

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**South Windsor School District**

ROBERT KOZACZKA, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 291-1205

Location: 1737 Main Street
South Windsor,
Connecticut

Website: www.swindsor.k12.ct.us

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: Hartford	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$30,966
Town Population in 2000: 24,412	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.3%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 10.5%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.6%
Number of Public Schools: 7	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.8%

*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): B 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, 2007	4,934
5-Year Enrollment Change	-3.2%

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	268	5.4	5.3	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	99	2.0	2.2	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	149	3.0	6.2	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	577	11.7	10.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	222	75.8	91.3	79.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	154	19.3	15.5	20.2

*42.3% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	16	0.3
Asian American	378	7.7
Black	275	5.6
Hispanic	237	4.8
White	4,028	81.6
Total Minority	906	18.4

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 4.3%

Open Choice: 59 students attended this district as part of the Open Choice program. Open Choice brings students from urban areas to attend school in suburban or rural towns, and students from non-urban areas to attend city schools.

Non-English Home Language: 6.2% 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 40.

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 South Windsor public schools have a significant history of providing opportunities for students and teachers to interact with their counterparts "from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds". The 2007-08 school year was no exception. Fifty-nine Project Choice students attended South Windsor public schools in grades one through twelve. In addition 72 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 larger community. The CARE philosophy is practiced throughout the entire town and school district. Elementary schools throughout the district have introduced "Tribes", a process that transforms the school environment to an inclusive and caring culture. 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 continues as a "Higher Order Thinking School" which promotes awareness and appreciation of other cultures through the arts. Approximately 376 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. Over 100 students participated in the Empty Bowls Program. This interdisciplinary program is one of inclusion. It cuts across social, political, racial, religious, age and any other perceived boundaries; and it provides a tool all students can use towards the goal of ending hunger. At P. R. Smith School community discussions and learning experiences regarding diversity and bias reduction are infused into the culture and interactions of our learning community. Orchard Hill's Mac's Apple Corps Program supports a goal of fostering compassion for others and creating an awareness of diversity in the world. South Windsor High School's Human Relations committee, which is primarily a student organization, and the CARE Committee which is primarily a faculty committee sponsored a multi-cultural fair that included visual, musical and dance presentations, food and other elements of cultures from around the world. Also, sixty high school students mentored students at Dwight Elementary in Hartford.

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	61.5	52.0	51.5
Writing	69.6	63.4	44.8
Mathematics	66.4	60.0	50.9
Grade 4 Reading	71.3	55.9	71.5
Writing	78.2	62.9	75.5
Mathematics	75.2	60.3	68.6
Grade 5 Reading	74.7	62.2	61.1
Writing	81.1	64.5	79.0
Mathematics	77.4	65.9	61.7
Science	62.4	54.9	42.0
Grade 6 Reading	81.3	66.3	70.2
Writing	74.4	61.9	68.5
Mathematics	78.7	66.4	63.7
Grade 7 Reading	88.0	71.1	80.6
Writing	79.9	62.0	79.4
Mathematics	86.5	63.0	89.0
Grade 8 Reading	84.6	64.8	82.4
Writing	87.8	63.4	88.7
Mathematics	79.9	60.8	75.5
Science	78.3	58.6	74.8

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 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	59.8	45.5	64.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	70.7	57.9	60.0
Mathematics	72.4	50.1	74.6
Science	66.3	46.3	72.3

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
	32.5	36.1	33.7

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		88.2	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	534	504	75.4
	Critical Reading	515	502	62.3
	Writing	517	503	63.8

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	97.7	92.6	68.5
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	2.0	6.2	67.7
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.4	1.7	79.3

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	93.3	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	6.2	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	298.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	21.10
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	46.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	89.00
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	10.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.50
School Level	18.50
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	6.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	22.80
School Nurses	9.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	208.50

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	14.7	13.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.8	82.7	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.7	18.3	18.1
Grade 2	20.8	19.8	19.3
Grade 5	21.9	22.3	20.9
Grade 7	19.3	21.2	20.5
High School	21.2	19.8	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,005	988	987
Middle School	1,035	1,022	1,017
High School	1,035	977	1,006

*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*	6.2	3.6	3.4
Middle School	3.0	2.7	2.7
High School	4.0	3.2	2.7

