STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2003-04

South Windsor School District JOSEPH L WOOD, Superintendent

Telephone: 860-291-1205



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

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Hartford Public School Enrollment as a Percent of Town Population: 20.7% 2000 Population: 24,412 Public School Enrollment as % of Total Student Population: 95.2% Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000: 14.3%

2000 Per Capita Income: \$30,966 Adult Education Enrollment in 2002-03 School Year: 51

Number of Public Schools: 7 Number of Adults Receiving Diplomas in 2002-03 School Yr.: 11

Number of Nonpublic Schools: 1

Education Reference Group (ERG): B ERG 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	ERG	State
% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2003-04	5.6	5.1	26.6
	2002-03	5.0	4.9	25.4
% of K-12 Students with Non-English Home	2003-04	5.3	6.8	12.4
Language	1998-99	3.9	6.1	12.3
% of Elementary and Middle School Students above	2003-04	95.0	93.6	88.9
Entry Gr. who Attended this School the Previous Yr.	1998-99	90.7	90.5	86.0
% of Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool,	2003-04	81.0	90.8	76.4
Nursery School, or Headstart	1998-99	88.7	87.8	72.0
% of Juniors and Seniors Working More Than 16	2003-04	23.6	20.2	23.0
Hours Per Week	1998-99	18.3	24.6	31.3

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY

Enrollment		Race/Ethnicity (Jan.)	Number	Percent
Grade Range	PK-12	American Indian	19	0.4
Total January Enrollment	5,113	Asian American	296	5.8
5-Year Oct. Enrollment Change	6.0%	Black	264	5.2
Projected Oct. 2008 Enrollment		Hispanic	172	3.4
Elementary	1,953	White	4,336	84.8
Middle School	1,146	Other	26	0.5
High School	1,641	Total Minority 2003-04	777	15.2
Prekindergarten, Other	55	Total Minority 1998-99	525	10.9

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.

The South Windsor Public Schools have a long history of cooperation with Hartford and surrounding towns to enhance the education of students. South Windsor was a charter town in Project Concern and a founding town in the Greater Hartford Academy of the Performing Arts. The number of Hartford students enrolled in the South Windsor Public Schools has grown to approximately sixty. This is almost a fifty percent increase since the inception of Project Choice. The South Windsor Public Schools, in partnership with Hartford, Glastonbury, and Manchester, established the Two Rivers Magnet Middle School. During the 2003-04 school year, 110 South Windsor students joined their peers from our partner schools at the Two Rivers Magnet Middle School.

The staff in South Windsor continues to take advantage of opportunities to offer students cross-cultural experiences. Sister School Partnerships flourish at the middle school and elementary schools. The high school received a Choice Support Grant for the second year in a row. This grant allows high school students to mentor elementary students in South Windsor and Hartford.

Finally, all schools in South Windsor are involved in our town/school Community Accepts and Respects Everyone (CARE) initiatives. The initiatives give students learning opportunities which teach acceptance and respect for all.

DISTRICT RESOURCES

Staff Count (Full-Time Equivalent)	
# of Certified Staff	220.4
Teachers	338.4
Administrators	23.1
Library/Media Staff	2.0
Other Professionals	36.3
% Minority 2003-04	2.9
% Minority 1998-99	1.9
# Non-Certified Instructional	99.0

Average C	Class Size	District	ERG	State
Grade K	2003-04	19.7	19.2	18.7
	1998-99	20.5	19.3	18.6
Grade 2	2003-04	19.5	20.2	19.8
	1998-99	21.3	20.3	20.1
Grade 5	2003-04	22.5	22.2	21.4
	1998-99	21.4	21.5	21.5
Grade 7	2003-04	19.7	21.4	21.6
	1998-99	18.0	21.3	21.7
High	2003-04	20.4	20.5	20.3
School	1998-99	20.7	20.7	19.9

Professional Staff Experience and Training	District	ERG	State
Average Number of Years Experience in Connecticut	13.8	12.9	13.5
% with Master's Degree or Above	76.2	81.8	78.6
% Trained as Mentors, Assessors, or Cooperating Teachers	31.9	29.2	26.6

DISTRICT RESOURCES, continued

Total Hours of Instruction Per Yr.*	Dist	ERG	State
Elementary	1,005	984	984
Middle School	1,035	1,018	1,014
High School	1,035	991	1,000

^{*}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	ERG	State
Students Per Academic Computer	5.0	3.9	3.7
Students Per Teacher	15.1	14.1	13.8
Teachers Per Administrator	14.6	14.2	14.0

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

夹







Physical Fitness	District	ERG	State
% Passing All 4 Tests	37.9	43.0	34.6

Connecticut Mastery Test, Third 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.

	cut Mastery Test, 3 rd Gen. ng State Goal	District 2000-01	District 2003-04	ERG 2003-04	State 2003-04
Grade 4	Reading	67	74.7	74.1	54.3
	Writing	57	78.0	81.7	65.8
	Mathematics	78	79.1	77.1	57.6
	All Three Tests	48.5	61.5	62.9	42.3
Grade 6	Reading	74	78.3	79.8	61.9
	Writing	72	78.1	78.4	62.2
	Mathematics	78	83.3	79.6	62.0
	All Three Tests	59.6	66.9	65.7	46.4
Grade 8	Reading	77	81.1	84.8	66.7
	Writing	66	84.7	80.6	61.8
	Mathematics	74	76.5	78.3	56.3
	All Three Tests	55.3	67.3	67.7	45.7
Participat	ion Rate	98.1	98.1	98.2	97.4



