

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2005-06**Easton School District****ALLEN J FOSSBENDER, Superintendent**

Telephone: (203) 261-2513



 This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c).

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Fairfield	Public School Enrollment as a Percent of Town Population: 15.6%
2000 Population: 7,272	Public School Enrollment as % of Total Student Population: 89.7%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 15.4%	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000: N/A
2000 Per Capita Income: \$53,885	Adult Education Enrollment in 2004-05 School Year: N/A
Number of Public Schools: 2	Number of Adults Receiving Diplomas in 2004-05 School Yr.: N/A
Number of Nonpublic Schools: 1	

 District Reference Group (DRG): A DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment.

DISTRICT NEED

Current and Past District Need	Year	District	DRG	State
% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2005-06	0.7	1.1	26.9
	2002-03	1.4	N/A	25.4
% of K-12 Students with Non-English Home Language	2005-06	1.6	2.5	12.6
	2000-01	5.4	N/A	12.5
% of Elementary and Middle School Students Above Entry Gr. Who Attended Same School Previous Yr.	2005-06	92.9	94.0	88.0
	2000-01	97.0	N/A	87.0
% of Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School, or Headstart	2005-06	94.3	95.3	79.2
	2000-01	84.8	N/A	74.7
% of Juniors and Seniors Working More Than 16 Hours Per Week	2005-06	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2000-01	N/A	N/A	N/A

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY

Enrollment	
Grade Range	PK- 8
Total Enrollment	1,154
5-Year Enrollment Change	12.0%
Projected 2010 Enrollment	
Elementary	594
Middle School	577
High School	0
Prekindergarten, Other	23

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	0	0.0
Asian American	44	3.8
Black	12	1.0
Hispanic	24	2.1
White	1,074	93.1
Total Minority 2005-06	80	6.9
Total Minority 2000-01	58	5.6

EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Connecticut law requires that school districts provide educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. This may occur through magnet school programs, public school choice programs, charter schools, minority staff recruitment, inter- or intradistrict programs and projects, distance learning, or other experiences. Below is the description submitted by this school district of how it provides such experiences.


Helen Keller Middle School and Samuel Staples Elementary School involve all of its students in experiences that build awareness of difference among people. The faculty embraces opportunities to incorporate diversity in a community that essentially is lacking in this area.

Samuel Staples and Helen Keller participate in Open Choice, an urban/suburban cooperative program, designed to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Students from urban environments enroll as full-time students and most continue from elementary through middle school in Easton.

The devastation from Hurricane Katrina, the Tsunami and the earthquake in Indonesia provided some context to many impoverished areas in the world. Students collected funds and raised awareness of the countries affected. An extraordinary evening of fun was organized and run by Helen Keller students, faculty and parents raised over \$10,000 for the Mikey's Way Foundation, Inc. a charitable non-profit organization to help pediatric cancer patients undergoing the strain of treatment. Through this Activity Night, Helen Keller students demonstrated support, empathy and compassion for those in need. Founded by Michael Friedman, a Keller graduate impacted by a rare form of cancer, the Foundation provides electronic toys and games to hospitalized pediatric cancer patients and computers, printers and other electronic equipment to the hospitals that treat these children.

We continue to identify ways to understand those who live in communities different from ours.

DISTRICT RESOURCES

Staff Count (Full-Time Equivalent)		Average Class Size				
# of Certified Staff		Grade K	2005-06	District	DRG	State
Teachers	81.2			20.3	18.8	18.3
Administrators	5.6			21.0	N/A	18.1
Department Chairs	0.0	Grade 2	2005-06	21.5	21.6	19.7
Library/Media Staff	2.0			19.8	N/A	19.5
Other Professionals	7.9	Grade 5	2005-06	19.8	21.7	21.2
% Minority 2005-06	1.0			23.2	N/A	21.7
% Minority 2000-01	3.4	Grade 7	2005-06	20.8	21.6	21.1
# Non-Certified Instructional	21.0			21.8	N/A	21.9
		High School	2005-06	N/A	N/A	N/A
			2000-01	N/A	N/A	N/A

Professional Staff Experience and Training	District	DRG	State
Average Number of Years Experience in Connecticut	10.4	11.1	13.1
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.5	85.5	78.5
% Trained as Mentors, Assessors, or Cooperating Teachers	43.7	30.5	28.5

DISTRICT RESOURCES, continued

Total Hours of Instruction Per Yr.*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary	972	1,005	986
Middle School	1,001	1,002	1,015
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*State law requires at least 900 hours for gr. 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours for half-day kindergarten.

