. Therefore, our system has a yearly mobility rate of approximately 20%. The Board of Education maintains 13 beliefs, many of which speak to diversity. Our students may select to attend neighboring magnet schools such as the Isaac Multicultural School, the Dual Language Academy, The Science and Technology High School, and or the Marine Magnet High School, all operated by LEARN. In our curriculum, we make continuous efforts to include culturally relevant approaches and relevant materials. For example, we offer a number of professional development opportunities that address diversity. In district, we have hosted a number of "book talks" that speak to the following topics: teaching with poverty in mind, racial imbalance, and the different leaning needs and styles of our male and female students. Out of district, our educators have attended workshops on multiculturalism, working with students from urban environments, and educating students in a Naval Submarine district. Additionally, our curriculum and instruction integrates culturally relevant approaches and materials. At the elementary level, LEAD 21, our main literacy program, incorporates diverse texts to cast a net on diverse readers. Our new LA curriculum at the middle and high school levels offer students opportunities to engage in texts and topics that foster global awareness, understanding, collaboration, and communication with and among diverse individuals. For instance, our ninth grade Freshman Seminar class, which is heterogeneously grouped, includes units on Cultural Heritage, 21st Century Communication Skills, and Interdisciplinary Studies. Our International Baccalaureate Program and Advanced Placement classes continue to incorporate topics and themes that speak to global awareness and diversity. The Groton Public School system benefits from having outstanding community partnerships with the Groton Public Library, the US Naval Submarine Base, The Mystic Seaport, The Mystic Aquarium, Pfizer Corporation, Project Oceanology, the Charter Oak Federal Credit Union, and the Eastern Connecticut Symphony. Such partnerships enrich our students' learning experiences and expand their understanding of diversity and awareness. For the 2012-2013 school year, we have consolidated our middle schools from 3 to 2. Thus, we have spent a great deal of time and effort offering middle school programs that promote positive school relationships and climate. The district has also hired the consulting firm of Milone and MacBroom to study possible options for re-districting. To that end, the study focuses largely on how Groton Public Schools can maintain our diversity while simultaneously observing state and federal guidelines.

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 an	nd CMT Subject	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal	These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable
Grade 3	Reading	53.4	59.2	23.1	tests who were enrolled in the district at the
	Writing	58.9	62.7	27.5	time of testing,
	Mathematics	58.5	66.5	18.1	regardless of the length
Grade 4	Reading	66.3	64.1	36.3	of time they were enrolled in the district.
	Writing	61.9	65.3	26.3	Results for fewer than
	Mathematics	70.2	68.0	35.6	20 students are not
Grade 5	Reading	67.8	67.6	33.1	presented.
	Writing	72.1	68.1	45.8	
	Mathematics	74.9	71.6	35.7	E
	Science	62.7	63.9	26.2	For more detailed CMT results, go to
Grade 6	Reading	69.6	74.1	23.5	www.ctreports.
	Writing	55.2	67.4	16.9	
	Mathematics	66.0	69.3	27.7	
Grade 7	Reading	80.7	79.8	32.1	To see the NCLB
	Writing	68.1	65.6	37.3	Report Card for this school, go to
	Mathematics	63.7	68.1	26.3	www.sde.ct.gov and
Grade 8	Reading	71.3	76.8	22.0	click on "No Child Left
	Writing	67.0	68.3	31.9	Behind."
	Mathematics	59.1	67.2	23.3	
	Science	60.9	61.9	29.4	

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	39.3	47.5	30.1
Writing Across the Disciplines	46.6	63.0	16.4
Mathematics	43.2	49.2	33.8
Science	41.0	47.1	35.1

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		% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	45.1	50.6	31.9

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates T	ested	84.0	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	504	505	45.8
	Critical Reading	497	502	44.3
	Writing	487	506	26.0

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, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2011	80.7	82.7	22.6
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	2.4	2.6	22.5

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	72.5	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	11.2	9.7

