STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2005-06

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 2000 Population: 24,412 1990-2000 Population Growth: 10.5% 2000 Per Capita Income: \$30,966 Number of Public Schools: 7 Number of Nonpublic Schools: 0 Public School Enrollment as a Percent of Town Population: 20.6% Public School Enrollment as % of Total Student Population: 95.2% Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000: 9.3% Adult Education Enrollment in 2004-05 School Year: 45 Number of Adults Receiving Diplomas in 2004-05 School Yr.: 14

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

Current and Past District Need	Year	District	DRG	State
% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2005-06	5.3	4.9	26.9
	2002-03	5.0	N/A	25.4
% of K-12 Students with Non-English Home	2005-06	5.5	6.4	12.6
Language	2000-01	4.0	N/A	12.5
% of Elementary and Middle School Students Above	2005-06	93.9	93.1	88.0
Entry Gr. Who Attended Same School Previous Yr.	2000-01	93.4	N/A	87.0
% of Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool,	2005-06	85.7	90.0	79.2
Nursery School, or Headstart	2000-01	84.2	N/A	74.7
% of Juniors and Seniors Working More Than 16	2005-06	24.8	16.9	21.7
Hours Per Week	2000-01	34.4	N/A	31.7

DISTRICT NEED

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY

Enrollment		Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
Grade Range	PK-12	American Indian	21	0.4
Total Enrollment	5,084	Asian American	338	6.6
5-Year Enrollment Change	0.5%	Black	278	5.5
Projected 2010 Enrollment		Hispanic	201	4.0
Elementary	1,940	White	4,246	83.5
Middle School	1,113	Total Minority 2005-06	838	16.5
High School	1,682	Total Minority 2000-01	630	12.5
Prekindergarten, Other	69			

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 proud history of providing opportunities for students and teachers to interact with their counterparts "from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds". The 2005-06 school year was no exception. Forty-five Project Choice students attended South Windsor public schools in grades one through twelve. In addition 87 students from South Windsor attended the Two Rivers Magnet Middle School in East Hartford.

South Windsor's CARE (Community Accepts and Respects Everyone) initiative serves as a central point to connect students with the lager community. The CARE philosophy is practiced throughout the entire town and school district. Elementary schools throughout the district are introducing "Tribes", a process that transforms the school environment to an inclusive and caring culture. Specific strategies facilitate student's relationship with peers and throughout the schools to instill kindness, respect for diversity, and social support.

The South Windsor staff continues to initiate and participate in programs which afford cross-cultural experiences. Our teachers utilize service learning as a means to connect with the larger community. Students interact with children from various grade levels, schools, and communities to forge valuable connections. Wapping School developed a Kwanza program to teach all students about African American culture and values. Eli Terry Project Choice students participate in school evening activities through host families who bring the children home after the activity. Pleasant Valley School is in its sixth year as a "Higher Order Thinking School" which promotes awareness and appreciation of other cultures through the arts. Approximately 400 Timothy Edwards Middle School students participated in the Hawkwing Project. This project provided students an opportunity to learn about the Lakota Indians and culminated with a collection drive to benefit the Lakota children.

	<u>አ</u> ሕ	Average C	lass Size	District	DRG	State
Staff Count (Full-Time Equivalent)	\$ 7	Grade K	2005-06	20.6	19.0	18.3
# of Certified Staff			2000-01	19.6	N/A	18.1
Teachers	329.6	Grade 2	2005-06	21.1	20.0	19.7
Administrators	23.0		2000-01	18.1	N/A	19.5
Department Chairs	0.0	Grade 5	2005-06	21.7	22.1	21.2
Library/Media Staff	2.0		2000-01	22.4	N/A	21.7
Other Professionals	34.8	Grade 7	2005-06	21.4	21.1	21.1
% Minority 2005-06	4.0		2000-01	20.0	N/A	21.9
% Minority 2000-01	2.5	High	2005-06	21.4	19.9	20.3
# Non-Certified Instructional	103.9	School	2000-01	19.0	N/A	20.0

DISTRICT RESOURCES

Professional Staff Experience and Training	District	DRG	State
Average Number of Years Experience in Connecticut	14.4	12.8	13.1
% with Master's Degree or Above	84.5	83.2	78.5
% Trained as Mentors, Assessors, or Cooperating Teachers	31.8	32.9	28.5

DISTRICT F	RESOURCES,	continued
------------	------------	-----------

Total Hours of Instruction Per Yr.*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary	1,007	989	986
Middle School	1,035	1,022	1,015
High School	1,035	977	1,002

Resource Ratios	District	DRG	State
Students Per Academic Computer	4.7	3.7	3.4
Students Per Teacher	15.4	14.2	13.6
Teachers Per Administrator	14.3	14.3	13.9

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

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

đ,	đ,	đ.	đ.	Physical Fitness	District	State
A.	A.	×.	<u>A</u>	% Passing All 4 Tests	29.1	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.

