

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

ALBERT A. COVIELLO, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 664-6500

Location: 137-B Glenwood Circle
Clinton,
Connecticut

Website: www.clintonpublic.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	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$26,080
Town Population in 2000: 13,094	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.4%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 2.6%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.1%
Number of Public Schools: 4	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 95.0%

*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, 2007 2,106
5-Year Enrollment Change -4.7%

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	170	8.1	10.5	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	36	1.7	2.4	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	113	5.4	4.5	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	253	12.0	10.9	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	145	84.8	84.1	79.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	111	34.7	22.2	20.2

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	2	0.1
Asian American	52	2.5
Black	15	0.7
Hispanic	130	6.2
White	1,907	90.6
Total Minority	199	9.4

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 0.5%

Non-English Home Language: 1.8% 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 7.

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 town of Clinton considers itself to be fortunate that the community reflects racial, ethnic, and economic diversity. With nearly ten percent of our population being members of minority groups, our schools provide wonderful opportunities for students and the community-at-large to practice and experience an environment that is racially, ethnically, and economically diverse. Our schools continue to celebrate this diversity with programs and activities that enable students, staff, and parents to learn about, observe and participate in various ethnic and cultural events.

One of the biggest challenges facing school districts is to insure that all students, regardless of race or ethnic background, are achieving at high levels and that no racial or ethnic group is disproportionately or inappropriately being represented in the Special Education population. Clinton is pleased that, according to State statistics, none of the four minority racial/ethnic groups represented in our population is disproportionately represented in Special Education. Additionally, Clinton's data reflects that the percentage of our Special Education students spend time with non-disabled peers on an equitable basis when compared to both our DRG and the State percentages and have a high rate of participation in extra-curricular activities.

Our World Languages Program is now operative from kg through grade 12. All students kg through grade 6 receive instruction in the Spanish language. Beginning in grade 7, students may elect to continue Spanish or switch to French. We introduced Chinese as a language elective at The Morgan School. The Clinton Public Schools continue to review/revise curricula on a five-year cycle and take measures to insure that the content includes all state-tested core curricula as well as multicultural elements and activities to understand and respect diversity.

During the past year, Clinton had twelve students who participated in an inter-district magnet school, seventeen students who attended a regional technical school, and four students who attended a Vo-Ag school. Clinton continued to provide several opportunities for students to participate in urban/suburban exchange programs. One of CPS's administrators, William Barney, participated in an educator exchange program by travelling to China. Also, Joel School again hosted several teachers-in-training from the University of Northern Switzerland for five weeks and Morgan hosted a delegation of students from the Republic of China for two weeks. Additionally, students and staff participated in programs and projects designed to address issues of isolation. Once again, nearly every student in the district was involved in at least one locally funded intradistrict program designed to reduce isolation, increase awareness of diversity of individuals and cultures, to reduce/eliminate harassment, and/or to respect 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	64.6	52.0	60.1
Writing	80.3	63.4	78.5
Mathematics	67.3	60.0	52.8
Grade 4 Reading	62.0	55.9	47.5
Writing	62.0	62.9	33.3
Mathematics	62.7	60.3	42.8
Grade 5 Reading	75.4	62.2	66.0
Writing	75.4	64.5	60.5
Mathematics	76.0	65.9	58.0
Science	68.4	54.9	54.9
Grade 6 Reading	77.1	66.3	58.9
Writing	72.0	61.9	61.3
Mathematics	72.6	66.4	46.4
Grade 7 Reading	81.0	71.1	51.0
Writing	72.2	62.0	56.8
Mathematics	69.2	63.0	45.2
Grade 8 Reading	81.9	64.8	74.2
Writing	79.2	63.4	69.8
Mathematics	80.6	60.8	78.0
Science	68.1	58.6	41.5

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	47.1	45.5	43.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	69.9	57.9	57.7
Mathematics	49.0	50.1	33.1
Science	50.3	46.3	46.2

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
	28.9	36.1	22.5

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		81.0	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	510	504	53.8
	Critical Reading	495	502	36.9
	Writing	503	503	45.4

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	97.4	92.6	66.2
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	2.5	6.2	62.4
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.4	1.7	37.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	76.9	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	23.1	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	147.53
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	9.79
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	24.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	35.93
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	6.31
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.50
School Level	7.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	3.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	12.00
School Nurses	3.72
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	84.30

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	16.8	14.1	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	76.3	74.9	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.0	17.4	18.1
Grade 2	15.4	19.1	19.3
Grade 5	23.1	20.6	20.9
Grade 7	20.0	21.0	20.5
High School	17.2	20.2	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	995	987	987
Middle School	1,055	1,023	1,017
High School	1,005	1,001	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*	4.1	3.7	3.4
Middle School	2.4	3.0	2.7
High School	3.1	3.1	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	\$17,281	\$8,163	\$7,153	\$6,689	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,033	\$488	\$262	\$257	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$715	\$338	\$443	\$364	\$429
Student Support Services	\$1,662	\$785	\$764	\$705	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$2,232	\$1,054	\$1,256	\$1,201	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,464	\$1,164	\$1,329	\$1,202	\$1,322
Transportation	\$1,447	\$632	\$605	\$552	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$826	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$201	\$95	\$147	\$139	\$145
Total	\$27,860	\$12,994	\$12,203	\$11,370	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$913	\$431	\$1,875	\$1,149	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$5,536,658
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	19.9%

