

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11**Groton School District**

PAUL J. KADRI, Superintendent

Location: 1300 Flanders Road

Telephone: (860) 572-2110

Mystic,
ConnecticutWebsite: 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

Town Population in 2000: 39,907

1990-2000 Population Growth: -11.6%

Number of Public Schools: 11

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$23,995

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: 94.9%

*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): 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

Enrollment on October 1, 2010 4,965
5-Year Enrollment Change -11.2%

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 | 1,752 | 35.3 | 40.3 | 34.1 |
| K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English | 89 | 1.9 | 3.8 | 5.6 |
| Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented* | 51 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District | 650 | 13.1 | 12.3 | 11.4 |
| Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart | 349 | 78.8 | 77.1 | 80.2 |
| Homeless | 5 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week | 86 | 13.6 | 13.3 | 13.2 |

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

| Student Race/Ethnicity | | |
|------------------------|--------|---------|
| Race/Ethnicity | Number | Percent |
| American Indian | 82 | 1.7 |
| Asian American | 353 | 7.1 |
| Black | 632 | 12.7 |
| Hispanic | 669 | 13.5 |
| Pacific Islander | 3 | 0.1 |
| White | 3,115 | 62.7 |
| Two or more races | 111 | 2.2 |
| Total Minority | 1,850 | 37.3 |

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 6.8%

Non-English Home Language:

7.2% 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 31.

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 5,000 diverse students. This includes economic, ethnic, and geographic diversity because of the U.S. Naval Base being located within the district. Groton has approximately a 20% yearly mobility rate, which also creates transitional diversity. The Board of Education maintains 13 beliefs, one of which speaks directly to the value of accentuating our diversity. The beliefs states: We believe diversity provides Groton with a unique strength as long as it is actively cultivated. This belief moves beyond a simple declaration that diversity is good. It highlights that we need to embrace diversity through deliberate actions to gain strength (the reverse is implied that we become weaker if we sit passive). In 2010-2011, 102 Groton students were enrolled in the Regional Multicultural Magnet School; 3 students participated in the Open Choice Program; 32 students attended the Science and Technology Magnet High School, and 33 students attended the Ledyard Vo-Ag Program. A new Marine Science Magnet High School will be available to students in 2011-2012. Forty-five students from other elementary catchment areas in Groton chose to attend the Catherine Kolnaski Magnet School. Fitch High School's International Baccalaureate Program and advanced placement classes continue to incorporate studies that increase culture awareness. The Groton School System benefits from having outstanding community partnerships. The New London Naval Submarine Base, The Mystic Seaport, The Mystic Aquarium, Project Oceanology (at the University of Connecticut), Pfizer Corporation, Electric Boat, the Eastern Connecticut Symphony, and many others provide opportunities for our students beyond what is found in the curriculum. In addition, the School District has become a leader in classroom technology. This allows each school to easily engage in distance learning opportunities. For the 2012-2013 school year, Groton anticipates consolidating middle schools because of enrollment shifts. The Board of Education and administration have at the forefront the importance of maintaining diversity in any redistricting efforts that take place.

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 | 59.4 | 58.4 | 33.8 |
| Writing | 59.6 | 61.1 | 32.9 |
| Mathematics | 63.7 | 63.0 | 38.5 |
| Grade 4 Reading | 63.7 | 62.5 | 35.6 |
| Writing | 66.0 | 65.5 | 32.9 |
| Mathematics | 63.0 | 67.0 | 25.0 |
| Grade 5 Reading | 61.8 | 61.4 | 32.5 |
| Writing | 62.6 | 66.8 | 25.8 |
| Mathematics | 73.2 | 72.5 | 36.2 |
| Science | 64.0 | 59.9 | 35.6 |
| Grade 6 Reading | 76.0 | 76.0 | 30.4 |
| Writing | 61.8 | 65.2 | 28.6 |
| Mathematics | 66.3 | 71.3 | 25.0 |
| Grade 7 Reading | 74.8 | 77.8 | 26.1 |
| Writing | 57.0 | 58.9 | 33.5 |
| Mathematics | 58.2 | 68.4 | 20.5 |
| Grade 8 Reading | 76.1 | 74.7 | 33.8 |
| Writing | 71.9 | 64.8 | 43.3 |
| Mathematics | 65.9 | 66.6 | 35.0 |
| Science | 69.6 | 63.1 | 40.8 |

