

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**East Hampton School District**

JUDITH A. GOLDEN, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 365-4000

Location: 94 Main Street
East Hampton,
Connecticut

Website: easthamptonct.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: \$22,769
Town Population in 2000: 13,352	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.3%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 28.0%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.5%
Number of Public Schools: 4	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 95.1%

*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, 2008 2,055
5-Year Enrollment Change -1.2%

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	151	7.3	11.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	13	0.6	2.3	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.9	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	172	8.4	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	134	91.2	85.8	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	53	18.2	22.8	19.0

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	1	0.0
Asian American	38	1.8
Black	29	1.4
Hispanic	57	2.8
White	1,930	93.9
Total Minority	125	6.1

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.7%

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 11.

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. Again this year, the music teachers from each school developed the exchange. 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. Economically, the school population is quite diverse. 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. In addition, the middle school hosted a Cultural Diversity Club from North Branford who came to perform skits and engage our students in discussions on diversity and prejudice.

Regarding efforts to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation, East Hampton High School participates in programs that enable the students to interact with diverse populations. Five of the students attended The Greater Hartford Academy of Arts, an inter-district magnet school. 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. School-wide service projects that benefit people in our world included the Save Darfur Coalition and the Haiti Hurricane Relief Project. Activities of this type enable East Hampton High School students to interact with students from diverse cultures.

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	56.1	54.6	35.8
Writing	74.8	62.5	65.4
Mathematics	72.0	62.8	55.3
Grade 4 Reading	64.8	60.7	40.5
Writing	71.8	64.2	48.5
Mathematics	71.1	63.6	53.0
Grade 5 Reading	77.3	66.0	65.2
Writing	80.4	66.5	73.5
Mathematics	74.1	68.8	46.9
Science	69.3	58.1	49.4
Grade 6 Reading	79.2	68.9	54.6
Writing	75.5	62.2	64.4
Mathematics	84.0	68.8	68.1
Grade 7 Reading	88.9	74.9	79.0
Writing	72.5	62.9	60.5
Mathematics	81.9	66.0	71.3
Grade 8 Reading	88.5	68.4	87.1
Writing	78.5	66.5	60.6
Mathematics	87.4	64.5	85.2
Science	85.9	60.6	87.7

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	65.6	47.4	75.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	70.1	55.0	64.9
Mathematics	59.5	47.8	57.3
Science	56.4	42.8	65.6

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
	38.9	36.2	53.2

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		73.7	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	540	507	77.5
	Critical Reading	538	503	82.9
	Writing	538	506	79.1

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 2008	98.6	92.1	82.4
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	1.4	6.6	78.8
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.5	2.5	77.4

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	83.9	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	15.3	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	125.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	13.51
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	24.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	48.05
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	6.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	7.70
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	99.60

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	15.9	14.1	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	83.3	75.1	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	21.0	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	18.9	19.0	19.3
Grade 5	25.6	20.9	21.0
Grade 7	18.8	20.7	20.5
High School	19.6	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,011	986	988
Middle School	996	1,026	1,016
High School	999	1,008	1,007

*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*	5.8	3.7	3.3
Middle School	3.1	3.0	2.6
High School	3.1	3.0	2.4

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

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	\$14,332	\$6,923	\$7,521	\$7,079	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$782	\$378	\$267	\$266	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$574	\$277	\$461	\$372	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,576	\$761	\$808	\$754	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$2,447	\$1,182	\$1,351	\$1,261	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,539	\$1,226	\$1,382	\$1,261	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,574	\$717	\$649	\$590	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,445	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$11	\$6	\$152	\$151	\$151
Total	\$25,280	\$12,055	\$12,869	\$12,042	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,597	\$772	\$1,791	\$1,047	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,049,436	23.9	20.6	20.5

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	64.6	33.4	1.9	0.1
Excluding School Construction	65.0	32.9	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. New staff to improve current programs.

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	171
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	8.4%

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	21	1.0	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	49	2.4	3.3	3.9
Intellectual Disability	5	0.2	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	12	0.6	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	47	2.3	2.5	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	25	1.2	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	12	0.6	0.9	0.9
Total	171	8.4	11.2	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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	83.3	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

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	32.4	30.2	75.9	65.7
	Writing	15.8	19.5	75.7	64.1
	Mathematics	40.4	30.7	78.3	65.7
	Science	30.0	23.8	76.8	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	65.6	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	70.1	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	59.5	47.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	56.4	42.8

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	8.0
	% With Accommodations	92.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	25.0
	% With Accommodations	75.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		10.9

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	11	6.4

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	107	62.6	75.5	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	46	26.9	15.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	18	10.5	9.3	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Memorial Elementary School had a sustained focus on reading and writing. The classroom teachers' goal was to increase students reading levels so all students would be reading at the appropriate level by June. Teachers continuously assessed the students throughout the year and students were taught on their instructional level in a guided reading group. Additional reading and writing services were provided by our support staff, including special education teachers and the language arts teachers for any student needing intervention. On the Connecticut Mastery Test 90% of third grade students were at or above proficiency in writing, 90% were at or above proficiency in mathematics and 82% of the students were at or above proficiency in reading.

In an effort to improve reading instruction and student learning, Center Elementary School has transitioned to a full balanced literacy reading program. 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 language arts and special education teachers. This year a reading consultant will work with teachers throughout the year on developing best practices in reading instruction. In mathematics, efforts to align and pace the Everyday Math program to the Fourth Generation CMT was a focus that will continue to be addressed this year. Specific emphasis will be on key elements and content strands identified as areas of need. Increased opportunities for teachers to meet in collaborative teams, analyze data, discuss curriculum and instructional strategies, and focus on student learning outcomes are a primary focus.

Through a focused attention on analyzing the students' Fourth Generation CMT results, examining student outcomes in the academic areas, and examining the curriculum delivery through the mapping process, areas were identified for improvement within East Hampton Middle School. To improve student reading performance, focus began on teaching content literacy and implementing reading activities across curricular areas. Teachers worked in conjunction with administration and the district reading coordinator to implement specific reading activities within the lessons. Also identified were specific reading strand areas on the CMT in need of improvement and attention was focused on instruction in those areas. In the area of mathematics, questions were reworked in the Daily Oral Math program to consistently align with the Fourth Generation CMT. Within that program, assessment and review of student progress continued on a weekly basis. Throughout all curricular areas, a process began of creating common assessments and using the data from those assessments to inform instruction and improve student learning. The high school 2008-2009 school improvement plan included two major goals: increasing the students' reading comprehension across all content areas and implementing a data-informed system to monitor and improve student learning. With respect to improvement in reading, the high school set a target to decrease the number of struggling readers as measured by the percentage of students scoring below the proficiency level on the CAPT Reading for Information test. Accordingly, benchmarks were set to increase the number of students meeting goal on that test. A school-wide reading period was instituted every Friday to encourage students to read for pleasure. In addition, all elective areas utilized school-wide strategies for improving reading comprehension. The result was a 16% increase in the number of students meeting goal on this test. Literacy and the understanding and managing of data have been important components of our professional development this year. Other components have included training in how to develop effective assessments and how to differentiate instruction. The staff continued its work on writing common, summative (midterm and final exams) assessments in all courses. To further this work on assessment, teachers began developing course-specific, formative, "snapshot" assessments to target specific skill deficiencies. Resources, instructional materials, and access to in and out-of-district learning opportunities were provided for teachers. Other activities included in the school improvement plan were the writing of the NEASC 2 year follow-up report, the high school's participation in the CIAC Athletic Program Evaluation, and the continuation of curriculum writing.