Connecti	cut Mastery Test	District	State	Of All Dist	ricts in State
% Meeting State Goal in:				Lowest %	Highest %
Grade 3	Reading	67.7	54.4	10.3	91.3
	Writing	64.2	61.0	13.6	100.0
	Mathematics	62.6	56.3	13.6	90.0
Grade 4	Reading	70.4	57.8	17.5	89.7
	Writing	72.6	62.8	29.9	91.1
	Mathematics	79.2	58.8	22.4	92.3
Grade 5	Reading	76.7	60.9	19.5	92.0
	Writing	77.4	65.0	25.0	90.8
	Mathematics	78.7	60.7	18.2	89.9
Grade 6	Reading	84.3	63.6	26.6	92.8
	Writing	79.9	62.2	25.9	94.4
	Mathematics	82.0	58.6	12.5	95.1
Grade 7	Reading	86.0	66.7	26.9	95.0
	Writing	76.5	60.0	25.5	89.8
	Mathematics	82.8	57.0	19.2	93.0
Grade 8	Reading	84.7	66.7	13.3	93.6
	Writing	81.4	62.4	2.7	96.4
	Mathematics	77.4	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	District	State	Of All Districts in State	
% Grade 10 Meeting State Goal in:			Lowest %	Highest %
Reading Across the Disciplines	66.3	46.5	0.0	83.1
Writing Across the Disciplines	63.0	52.4	0.0	86.3
Mathematics	68.4	46.3	0.0	82.3
Science	57.9	44.6	0.0	85.3



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	89.3	92.2	74.9
Mathematics: Average Score	539	545	512
Mathematics: % Scoring 600 or More	30.0	35.5	24.6
Verbal: Average Score	516	519	510
Verbal: % Scoring 600 or More	20.8	23.5	22.7

Dropout Rates	District	State
Cumulative Four-Year Rate for Class of 2005	3.1	7.4
2004-2005 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	0.8	1.7
1999-2000 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	0.9	3.1

Activities of Graduates		Class of	# in District	District %	State %
	Pursuing Higher	2005	346	92.8	82.3
	Education	2000	255	80.4	78.5
	Employed or in	2005	24	6.4	13.9
	Military	2000	21	6.6	17.6
	Unemployed	2005	1	0.3	0.9
		2000	0	0.0	0.7

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 Total Expenditu			Expenditure	es Per Pupil	
All figures are unaudited.	(in 1000s)	District	PK-12	DRG	State
			Districts		
Instructional Staff and Services	\$28,888	\$5,706	\$6,555	\$6,212	\$6,555
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,302	\$257	\$259	\$225	\$260
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,916	\$378	\$402	\$465	\$391
Student Support Services	\$3,411	\$674	\$656	\$737	\$656
Administration and Support Services	\$4,917	\$971	\$1,144	\$1,120	\$1,153
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$4,345	\$858	\$1,120	\$1,152	\$1,113
Transportation	\$2,773	\$533	\$523	\$487	\$522
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,480	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$870	\$172	\$124	\$148	\$122
Total	\$50,902	\$9,785	\$11,031	\$10,755	\$10,994
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,830	\$559	\$1,473	\$1,027	\$1,467
Adult Education	\$35	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	75.9	22.4	1.6	0.1	
Without School Construction	77.0	21.2	1.7	0.1	

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		DRG	State	
Level	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	Per Pupil	% Change
Elementary and Middle					
Total	\$8,266	2.2	\$8,587	\$9,062	5.1
Salaries and Benefits	\$6,944	1.9	\$7,114	\$7,454	4.7
Supplies	\$592	4.4	\$480	\$513	12.7
Equipment	\$88	-11.1	\$182	\$133	16.7
High School					
Total	\$8,772	11.6	\$9,933	\$9,640	3.5
Salaries and Benefits	\$7,287	12.0	\$8,103	\$7,759	3.1
Supplies	\$638	11.9	\$592	\$585	11.6
Equipment	\$89	-3.3	\$188	\$152	14.3

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 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.

One way to demonstrate evidence of improvement of student performance is through test results. Three sets of test data provide opportunities to track student performance as they move through the grades. During the 2005-06 school year the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) was administered to all students in grades 3 - 8. In addition to the CMT, the CT Academic Performance Test (CAPT) is administered to tenth-grade students, and the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) is offered to high school students.

Student results have revealed that South Windsor students customarily do well on all three tests. The 2005-06 CMT was a new generation of assessments in reading, writing, and math. South Windsor students outscored their state peers in all comparisons on the new generation CMT. Because the 2005-06 CMT is a new generation, student peer performance over time cannot be compared to previous CMT results. However, a review of the 2005-06 results revealed the following: Reading scores: Grade 6, 7, and 8 were in the middle range of our District Reference Group (DRG) and grades 3, 4, and 5 were in the lower quarter. Writing scores: Grades 6 and 8 were in the middle range and grades 3, 4, 5, and 7 were in the lower quarter. Math scores: Grade 7 was in the upper quarter, grades 4, 5, and 6, were in the middle range and grades 3 and 8 were in the lower quarter.

South Windsor's tenth-grade students continue to demonstrate strong performance on the CAPT. The 2005-06 scores exceeded the state scores in all areas of comparison. A comparison of 2004-05/2005-06 scores revealed a slight decrease in math, science, and writing and a significant increase in reading. South Windsor staff analyzes the CMT and CAPT results. The analysis provides information as to where we must increase our efforts in order to increase the number of students who are at or above goal on the CMT and the CAPT. The participation rate of South Windsor students in the 2005-06 SAT was 92%. This rate exceeds the Connecticut participation rate by 6%. The overall math score exceeded both the state and nation significantly. The math scores exceeded the state by 28 points, and the nation by 25 points. The overall verbal score exceeded the state by 2 points and the nation by 11 points. While test results are important they do not present a complete picture of educational performance. Over the years, South Windsor schools have been recognized for excellence on the national and state levels. During the 2005-06 school year the town of South Windsor received the distinction of being identified as one of 100 cities in the United States as the best community to raise children. A major part of this recognition is a result of the quality of the schools. South Windsor's achievements such as Robotics, Science Olympiad, Continental Math League and music adjudications provide a well-rounded approach to the arts and sciences. Each of the schools has parents that serve on school development councils to help identify short and long-term school initiatives. In addition, each school has parent advisory councils that assist in supporting the operation of each school. Finally, volunteers are recruited and welcomed into each of the classrooms at every level.

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