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, 2 nd Gen.	District	District	ERG 2003-04	State
% Grade 10 Meeting State Goal	2000-01	2003-04	2003-04	2003-04
Reading Across the Disciplines	45	68.1	69.6	48.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	56	67.3	71.4	53.7
Mathematics	60	69.6	67.0	46.1
Science	56	60.8	66.1	47.4
All Four Tests	31.3	43.0	45.7	27.7
Participation Rate	96.1	98.4	98.7	96.9



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 1998		Class of 2003		
	District	District	ERG	State	
% of Graduates Tested	90.8	90.7	91.6	76.2	
Mathematics: Average Score	519	536	546	508	
Mathematics: % Scoring 600 or More	26.2	25.7	34.0	23.8	
Verbal: Average Score	515	510	537	504	
Verbal: % Scoring 600 or More	22.2	18.3	29.2	21.1	

Dropout Rates	District	ERG	State
Cumulative Four-Year Rate for Class of 2003	3.4	3.6	9.5
2002-03 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	1.2	0.9	2.1
1997-98 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	1.9	1.5	3.5

Activities of	Graduates	Class of	# in District	District %	ERG %	State %
*	Pursuing Higher	2003	268	85.6	90.6	80.3
	Education	1998	240	87.8	89.2	76.7
5 1.	Employed or in	2003	26	8.3	7.0	15.7
Mil	Military	1998	15	5.5	8.1	17.8
	Unemployed	2003	0	0.0	0.3	1.1
		1998	0	0.0	0.4	2.0

132-00 Page 5

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. ERG 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	PK-12	ERG	State
			Districts		
Instructional Staff and Services	\$26,104	\$5,146	\$6,046	\$5,758	\$6,036
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,787	\$352	\$249	\$232	\$252
Improvement of Instruction and	\$1,707	\$337	\$386	\$462	\$376
Educational Media Services					
Student Support Services	\$3,075	\$606	\$583	\$653	\$580
Administration and Support Services	\$4,354	\$858	\$1,051	\$1,090	\$1,061
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$4,295	\$847	\$998	\$1,021	\$992
Transportation	\$2,216	\$419	\$468	\$420	\$470
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,673	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$860	\$170	\$120	\$126	\$117
Total	\$46,071	\$8,877	\$10,129	\$9,931	\$10,096
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,334	\$657	\$1,132	\$994	\$1,177
Adult Education	\$32	\$620	N/A	\$820	\$996

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	75.5	23.1	1.1	0.2
Without School Construction	76.6	21.9	1.2	0.3

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	District		ERG		State	
Level	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change
Elementary and Middle						
Total	\$7,679	4.0	\$7,881	3.9	\$8,306	3.6
Salaries and Benefits	\$6,282	1.8	\$6,544	4.1	\$6,848	3.9
Supplies	\$570	18.8	\$423	9.9	\$431	1.4
Equipment	\$167	24.6	\$117	-9.3	\$125	-3.8
High School						
Total	\$8,257	6.0	\$9,714	6.2	\$9,192	3.3
Salaries and Benefits	\$6,644	4.1	\$7,901	6.7	\$7,406	3.7
Supplies	\$636	19.8	\$537	10.3	\$504	1.8
Equipment	\$171	28.6	\$139	-2.8	\$153	-11.6

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 recognizes that, at all times, every school in the district should have comparable resources within existing financial limitations. To that end, a systematic multilevel process involving teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists and central office has been used to build a budget that achieves an equitable allocation of those resources. Meetings are held with representatives of each building and department to identify needs and supporting rationale. Recommendations are then reviewed by the superintendent. In addition, a five-year continuous cycle of curriculum review insures that every content area across the district has up-to-date materials that reflect appropriate standards and practices. Enrollment figures are closely monitored across the district to ensure that school staffing and resources are adequate. Each year, a historical analysis of resource usage is undertaken. A per pupil allocation level for supplies and equipment is used as a guideline for the development of the overall program budget. Therefore, each school receives a proportional share of the budget reflective of its enrollment. District initiatives are identified through an extensive strategic planning process involving the Board of Education, representative groups from all schools and the community at large. Finally, an annual assessment of each school facility addresses particular building needs.

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.

Question: What do you call a school system where three schools have received national recognition in as many years; where teachers are consistently recognized for superior curricular projects by the State of Connecticut in its "Celebration of Excellence" program; where its music program has been recognized by the music industry as one of the top 100 in the country; and whose students consistently outperform their peers on state and national tests?

Answer: A great investment.

Here are some of the facts that support this conclusion. South Windsor students continue to perform well on the Connecticut Mastery Tests (CMT), the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), and the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT). Since 2000-01, the percentage of South Windsor students achieving goal on the CMT's has increased in all tests and in all grades. The 2004 results of the CAPT are similar. The scores of SWHS students on the 2004 CAPT are consistent with a pattern of continual increases. Since 1999, the number of South Windsor students achieving goal on all four tests has almost doubled. The test results of the Class of 2003 Scholastic Assessment Tests (SAT) are similar to previous years' results. The 2003 scores were slightly higher than those of 2002. However, scores have remained fairly constant over a ten-year period.

Notwithstanding the positive results of South Windsor students on these tests, South Windsor staff is committed to the pursuit of excellence. Plans call for the continued use of data-driven-decision-making, facilitated by our eScholar data warehouse. In the CMT's, we have set an objective of having 80 percent of our students achieving goal on all_tests on a consistent basis. To enhance the CAPT scores, we will work with students to help them reach goal and also use the data to continue to align curriculum and instruction to the tests. Finally, in the SAT, we are going to continue our efforts to ensure that our high school curriculum reflects the new generation of the SAT.

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.swindsor.k12.ct.us