STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08

Preston School District

JOHN J. WELCH, Superintendent Location: 325 Shetucket Turnpike

Telephone: (860) 889-6098 Preston,
Connecticut

Website: www.prestonschools.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: New London Per Capita Income in 2000: \$24,752

Town Population in 2000: 4,688 Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 15.4% 1990-2000 Population Growth: -6.4% Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.7% Number of Public Schools: 2 District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.2%

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

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2007 504 Grade Range PK- 8 5-Year Enrollment Change -2.5%

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in	Percent		
	District	District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	57	11.3	9.7	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	9	1.9	0.5	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.3	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	71	14.1	11.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	41	78.8	82.5	79.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Studer	nt Race/Ethnici	ty
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	15	3.0
Asian American	16	3.2
Black	11	2.2
Hispanic	15	3.0
White	447	88.7
Total Minority	57	11.3

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.9%

Non-English Home Language: 1.9% 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 2.

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 Preston Public School District is a small, rural, homogeneous district. Therefore, it is a priority to have our students engage in activities that increase their awareness of and sensitivity to racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic differences. Efforts to expose our students to a variety of cultures include in class multidisciplinary study of different cultures, participation in inter-district programs to increase awareness and sensitivity, and historical units of study focusing on the impact of intolerance, i.e. the holocaust.

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	65.0	52.0	61.3
Writing	72.5	63.4	58.9
Mathematics	72.5	60.0	65.6
Grade 4 Reading	70.0	55.9	68.4
Writing	76.0	62.9	69.2
Mathematics	82.0	60.3	87.4
Grade 5 Reading	72.3	62.2	51.9
Writing	70.2	64.5	45.1
Mathematics	78.7	65.9	64.8
Science	72.3	54.9	67.3
Grade 6 Reading	74.6	66.3	50.6
Writing	58.7	61.9	29.8
Mathematics	68.3	66.4	37.5
Grade 7 Reading	81.3	71.1	51.6
Writing	64.1	62.0	40.6
Mathematics	64.1	63.0	37.4
Grade 8 Reading	52.5	64.8	14.5
Writing	50.8	63.4	18.2
Mathematics	49.2	60.8	20.8
Science	44.1	58.6	15.7

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.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <u>www.sde.ct.gov</u> 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	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

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	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
Four Tests	29.7	36.1	25.7

SAT® I: Reasonin Class of 2007	g Test	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or
% of Graduates Te	ested	N/A	N/A	Lower Scores
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, Class of 2007	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006-07 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 District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	32.40
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	0.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	9.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	23.00
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	1.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	2.00
School Level	2.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	0.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	1.60
School Nurses	1.64
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	29.88

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	18.5	14.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	88.4	78.1	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.7	15.7	18.1
Grade 2	17.7	16.8	19.3
Grade 5	16.0	19.9	20.9
Grade 7	18.8	19.6	20.5
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	975	984	987
Middle School	964	1,012	1,017
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*	2.5	3.0	3.4
Middle School	3.5	2.5	2.7
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

^{*}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	Total	Expenditures Per Pupil			
All figures are unaudited.	(in 1000s)	District	Elementary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$4,619	\$9,275	\$7,141	\$6,656	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$356	\$715	\$314	\$302	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$0	\$0	\$219	\$364	\$429
Student Support Services	\$387	\$778	\$732	\$810	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$637	\$1,280	\$1,370	\$1,264	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$637	\$1,279	\$1,146	\$1,301	\$1,322
Transportation	\$610	\$790	\$575	\$622	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$776	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$7	\$13	\$62	\$154	\$145
Total*	\$8,029	\$15,681	\$12,187	\$11,756	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$0	\$0	\$1,737	\$1,899	\$1,882

^{*}Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$10,502; Tuition Costs, \$3,249. Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$13,782.

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$2,841,932
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	27.1%

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	63.4	33.2	2.5	0.9
Excluding School Construction	66.1	30.4	2.5	0.9

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.

