

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11**East Hampton School District**

JUDITH A. GOLDEN, Superintendent

Location: 94 Main Street
East Hampton,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 365-4000

Website: www.easthamptonps.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%	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: 93.9%

*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): 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, 2010	1,965
5-Year Enrollment Change	-7.1%

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	225	11.5	13.8	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	12	0.6	2.3	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented	0	0.0	4.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	144	7.3	11.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	117	86.0	85.1	80.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	44	15.4	17.2	13.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	1	0.1
Asian American	39	2.0
Black	24	1.2
Hispanic	68	3.5
Pacific Islander	1	0.1
White	1,820	92.6
Two or more races	12	0.6
Total Minority	145	7.4

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 2.3%

Non-English Home Language:

2.4% 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 12.

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 school day begins each day at Memorial Elementary School 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. As a school community, the Center Elementary School faculty focuses on providing an environment that fosters student academic and social development by expecting kind, responsible actions and tolerance of diversity. These concepts are supported and consistently reinforced through our school wide positive behavior support system. Through the student council, students have had the opportunity to participate in community service projects for those less fortunate, both locally and abroad, including collections for the local food bank, fundraisers for people in Haiti and Tanzania, and making cards for local senior citizens. 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. 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. A number of students participate throughout the year in a mathematics and technology academy with students from a number of area towns. East Hampton High School participates in programs that enable the students to interact with diverse populations. Two of the students attended The Greater Hartford Academy of Arts, an inter-district magnet school. Fourteen students attend various magnet schools in the Hartford area. 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. In living the mission of EHHS, the school undertook projects to provide relief for Haiti hurricane relief. The French club continues to raise funds for the Root of Development organization to purchase goats for people in Haiti. Over 100 students participated in the Interact Club, a community service organization and twenty students attended the Diversity Conference sponsored by the Middlesex Consortium.

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	70.6	58.4	63.1
Writing	73.8	61.1	65.2
Mathematics	68.8	63.0	50.9
Grade 4 Reading	72.3	62.5	55.8
Writing	63.0	65.5	28.0
Mathematics	73.8	67.0	46.3
Grade 5 Reading	78.5	61.4	74.2
Writing	78.2	66.8	60.7
Mathematics	80.8	72.5	55.8
Science	73.7	59.9	60.1
Grade 6 Reading	84.8	76.0	55.4
Writing	73.8	65.2	56.5
Mathematics	86.2	71.3	72.6
Grade 7 Reading	89.6	77.8	70.7
Writing	77.1	58.9	75.9
Mathematics	79.2	68.4	56.4
Grade 8 Reading	86.4	74.7	64.3
Writing	83.8	64.8	74.5
Mathematics	79.6	66.6	59.9
Science	81.6	63.1	70.1

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	68.4	44.7	84.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	83.9	61.2	86.5
Mathematics	71.9	49.5	82.7
Science	64.7	47.0	75.2

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
	53.5	51.0	50.8

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		72.9	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	519	510	57.3
	Critical Reading	535	505	75.6
	Writing	542	510	78.6

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	92.0	81.8	71.8
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.7	2.8	59.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	90.7	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	8.6	9.1

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	123.40
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	13.51
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	23.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	48.40
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	3.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	1.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.00
School Level	6.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	11.00
School Nurses	5.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	100.25

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	15.0	14.6	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	81.8	79.0	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.0	17.5	18.4
Grade 2	20.0	19.2	19.9
Grade 5	22.2	21.7	21.2
Grade 7	22.4	20.7	20.6
High School	20.0	19.8	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,003	984	992
Middle School	1,002	1,025	1,017
High School	999	1,004	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*	5.0	3.2	3.1
Middle School	3.3	2.5	2.4
High School	2.4	2.6	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	\$16,090	\$7,942	\$8,232	\$7,875	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$455	\$225	\$299	\$267	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$738	\$364	\$477	\$387	\$463
Student Support Services	\$1,692	\$835	\$875	\$828	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$2,784	\$1,374	\$1,433	\$1,339	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,586	\$1,277	\$1,421	\$1,322	\$1,410
Transportation	\$1,448	\$694	\$701	\$641	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$926	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$24	\$12	\$161	\$159	\$159
Total	\$26,743	\$13,014	\$13,878	\$13,136	\$13,780
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,466	\$724	\$1,622	\$1,432	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$6,496,548	24.3	21.7	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	65.9	28.0	6.0	0.1
Excluding School Construction	66.4	27.2	6.4	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. Efficient use of staff without causing any employees to lose their jobs. 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. 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. The district was also able to leverage ARRA funds from the Federal government to provide significant on-site professional development in the teaching of reading for teachers in grades K-12.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	146
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	7.4%