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	346.10
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	32.60
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	54.40
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	148.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	19.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs District Central Office School Level	8.00 24.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	27.00
School Nurses	11.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	208.85

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	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	85.4	79.5	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	20.1	18.7	18.5
Grade 2	21.6	19.3	19.7
Grade 5	20.1	21.1	21.6
Grade 7	21.6	20.3	20.3
High School	16.1	19.4	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	954	989	993
Middle School	1,085	1,012	1,024
High School	949	1,013	1,024

*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*	2.6	3.4	2.8
Middle School	1.5	2.4	2.2
High School	1.8	2.1	2.1

^{*}Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2010-11

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	\$43,937	\$8,842	\$8,464	\$8,467	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,740	\$350	\$267	\$222	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,681	\$540	\$487	\$406	\$482
Student Support Services	\$5,901	\$1,188	\$901	\$999	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$7,925	\$1,595	\$1,468	\$1,417	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$8,046	\$1,619	\$1,471	\$1,459	\$1,463
Transportation	\$4,200	\$787	\$735	\$732	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,538	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$165	\$166	\$165
Total	\$76,969	\$14,850	\$14,238	\$14,111	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,202	\$644	\$1,290	\$1,057	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District DRG State		State
	\$15,244,196	19.8	22.7	21.7

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	60.1	31.2	8.4	0.2
Excluding School Construction	60.1	30.9	8.8	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 Groton Board of Education's policy concerning the annual distribution of resources ensures that each of the eleven 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 th eunique needs of its students, commensurate with district goals and available resources to ensure equity and address needs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible 683
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities 13.7%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities						
Disability	Disability Count District Percent DRG Percent					
Autism	90	1.8	1.3	1.2		
Learning Disability	195	3.9	3.9	3.9		
Intellectual Disability	36	0.7	0.5	0.4		
Emotional Disturbance	62	1.2	1.2	1.0		
Speech Impairment	121	2.4	2.3	2.1		
Other Health Impairment*	102	2.0	2.5	2.2		
Other Disabilities**	77	1.5	1.2	1.0		
Total	683	13.7	12.9	11.7		

^{*}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 2010-11 with a Standard Diploma	50.0	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	5.1

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	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	32.6	36.0	67.9	70.4
	Writing	20.4	21.5	63.9	66.3
	Mathematics	32.8	31.8	65.3	68.4
	Science	23.9	23.0	61.8	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	39.3	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	6.7	18.2	46.6	63.0
	Mathematics	5.3	15.4	43.2	49.2
	Science	6.5	13.6	41.0	47.1

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	37.4	
	% With Accommodations	62.6	
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	12.8	
	% With Accommodations	87.2	
% Assessed U	Ising Skills Checklist	9.7	

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	13	1.9			
Private Schools or Other Settings	54	7.9			

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	538	78.8	68.0	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	68	10.0	16.4	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	77	11.3	15.6	11.7

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

At all three district levels, we focused on SRBI implementation this year with an emphasis on Tier 1 instructional practices. District-wide, we implemented MAP testing as part of our yearly assessment calendar to drive instruction. The MAP test was issued three times a 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 practices to cast a wide net on student learners; at the middle school level, teams of teachers would discuss student performance, assessment results, and learning styles; and at the high school level, all teachers cycled through 6 mini-workshops on Tier 1 instructional practices. In the area of special of education, we have 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 continued with our PBIS implementation at various schools throughout the district, and we began year one implementation at Fitch High School. With the input of various parent and community stakeholders, our school district finalized its District Improvement Plan. Each individual school, and thus each individual school data team/SIT team, finalized their own school improvement plan. Per CT state statute, we submitted a Safe School Climate Plan. In addition to our PBIS implementation throughout the district, two schools—and their coordinating committees—were trained in the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. At the end of the school year, we began work on scheduling Groton Public Schools Night 3-4 times a year, during the early evening hours, to further promote community outreach and involvement by running a series of informational sessions for parents, care-givers, and interested citizens.