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	68.0	29.5	2.5	0.0
Excluding School Construction	74.5	22.9	2.6	0.0

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 Clinton Board of Education recognizes that every school within our district must have the resources necessary to effectively operate its programs within the financial limitations of the town. A systematic, bottom-to-top process involving all aspects of our school and town community is used to construct a budget that achieves an equitable allocation of those resources. Meetings are held with the administrators from each school building and department to discuss budget goals and parameters, to identify instructional and operational needs, and to review and revise the capital improvement plan. Each administrator, with input from staff and community, then proposes a school/department budget for submission to the central office administrators who review and clarify each proposed budget. Administrators also meet together to review personnel requests and prioritize personnel needs. The superintendent then develops an overall district budget and submits it to the elected Board for its consideration. The Board holds extra public sessions to receive input from community members. Embedded in this process is an annual up-date of a ten year plan for capital improvements which also includes funds for equipment, furniture and technology. The Board receives additional monies from both State and Federal sources to help finance the Special Education programs. When a student is outplaced, the State promises to pay any costs in excess of 450% of the regular per student expenditure cost. The Federal government, although never paying the portion of Special Education costs that were promised, does pay a small portion of our program costs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	241
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.5%

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	13	0.6	0.8	0.7
Learning Disability	104	5.0	3.3	4.0
Intellectual Disability	9	0.4	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	14	0.7	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	47	2.3	2.5	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	37	1.8	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	17	0.8	0.8	0.9
Total	241	11.5	10.9	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	86.4	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	3.0	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	30.9	20.4	73.6	62.1
	Writing	22.7	19.3	73.3	63.0
	Mathematics	30.9	22.6	71.3	62.7
	Science	28.2	22.2	68.3	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	10.3	11.4	47.1	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	20.7	16.3	69.9	57.9
	Mathematics	24.1	14.7	49.0	50.1
	Science	24.1	14.4	50.3	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	26.3
	% With Accommodations	73.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	9.4
	% With Accommodations	90.6
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		6.6

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	10	4.1

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	156	64.7	73.4	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	63	26.1	16.6	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	22	9.1	10.0	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The focus for 2007-08 was the development and implementation of professional learning communities as a mechanism for collaborative and systemic improvement. Basic concepts of the professional learning communities' model were utilized at the district level to reorganize; K-12 curriculum renewal teams, the district-wide response to intervention (RtI) research and development committee, and the administrative council; and introduced at the building level to guide professional development and professional growth plans. The reorganization of the K-12 curriculum renewal team emphasized a true collaboration of all levels. The Board of Education recognized the need for regular and systematic coordination by committing to a schedule of release to for each of the curriculum renewal teams. Each discipline completed the first step in a curriculum audit based on guidelines developed by the district-wide curriculum and professional development council. In addition, three disciplines (language arts, math, and social studies) initiated full renewal. As part of the systemic coordination, transition grades, (third to fourth, fifth to sixth, and eighth to ninth) scheduled meeting to expand communication and dialogue about mutual expectations. Literacy continues to be the primary focus at the elementary level with continued efforts to improve writing. Key to this improvement is the development of pacing guides and coordination between the PK-3 teachers and the 4-5 teachers. The district continues to support teachers involved in the Columbia Writer's project. At the high school level the Board of Education has initiated a High School of the Future Task force to examine the impact of 21st century learning expectations on existing educational programming and facility capacity. Recommendations will be made to the Board of Education in the fall of 2008. This initiative is running concurrently with the school's preparation for a 2010 accreditation visit. One of the first outcomes of this process was the mid-year introduction of an advisory program.

CPS continued its focus on supporting the inclusion of students with disabilities with their non-disabled peers. Training in differentiated instruction and reading intervention programs was a primary focus for expanding the skill set for the special education staff in their efforts to support students in the classroom and provide teachers with additional intervention strategies. The middle school staff focused on increasing the number of special education students meeting the state proficiency standard in reading. The staff identified areas of concern using CMT results and district assessment tools and targeted instruction in these areas. Students received instruction and subsequent interventions in co-taught language arts classes. Response to Intervention (RtI) continues to be a major thrust for the district. This year teams of special education teachers, classroom teachers and administrators attended the state's RtI training sessions and as a result has developed a district-wide action plan for developing models of intervention for grades K-5, 6-8 and 9-12. The high school team began its work during the summer with training in the CRISS program. This group will provide in-house training and guidance for implementing a series of selected intervention strategies. Pupil services staff participated in a regional training on Positive Behavioral Support (PBS) with Dr. George Sugai from UCONN. The special services department continued its efforts to support the newly formed Special Educational Parent and Teachers Association (SEPTA). Parent surveys were developed and distributed to assess parent satisfaction with the PPT process for their children. Feedback from the surveys will guide the department in future refinements.

The district continues its efforts to engage parents in supporting school improvement including: the Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council; and the initiation of the High School of the Future Task Force; Principal Hours; and the establishment of parent liaisons for the various "Friends of..." organizations (local parent-teacher organizations) Participation in forums suggests a high level of interest. The Joel Elementary School wrote and received a Family Learning Connection grant that was designed to work with parents and first grade students on developing home support for reading. The literacy staff conducted a series of afternoon and evening events to teach parents what they can do to support their children at home followed by time for parent to practice the techniques with guidance from the literacy staff.
