

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12**Woodstock School District**

FRANCIS A. BARAN, Superintendent

Location: 147 Route 169

Telephone: (860) 928-7453

Woodstock,
ConnecticutWebsite: 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

Town Population in 2000: 7,221

1990-2000 Population Growth: 20.2%

Number of Public Schools: 2

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$25,331

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.4%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.6%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 98.3%

*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): 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, 2011 888
5-Year Enrollment Change -7.8%

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 | 100 | 11.3 | 14.9 | 35.2 |
| K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English | 6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 5.6 |
| Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented* | 115 | 13.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 |
| PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District | 73 | 8.2 | 11.1 | 11.5 |
| Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart | 59 | 80.8 | 86.6 | 79.8 |
| Homeless | 0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

*94.8 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

| Student Race/Ethnicity | | |
|------------------------|--------|---------|
| Race/Ethnicity | Number | Percent |
| American Indian | 0 | 0.0 |
| Asian American | 11 | 1.2 |
| Black | 3 | 0.3 |
| Hispanic | 32 | 3.6 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 |
| White | 813 | 91.6 |
| Two or more races | 29 | 3.3 |
| Total Minority | 75 | 8.4 |

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.4%

Non-English Home Language:

1.7% 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 9.

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.

During the 2011-2012 school year, we continued our International Week, a program which is now in its 9th year. This year, we focused on the country of Egypt. Specialists incorporated North African themes into their lessons in the weeks leading up to and during this event, as did many classroom teachers. For example, in some fourth grade classrooms, students did Egypt research projects, and all of the first and second graders, and many of the students in other grades, extended their learning about Egypt and its culture during their enrichment time over the course of many weeks. Our music teacher led the entire fourth grade in "Tombs and Temples," a 30-minute "musical" with songs, costumes, and props representing Ancient Egypt. The Enrichment Teacher and the School Counselor set up a classroom as our VISIT EGYPT area and made the room center-based with activities and displays for students and adults to rotate through. These activities included building sand pyramids, sampling various Egyptian foods, learning a few words in Arabic and Egyptian Arabic, creating tessellations, and exploring an area filled with Egyptian artifacts. All students at Woodstock Middle School participated in a series of tolerance activities during the 2011-12 school year. Organized activities 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 6th grade student is required to do an in-depth research project and display on a foreign country culminating in an annual fair open to the school and the community. For the second year in a row Senegalese students and a teacher came to us visiting a variety of classes throughout the school. These visitors from Africa shared much historical and cultural information about their country and people. All 8th grade students take Spanish as part of their core course of study which includes learning about the cultures of Spain and Latin America. Every year, the 5th grade goes on a tour of the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and the 8th grade takes a four day trip to Washington, D.C. In the past six years WMS has collaborated with a local camp and a nearby private high school to immerse fifth and sixth grade 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. Students in the 7th and 8th grades participated in a one day presentation, discussions and related activities on the topic of bullying and the acceptance of differences in others.

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 | <p>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.</p> <p>For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p> |
|----------------------------|----------|-------|--|--|
| Grade 3 Reading | 69.3 | 59.2 | 60.6 | |
| Writing | 61.3 | 62.7 | 36.3 | |
| Mathematics | 82.4 | 66.5 | 74.4 | |
| Grade 4 Reading | 74.0 | 64.1 | 53.1 | |
| Writing | 65.0 | 65.3 | 33.1 | |
| Mathematics | 70.1 | 68.0 | 35.0 | |
| Grade 5 Reading | 75.5 | 67.6 | 50.6 | |
| Writing | 65.7 | 68.1 | 31.0 | |
| Mathematics | 78.5 | 71.6 | 48.2 | |
| Science | 83.8 | 63.9 | 76.8 | |
| Grade 6 Reading | 82.2 | 74.1 | 54.2 | |
| Writing | 72.9 | 67.4 | 45.8 | |
| Mathematics | 79.4 | 69.3 | 52.4 | |
| Grade 7 Reading | 87.5 | 79.8 | 50.9 | |
| Writing | 82.5 | 65.6 | 77.0 | |
| Mathematics | 91.0 | 68.1 | 93.1 | |
| Grade 8 Reading | 84.4 | 76.8 | 51.6 | |
| Writing | 69.8 | 68.3 | 38.1 | |
| Mathematics | 82.3 | 67.2 | 63.5 | |
| Science | 83.3 | 61.9 | 78.8 | |