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 | 30.7 | 44.7 | 22.0 |
| Writing Across the Disciplines | 48.1 | 61.2 | 18.8 |
| Mathematics | 41.8 | 49.5 | 31.6 |
| Science | 35.8 | 47.0 | 27.1 |

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 | State | % of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard |
|--|----------|-------|---|
| | 46.6 | 51.0 | 36.0 |

| SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010 | | District | State | % of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores |
|---|------------------|----------|-------|--|
| % of Graduates Tested | | 71.4 | 70.6 | |
| Average Score | Mathematics | 514 | 510 | 52.7 |
| | Critical Reading | 508 | 505 | 50.4 |
| | Writing | 501 | 510 | 39.7 |

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 2010 | 78.9 | 81.8 | 22.1 |
| 2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12 | 0.5 | 2.8 | 66.2 |

| Activities of Graduates | District | State |
|--|----------|-------|
| % Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs) | 87.7 | 84.8 |
| % Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services) | 3.7 | 9.1 |

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

| Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff | |
|---|--------|
| General Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 357.80 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants | 54.90 |
| Special Education | |
| Teachers and Instructors | 54.30 |
| Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants | 147.60 |
| Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants | 19.00 |
| Staff Devoted to Adult Education | 0.00 |
| Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs | |
| District Central Office | 9.00 |
| School Level | 24.20 |
| Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists) | 1.00 |
| Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists | 26.00 |
| School Nurses | 11.00 |
| Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support | 215.30 |

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 | 18.0 | 14.8 | 13.9 |
| % with Master's Degree or Above | 85.3 | 79.6 | 79.0 |

| Average Class Size | District | DRG | State |
|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| Grade K | 17.1 | 18.3 | 18.4 |
| Grade 2 | 18.5 | 19.5 | 19.9 |
| Grade 5 | 20.3 | 21.7 | 21.2 |
| Grade 7 | 18.3 | 19.3 | 20.6 |
| High School | 18.9 | 19.7 | 19.3 |

| Hours of Instruction Per Year* | Dist | DRG | State |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Elementary School | 1,001 | 985 | 992 |
| Middle School | 1,020 | 1,007 | 1,017 |
| High School | 993 | 1,011 | 1,010 |

*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* | 2.2 | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| Middle School | 1.2 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| High School | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.2 |

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2009-10

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 | \$42,727 | \$8,496 | \$8,232 | \$8,256 | \$8,237 |
| Instructional Supplies and Equipment | \$1,985 | \$395 | \$299 | \$252 | \$300 |
| Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services | \$2,793 | \$555 | \$477 | \$379 | \$463 |
| Student Support Services | \$6,270 | \$1,247 | \$875 | \$945 | \$872 |
| Administration and Support Services | \$7,527 | \$1,497 | \$1,433 | \$1,360 | \$1,459 |
| Plant Operation and Maintenance | \$8,228 | \$1,636 | \$1,421 | \$1,418 | \$1,410 |
| Transportation | \$4,056 | \$751 | \$701 | \$705 | \$692 |
| Costs for Students Tuitioned Out | \$3,057 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$161 | \$154 | \$159 |
| Total | \$76,642 | \$14,666 | \$13,878 | \$13,783 | \$13,780 |
| Additional Expenditures | | | | | |
| Land, Buildings, and Debt Service | \$3,139 | \$624 | \$1,622 | \$1,523 | \$1,616 |

| Special Education Expenditures | District Total | Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--|------|-------|
| | | District | DRG | State |
| | \$16,136,378 | 21.1 | 23.2 | 21.5 |

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 | 62.2 | 30.0 | 7.6 | 0.2 |
| Excluding School Construction | 61.3 | 30.6 | 7.9 | 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 the unique 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 | 628 |
| Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities | 12.8% |

| 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 | 79 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Learning Disability | 185 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 |
| Intellectual Disability | 34 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Emotional Disturbance | 55 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| Speech Impairment | 119 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Other Health Impairment* | 81 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| Other Disabilities** | 75 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| Total | 628 | 12.8 | 12.5 | 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 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma | 57.7 | 62.5 |
| 2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21 | N/A | 3.9 |