*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 All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$32,598	\$6,494	\$7,153	\$6,939	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,468	\$292	\$262	\$237	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,431	\$285	\$443	\$491	\$429
Student Support Services	\$3,780	\$753	\$764	\$803	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$5,791	\$1,154	\$1,256	\$1,217	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$4,864	\$969	\$1,329	\$1,365	\$1,322
Transportation	\$3,136	\$594	\$605	\$537	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,714	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,134	\$226	\$147	\$159	\$145
Total	\$56,916	\$10,983	\$12,203	\$11,984	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,034	\$604	\$1,875	\$1,397	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$10,059,395
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	17.7%

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	76.8	21.0	2.0	0.2
Excluding School Construction	77.4	20.3	2.2	0.2

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.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	586
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.7%

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	45	0.9	0.9	0.7
Learning Disability	148	3.0	3.5	4.0
Intellectual Disability	17	0.3	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	24	0.5	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	116	2.3	2.2	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	189	3.8	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	47	0.9	0.6	0.9
Total	586	11.7	10.4	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	96.2	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	2.8	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 with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	30.7	20.4	77.2	62.1
	Writing	34.5	19.3	78.8	63.0
	Mathematics	29.1	22.6	77.6	62.7
	Science	31.6	22.2	70.5	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	5.7	11.4	59.8	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	14.7	16.3	70.7	57.9
	Mathematics	17.1	14.7	72.4	50.1
	Science	8.6	14.4	66.3	46.3

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	41.0
	% With Accommodations	59.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	17.1
	% With Accommodations	82.9
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		10.1

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	11	1.9
Private Schools or Other Settings	42	7.2

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	466	79.5	75.0	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	67	11.4	17.7	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	53	9.0	7.3	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Beginning January 2007 a new central office team focused on presenting a unified voice focused on instruction and learning. Through a systemic instructional improvement program based on the Harvard Change Leadership model we have begun to refine the improvement efforts already in place to create a more “laser-like” focus on ensuring high levels of learning for all students, a standards-based curriculum that is relevant to students, and many opportunities for students and adults to develop positive relationships and interact with each other about the learning. Current improvement work underway in South Windsor Public Schools:

- The South Windsor Vision for Learning has been in place for 17 years. There is a systematic planning process in place requiring each school to develop yearly action plans. There is a district wide committee that monitors the action plan process. There is a systematic curriculum review process in place. Each of these processes has been refined to become more focused on student achievement results with a specific target of increasing literacy achievement K-12. All teachers develop professional learning plans focused on improving student literacy achievement. Teachers have been encouraged to work in teams to accomplish these goals.
 - In order to create safe, caring and supportive learning environments for all students and staff the district has committed to extensive training in the Tribes Learning Community process (Tribes TLC®). This training is centered on best practice research and promotes positive, respectful school climates with high expectations for all students.
 - The central office team attended a three-day Change Leadership seminar with Richard Lemons and Deborah Haskins and then presented an overview of the Change Leadership model to all K-12 administrators and curriculum leaders at a dinner retreat meeting. The workshop modeled interactive structures as a way to achieve the workshop’s objectives.
 - Monthly Change Leadership meetings are planned for all K-12 administrators using the Dufour guide, Learning by Doing. We are creating a Professional Learning Community with all K-12 “lead learners” as a model for building level PLCs.
 - The administrative team regularly participates in professional learning experiences such as book study groups on Good to Great, Leadership on the Line, and Change Leadership and a representative team of administrators attended the two-day Dufour conference on Building Professional Learning Communities; From Theory to Practice.
 - Over the past year we have had the opportunity to bring several new administrators to our district and we have been successful in finding candidates who have strength in literacy and developing professional learning communities.
 - The middle school conducts weekly content area meetings facilitated by the curriculum specialist. All content teams at the middle school have completed a three-day Backward by Design training. These weekly meetings will be used to continue the work of unit design. Curriculum mapping tools were in place by summer 2007 to assist them with aligning their curriculum to state standards and mapping their curriculum in real time.
 - The five elementary schools have created extended professional development blocks for teachers to work on their professional learning plans which are focused on literacy instruction. All elementary schools have common planning times for each grade level and specials teachers.
 - The district has established a districtwide assessment database to collect and analyze assessment data. Districtwide common assessments have been developed or refined to more closely align with state standards. All districtwide assessments have identified benchmarks aligned with state reporting benchmarks. (Advanced, goal, proficient, basic, and below basic).
-