Resource Ratios	District	DRG	State
Students Per Academic Computer	2.1	2.9	3.4
Students Per Teacher	14.2	13.2	13.6
Teachers Per Administrator	14.5	13.3	13.8

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Physical Fitness	District	State
% Passing All 4 Tests	52.9	35.6

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Meeting State Goal: The state goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. 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.

Connecticut Mastery Test % Meeting State Goal in:	District	State	Of All Districts in State		
			Lowest %	Highest %	
Grade 3	Reading	76.5	54.4	10.3	91.3
	Writing	81.4	61.0	13.6	100.0
	Mathematics	79.5	56.3	13.6	90.0
Grade 4	Reading	82.8	57.8	17.5	89.7
	Writing	89.1	62.8	29.9	91.1
	Mathematics	86.7	58.8	22.4	92.3
Grade 5	Reading	82.5	60.9	19.5	92.0
	Writing	80.7	65.0	25.0	90.8
	Mathematics	83.3	60.7	18.2	89.9
Grade 6	Reading	90.2	63.6	26.6	92.8
	Writing	89.4	62.2	25.9	94.4
	Mathematics	82.9	58.6	12.5	95.1
Grade 7	Reading	88.2	66.7	26.9	95.0
	Writing	78.7	60.0	25.5	89.8
	Mathematics	85.8	57.0	19.2	93.0
Grade 8	Reading	87.5	66.7	13.3	93.6
	Writing	90.0	62.4	2.7	96.4
	Mathematics	85.8	58.3	0.0	93.6



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, 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.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE, continued

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Second Generation, % Meeting State Goal: The state Goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. Students receive certification of mastery for each area in which they meet or exceed the Goal. 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.


Conn. Academic Performance Test % Grade 10 Meeting State Goal in:	District	State	Of All Districts in State	
			Lowest %	Highest %
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



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, 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.

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test	Class of 2000	Class of 2005	
	District	District	State
% of Graduates Tested	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics: Average Score	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics: % Scoring 600 or More	N/A	N/A	N/A
Verbal: Average Score	N/A	N/A	N/A
Verbal: % Scoring 600 or More	N/A	N/A	N/A

Dropout Rates	District	State
Cumulative Four-Year Rate for Class of 2005	N/A	N/A
2004-2005 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	N/A	N/A
1999-2000 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	0.0	3.1

Activities of Graduates	Class of	# in District	District %	State %
 Pursuing Higher Education	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Employed or in Military	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unemployed	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2000	N/A	N/A	N/A

DISTRICT REVENUES/EXPENDITURES 2004-05

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	Elementary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$8,150	\$7,168	\$6,443	\$7,645	\$6,555
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$184	\$162	\$266	\$256	\$260
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$172	\$151	\$219	\$469	\$391
Student Support Services	\$165	\$145	\$646	\$753	\$656
Administration and Support Services	\$1,301	\$1,144	\$1,174	\$1,349	\$1,153
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,141	\$1,003	\$979	\$1,406	\$1,113
Transportation	\$840	\$537	\$522	\$615	\$522
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$116	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$40	\$120	\$122
Total*	\$12,069	\$10,587	\$10,946	\$12,981	\$10,994
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$5,584	\$4,911	\$1,140	\$2,079	\$1,467
Adult Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$18,339; Tuition Costs, \$6,205.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$11,636.

Revenue Sources, % 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
With School Construction	73.9	25.0	1.1	0.0
Without School Construction	95.4	2.9	1.6	0.0

Selected Regular Education Expenditures, Amount Per Pupil and Percent Change from Prior Year. Selected regular education expenditures exclude costs of special education and land, building, and debt service.

Expenditures by Grade Level	District		DRG	State	
	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	Per Pupil	% Change
Elementary and Middle					
Total	\$8,992	8.9	\$10,587	\$9,062	5.1
Salaries and Benefits	\$6,923	8.8	\$8,533	\$7,454	4.7
Supplies	\$471	4.0	\$594	\$513	12.7
Equipment	\$10	-37.5	\$169	\$133	16.7
High School*					
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Salaries and Benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Supplies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Equipment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*High school expenditures are not reported for districts without secondary schools.