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 | 28.1 | 33.0 | 68.4 | 68.6 |
| | Writing | 18.5 | 19.3 | 63.1 | 63.7 |
| | Mathematics | 36.0 | 33.4 | 65.1 | 68.2 |
| | Science | 21.5 | 21.2 | 66.7 | 61.5 |
| CAPT | Reading Across the Disciplines | N/A | N/A | 30.7 | 44.7 |
| | Writing Across the Disciplines | 11.5 | 17.3 | 48.1 | 61.2 |
| | Mathematics | N/A | N/A | 41.8 | 49.5 |
| | Science | 3.8 | 13.1 | 35.8 | 47.0 |

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 | 19.5 |
| | % With Accommodations | 80.5 |
| CAPT | % Without Accommodations | 21.2 |
| | % With Accommodations | 78.8 |
| % Assessed Using Skills Checklist | | 11.0 |

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 | 8 | 1.3 |
| Private Schools or Other Settings | 34 | 5.4 |

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 | 505 | 80.4 | 69.3 | 74.1 |
| 40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time | 65 | 10.4 | 15.9 | 14.9 |
| 0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time | 58 | 9.2 | 14.8 | 11.0 |

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Efforts continued this year to improve the core instructional practices across the district. Weekly data teams took place in every building. All district administrators received refresher training on the Data Driven Decision Making process to support the work in their buildings. The Math Expressions program was successfully launched in all seven elementary schools with ongoing professional development provided throughout the year. A new reading program, Lead 21, was identified as a resource to enhance the reading curriculum in Grades 3-5. Lexia was introduced at all seven elementary schools as a tool to strengthen the reading skills of all students. A new District Improvement Plan was developed effective for the years 2011-2014, and focuses the district's efforts on improving student achievement in reading over the next three years with an emphasis on the subgroups that include free and reduced lunch and students with disabilities. The District Improvement Plan also targets improving the school climate as measured by referrals to administration. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) conducted a Focus Monitoring visit in February based upon the low reading scores of students with disabilities. As a result of the visit, a Focus Monitoring Improvement Plan was developed and filed with the CSDE. It aligns with the District Improvement Plan and, in addition, outlines specific professional development initiatives and strategies to improve communication with parents in order to accelerate the achievement of students with disabilities. The rollout of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) continued this year with Charles Barnum, Pleasant Valley and Mary Morrison completing the first year of implementation. Fitch Middle School and Catherine Kolnaski continued the PBIS program for a second year, as did Claude Chester in its third year. Fitch High School, Northeast Academy and S.B. Butler are entering the first year of implementation in the 2011-2012 academic year. In order to more effectively provide intervention/enrichment opportunities for students as outlined in the Scientifically Research-Based Intervention (SRBI) Framework, new schedules were developed at elementary, middle and high school levels with plans to launch them at the start of the 2011-2012 academic year. The elementary schedule was piloted in the spring of 2011 at Catherine Kolnaski. Instructional Rounds were conducted in district this spring after a team of teachers and administrators were trained in the process to improve instructional practice. A vertical round was conducted at S.B. Butler centered on the focus area of differentiated instruction. The staff at S.B. Butler identified next steps for improving their practice as a result of the round and intend on visiting each other's classrooms during the upcoming year. All seven elementary schools participated in a horizontal round to examine practices in the grade 4 reading block. As a result of the second round, the Curriculum Office will provide guidance on the structure of the reading block and building administrators will monitor the implementation of the model. A group of thirty five (35) secondary teachers from across the district participated in 10 hours of English Language Learner training, Teaching All Teachers, facilitated by two university professors at Southern Connecticut State University. The training allowed middle school and high school content area teachers the opportunity to learn how English Language Learners (ELLs) acquire social and academic language. Teachers learned how to construct/modify lessons to provide ELLs access to academic content. Teachers also learned what kinds of behaviors and performance to expect from ELLs at different stages of the language acquisition. The identical training will be provided in the 2011-2012 school year to a cadre of elementary teachers (predominantly those at Catherine Kolnaski Magnet). The district ELL tutors attended ELL training in the fall of 2010 to enhance their ability to support ELL students. The New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) visited Fitch High School in April as part of the accreditation review process. Groton partnered with Emetric to design a Data Warehouse. The Data Warehouse will allow for the easy retrieval of student information including but not limited to academic performance. Central Office will be able to track trends and investigate indicators of student risk/success to improve the ability of teachers and administrators to enhance student achievement and ensure all students complete a rigorous academic program.