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	26	1.3	1.2	1.1
Learning Disability	31	1.6	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	7	0.4	0.4	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	12	0.6	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	32	1.6	2.3	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	32	1.6	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	6	0.3	0.9	0.9
Total	146	7.4	11.3	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	77.8	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	35.3	33.0	80.8	68.6
	Writing	17.2	19.3	75.0	63.7
	Mathematics	34.1	33.4	78.2	68.2
	Science	29.4	21.2	78.0	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	68.4	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	83.9	61.2
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	71.9	49.5
	Science	N/A	N/A	64.7	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	17.8
	% With Accommodations	82.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	11.1
	% With Accommodations	88.9
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		12.2

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 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	0.7
Private Schools or Other Settings	9	6.2

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	106	72.6	77.0	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	33	22.6	13.9	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	7	4.8	9.1	11.0

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The major focus at Memorial Elementary School (MES) continued to be reading. Data Teams enabled teachers to provide students an intervention that addressed specific skills. There was over a 9% increase in students meeting goal in reading over 2009 CMT scores and almost 5% increase in reaching the math goal. Teachers continuously assessed students throughout the year and made sure the students were being taught on their instructional level in a guided reading group. Additional reading and writing services were provided by classroom teachers and our support staff for any student needing intervention. Over 95% of third grade students reached proficiency or better in math. Kindergarten teachers and the language arts department received ongoing professional development from LiteracyHow in an effort to improve reading instruction and student learning. Center Elementary School staff has worked to improve reading instruction through the implementation of the reader's workshop. 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 reading and special education teachers. Professional development for teachers included working with a reading consultant throughout the year to develop strategies for best practice. Work with a reading consultant will continue next year on best practices within the reader's workshop. In mathematics, emphasis is on focused attention to implementation of the Everyday Math program, a research-based core program, to provide comprehensive instruction. Center Elementary School has fully implemented the SRBI (Scientific Research Based Intervention) model. Universal screens and district data assessments are used to determine the need for student intervention. Data teams meet to analyze data, discuss curriculum and instructional strategies, and focus on student learning outcomes. East Hampton Middle School has continued its emphasis on improving our reading program. This year we implemented a block schedule format that provided the time periods necessary for implementing a reader's workshop model in the sixth grade and allowing for more in-depth reading instruction in the seventh and eighth grade. We added supplemental reading classes at all grade levels for students requiring that level of support and employed an improved progress monitoring system to provide the data to drive instruction for those students. We continued our focus on teaching content literacy and the implementation of reading activities across curricular areas. In addition to improving our general instruction, we identified reading strand areas on the CMT where we were in need of improvement and focused instruction in those areas. In the area of mathematics we continued to rework questions in our Daily Oral Math program to consistently align with the Fourth Generation CMT. Here, too, we improved our progress monitoring system for students receiving supplemental support in math. Throughout all curricular areas we continued the collaborative process of creating common assessments and using the data from those assessments to inform instruction and improve student learning. The 2010-2011 high school improvement plan was centered around collecting, organizing, analyzing, and reporting on data from a variety of performance measures including formative assessments ("snapshots"), common, summative assessments, and CAPT, PSAT, SAT, and AP assessments. To promote a broad faculty participation and investment in the process, all teachers served on one of four school improvement committees directly related to the school improvement plan in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and climate. Their work directly informed the school administration on decisions of professional development and allocation of resources. The objective of our work was to demonstrate consistency and equity for all students across multiple objective measures of achievement. This information was used to investigate the relationship between the objective measures of student achievement and high academic standards and student ability. Significant progress was made on our two academic goals addressing the issue of gender gap in achievement: 1) Having an average of 65% of males and females score at or above goal over the 2011 and 2012 administration of the CAPT Mathematics, Reading Across the Disciplines and Science tests and 2) Having an average of 75% of males and females scoring at or above goal over the 2011, and 2012 administrations of the CAPT Writing Across the Disciplines test.