Every effort is made to equalize the distribution of resources through the budgetary process. This requires a collaborative approach to budget planning that includes the building level administrators and central office. Budgetary decisions are based upon the curriculum initiatives that are currently in place, or are being developed. Teams of teachers are involved in those curriculum development decisions. Since there are only two schools within this district, there is no competition for resources by teachers on the same grade level. The budget process includes open meetings for distribution of information and to allow for community input.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	109
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	14.7%

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	12	1.6	0.7	0.7		
Learning Disability	29	3.9	3.9	4.0		
Intellectual Disability	6	0.8	0.4	0.5		
Emotional Disturbance	8	1.1	0.7	1.0		
Speech Impairment	20	2.7	3.0	2.4		
Other Health Impairment*	24	3.2	1.9	2.1		
Other Disabilities**	10	1.4	0.7	0.9		
Total	109	14.7	11.2	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	100.0	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	4.9	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 wit	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	15.6	20.4	69.7	62.1
	Writing	8.9	19.3	64.4	63.0
	Mathematics	20.0	22.6	68.1	62.7
	Science	N/A	N/A	56.6	56.8
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	18.4		
	% With Accommodations	81.6		
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A		
	% With Accommodations	N/A		
% Asse	% Assessed Using Skills Checklist 8.2			

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 nondisabled 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	6	5.5		

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 Count of Percent of Students					
Peers	Students	District	DRG	State	
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	57	52.3	74.4	71.6	
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	38	34.9	18.8	16.6	
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	14	12.8	6.8	11.8	

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

During the 2007-2008 school year, Preston Public Schools focused on increasing time with non-disabled peers for all identified special education students. After examining how each identified special education student could best benefit from increased regular education programming, instructional time in the regular education setting was increased accordingly with appropriate supports and modifications. Particular effort was made to increase inclusion time for Intellectually Disabled students and students on the autism spectrum who participate in our ABA program. Middle school ID students who participated in co-taught content area classes had the opportunity to apply and practice learned content with meaningful, real world simulations in their living skills classes. Elementary ABA students increased inclusion time by engaging in regular education activities on a regularly scheduled basis. District IEP goals were written to reflect curriculum standards, ensuring programming for all special needs students are based on grade level end-of-year goals. We continue our efforts to provide needed services to at risk students within the regular education setting as a first response rather than pursuing special education eligibility for struggling learners. This includes exhausting regular education interventions and accommodations through the TAM (Teacher Assistance Meeting) and CST (Child Study Team) processes prior to considering a special education evaluation. Clearly identifying regular education interventions and defining adequate student progress will be addressed during the 2008-2009 school year when Preston Veterans' Memorial School will implement tiered instruction and response to intervention programming.

Both Preston Veterans' Memorial School and Preston Plains Middle School seek parent involvement through their respective Parent-Teacher Organizations and through direct appeal for parent involvement in specific programs. The following list highlights those activities involving parents in planning and improvement projects during the 2007-2008 school year:

- Preston Veterans' Memorial School offered multiple parent information sessions concerning the implementation of its standards-based report card. These sessions provided parents with specific information about grade level standards and benchmarks and how these were derived and are applied to student achievement and progress. The feedback provided by parents whose students participated in the 2006-2007 SBRC pilot could also be addressed during these sessions. The Q & A forum encouraged parents to raise issues and concerns which could be directly addressed. Although the explanatory PowerPoint was placed on the district website, parents who attended these sessions were able to share information with those who could not attend.
- A Preschool Advisory Board was convened at Preston Veterans' Memorial School. This Board allows parents the opportunity to collaborate with staff to improve preschool programming, participate in decision-making related to the School Readiness Grant and develop community support systems.
- Preston Plains Middle School teachers and students prepared multiple presentations for parents and Board of Education members on the use of technology in their classrooms. These presentations allowed students to demonstrate learned skills and how they have applied these skills across academic areas. These presentations allowed parents to see firsthand how technology is being incorporated into instruction as well as how it engages and motivates middle school learners. Parents were then invited to join administration and the Board of Education in developing plans and budgets that will sustain and refresh technology throughout the district.