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 | <p>For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|--|--|
| 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 | |

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 |
|--|----------|-------|---|
| | 45.7 | 50.6 | 33.0 |

| SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011 | | 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, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2011 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2010-11 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 School Staff | |
|---|-------|
| General Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 53.00 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants | 17.00 |
| Special Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 6.00 |
| 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 | 4.00 |
| Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists) | 1.00 |
| Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists | 2.40 |
| School Nurses | 2.00 |
| Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support | 36.13 |

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 | 15.4 | 13.9 |
| % with Master's Degree or Above | 91.5 | 81.8 | 79.6 |

| Average Class Size | District | DRG | State |
|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| Grade K | 18.3 | 15.5 | 18.5 |
| Grade 2 | 19.0 | 17.0 | 19.7 |
| Grade 5 | 19.8 | 18.5 | 21.6 |
| Grade 7 | 16.8 | 19.1 | 20.3 |
| High School | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Hours of Instruction Per Year* | Dist | DRG | State |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Elementary School | 1,055 | 992 | 993 |
| Middle School | 1,040 | 1,027 | 1,024 |
| 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* | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.8 |
| Middle School | 1.5 | 1.9 | 2.2 |
| High School | N/A | N/A | N/A |

*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 | \$6,631 | \$7,169 | \$8,513 | \$8,407 | \$8,469 |
| Instructional Supplies and Equipment | \$258 | \$279 | \$323 | \$300 | \$271 |
| Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services | \$177 | \$191 | \$407 | \$412 | \$482 |
| Student Support Services | \$747 | \$808 | \$919 | \$905 | \$901 |
| Administration and Support Services | \$824 | \$891 | \$1,700 | \$1,532 | \$1,490 |
| Plant Operation and Maintenance | \$983 | \$1,062 | \$1,281 | \$1,547 | \$1,463 |
| Transportation | \$800 | \$557 | \$678 | \$768 | \$724 |
| Costs for Students Tuitioned Out* | \$497 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other | \$57 | \$61 | \$102 | \$178 | \$165 |
| Total* | \$10,973 | \$11,563 | \$14,710 | \$14,452 | \$14,140 |
| Additional Expenditures | | | | | |
| Land, Buildings, and Debt Service | \$804 | \$869 | \$1,866 | \$1,107 | \$1,331 |

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$16,198 Tuition Costs, \$5,721.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$11,678.

| Special Education Expenditures | District Total | Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--|------|-------|
| | | District | DRG | State |
| | \$2,983,798 | 18.4 | 20.1 | 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 | 59.7 | 31.1 | 8.6 | 0.6 |
| Excluding School Construction | 59.9 | 30.4 | 9.0 | 0.7 |

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 | 86 |
| Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities | 6.6% |

| 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 | 9 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Learning Disability | 42 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.9 |
| Intellectual Disability | 5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Emotional Disturbance | 5 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| Speech Impairment | 15 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 2.1 |
| Other Health Impairment* | 7 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 2.2 |
| Other Disabilities** | 3 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| Total | 86 | 6.6 | 11.1 | 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 | N/A | N/A |
| 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 Disabilities | | All Students | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | | District | State | District | State |
| CMT | Reading | 18.5 | 36.0 | 78.5 | 70.4 |
| | Writing | 10.6 | 21.5 | 69.0 | 66.3 |
| | Mathematics | 29.6 | 31.8 | 80.3 | 68.4 |
| | Science | 11.8 | 23.0 | 83.6 | 62.9 |
| 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 | 22.6 |
| | % With Accommodations | 77.4 |
| CAPT | % Without Accommodations | 100.0 |
| | % With Accommodations | N/A |
| % Assessed Using Skills Checklist | | 13.0 |

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 | 1.2 |
| Private Schools or Other Settings | 8 | 9.3 |

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 | 42 | 48.8 | 74.3 | 72.1 |
| 40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time | 37 | 43.0 | 18.2 | 16.3 |
| 0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time | 7 | 8.1 | 7.5 | 11.7 |

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

For the past six school years, 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 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. 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. To address the issue of truancy prevention, both the elementary and middle schools utilize the school district student data system to identify students with chronically poor attendance. Students identified as chronically absent or truant are contacted and appropriate school personnel work with the student and their families to improve school attendance.