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 Easton Public School District consists of two schools, a K-5 elementary school and a 6-8 middle school. On an annual basis, the budget is prepared collaboratively. Due to our small size, we are able to employ a process that involves representation of every level of professional staff, as well as representation of the Board of Education and community members. From each of these groups, input leads to the development of a list of budgetary priorities. Between the months of October and the final town approval of the budget in the spring, there are numerous meetings to present and get input on the budget. The process itself lends itself to equality.

A second aspect of our budget that promotes equity is the degree of detail that we include in our budget documents. The level of disclosure provides detailed information about the level of funding allocated to each school. This specificity allows the community at large to scrutinize not only the funding patterns, but also the specific ways in which funding is applied to new program development.

We view our schools systematically, recognizing that the whole cannot be greater than any of its parts. Within this framework, we consider the greatest needs and make those priorities. Therefore, the funding to the individual schools is based on a model of continual improvement for our system. The equity issue is one that has, in this district, simply never been an issue.

EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED IMPROVEMENTS IN STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Below is a summary, submitted by this school district, of the major trends in student performance and accomplishments that indicate sustained improvement over time. Also, areas of need are identified and plans to address these needs are presented.

The CMT-4 was administered for the first time during March 2006. Test scores were relative to schools in our DRG, with marked increases in reading, math, and writing across grades 4, 6, and 8.

Third, fifth and seventh graders were tested for the first time. The percentage of third grade students at or above goal in math was 79.5%, 76.5% in reading, and 81.4% in writing. In grade five, the percentage of students at or above goal was 83.3% in math, 82.5% in reading, and 80.7% in writing. The percentage of seventh grade students at or above goal in math was 85.8%, 88.1% in reading, and 78.7% in writing. Although the CMT-4 is a new version of the test and it was given during March, as opposed to September, grades 4, 6, and 8 demonstrated significant improvement in eight out of nine subtests administered.

Grade to grade comparisons to previous CMT test versions are limited. Even though test versions differ, cohort comparisons can be made between fourth graders that took the CMT-3 in 2004-05 and more recently as fifth graders taking the CMT-4 in 2005-06. This particular cohort moved from 69.8% at or above goal in mathematics as fourth graders to 83.3% as fifth graders, 71.6% at or above goal in reading as fourth graders to 82.5% at or above goal as fifth graders, and 69.8% at or above goal in writing as fourth graders to 80.7% at or above goal as fifth graders.

Another cohort comparison can be made between sixth graders that took the CMT-3 in 2004-05 and more recently as seventh graders taking the CMT-4 in 2005-06. This particular cohort moved from 77.4% at or above goal in math as sixth graders to 85.8% at or above goal as seventh graders, 79.8% at or above goal in reading as sixth graders to 88.1% at or above goal as seventh graders, and 75.8% at or above goal as sixth graders to 78.7% at or above goal as seventh graders.

Based on these scores and other assessment data, the elementary school will continue guided reading to facilitate small group explicit reading instruction. The middle school will continue implementing the Reciprocal Teaching Model to improve reading comprehension across the curriculum. Elementary teachers have been trained in the Empowering Writers Program. A new mathematics program, Growing with Math, was implemented during 2005-06 in grades K-5. Professional development will focus on using data to drive instructional decisions. The ER9 School Strategic Plan will continue to focus on aligning curriculum, providing meaningful professional development based on data information, and looking at student work in a systematic manner to improve student achievement.

Strategic School Profiles may be viewed on the internet at www.state.ct.us/sde . A more detailed, searchable SSP database, data tables, and additional CT education facts are also available at this site.

For the school district website, see www.er9.org

Filename: DIST028.DOC
Directory: J:\SSPbox\SSP Internet 2005-06
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\cloudr\Application
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: 46-00
Subject:
Author: csde
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 12/4/2006 11:18 AM
Change Number: 1
Last Saved On: 12/4/2006 11:18 AM
Last Saved By: csde
Total Editing Time: 1 Minute
Last Printed On: 12/4/2006 12:11 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 7
Number of Words: 2,598 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 13,773 (approx.)