132-00 Rev. 11-6

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09

South Windsor School District

ROBERT KOZACZKA, Superintendent Location: 1737 Main Street Telephone: (860) 291-1205 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% District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.5%

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

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2008 4,795 Grade Range PK-12 5-Year Enrollment Change -6.2%

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in		Percent	
	District	District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	281	5.9	6.4	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	117	2.5	2.2	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	115	2.4	6.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	555	11.6	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	206	74.9	91.3	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	162	19.4	14.2	19.0

^{*53.0%} of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

^{*}To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity				
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent		
American Indian	12	0.3		
Asian American	388	8.1		
Black	282	5.9		
Hispanic	249	5.2		
White	3,864	80.6		
Total Minority	931	19.4		

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 4.1%

Open Choice: 72 student(s) 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: 6.8% 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 42.

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 students and teachers the opportunity to interact with their counterparts "from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds". Seventy Project Choice students attended South Windsor public schools in grades one through twelve. In addition 90 students 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. All schools have introduced "Tribes", a process that transforms the school environment to an inclusive caring culture.

Pleasant Valley School is a Higher Order Thinking school. One of the goals of this program is to develop awareness and appreciation of other cultures through the arts. Students participated in residencies with master teaching artists emphasizing diverse cultural perspectives. Timothy Edwards Middle School employed "Tools for CARE" a sixth -grade character education program that served approximately 370 students. It is designed to reduce barriers by teaching tolerance and developing skills for understanding diversity. It also promotes the development of positive and confident young people by teaching them to respond rationally, thoughtfully, and constructively to personal challenges. Eli Terry students use "I messages" and make decisions through consensus as they learn to accept one another's differences. In addition, fifth-grade students are trained as peer mediators. Philip R. Smith School utilizes school-wide student base groups to focus on a variety of student related themes. These cross-grade level, multi-age groups of students meet five times a year with teachers as facilitators. They infuse into their yearlong themes strategies for children to use in better understanding and appreciating differences in each other with a goal of bias resolution. South Windsor High School offers many opportunities for students to celebrate their diversity and interact with students from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. These interactions occur during the traditional school day and during extracurricular activities and events. Through clubs, such as the Human Relations Club, Interact Club, Peace Jam, Project Unity and Model UN, students meet with neighboring school students to complete community service projects. Orchard Hill School had a performance called, "Dances of India", in which one woman performed the different types of dances of India. At Wapping School, Project Choice brings ten students from Hartford into our school community. The parents of these students have been involved and present for a variety of school events, concerts, conferences, special events, as well as classroom volunteering. The Wapping Student Council organized a school-wide fund raising project which raised awareness of the plight of the Haitian people and raised \$800 for the Haitian Foundation. The extended community has developed a relationship with Wapping School through a food pantry project, and Veterans Day and Memorial Day assemblies.

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	65.6	54.6	59.7
Writing	72.0	62.5	58.5
Mathematics	73.7	62.8	61.6
Grade 4 Reading	72.6	60.7	62.6
Writing	72.3	64.2	51.5
Mathematics	72.5	63.6	58.5
Grade 5 Reading	83.2	66.0	78.9
Writing	83.7	66.5	84.6
Mathematics	81.9	68.8	70.4
Science	78.3	58.1	75.3
Grade 6 Reading	85.7	68.9	76.1
Writing	73.4	62.2	58.9
Mathematics	83.2	68.8	65.6
Grade 7 Reading	89.7	74.9	83.4
Writing	73.7	62.9	62.4
Mathematics	81.9	66.0	71.3
Grade 8 Reading	90.6	68.4	91.0
Writing	83.5	66.5	77.4
Mathematics	88.3	64.5	88.4
Science	83.8	60.6	81.9

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.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <u>www.sde.ct.gov</u> 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	65.5	47.4	73.5
Writing Across the Disciplines	74.4	55.0	74.8
Mathematics	69.6	47.8	78.6
Science	65.1	42.8	80.9

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	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
Four Tests	28.4	36.2	24.7

SAT® I: Reasonin Class of 2008	ng Test	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or	
% of Graduates Te	ested	86.5	74.5	Lower Scores	
Average Score	Mathematics	548	507	81.4	
	Critical Reading	525	503	69.8	
	Writing	531	506	72.9	

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 2008	96.9	92.1	68.7
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	3.1	6.6	62.0
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.6	2.5	36.5

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.5	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.3	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	299.20
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	14.10
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	49.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	103.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	10.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.50
School Level	18.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	21.80
School Nurses	9.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	203.85

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	14.5	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	85.7	83.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	20.7	18.4	18.3
Grade 2	20.3	19.4	19.3
Grade 5	20.6	22.0	21.0
Grade 7	17.9	21.6	20.5
High School	20.9	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,005	991	988
Middle School	1,035	1,018	1,016
High School	1,035	977	1,007

*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*	5.7	3.4	3.3
Middle School	2.7	2.5	2.6
High School	3.8	2.9	2.4

^{*}Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

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		Expenditure	es Per Pupil	
All figures are unaudited.	(in 1000s)	District	PK-12	DRG	State
			Districts		
Instructional Staff and Services	\$33,676	\$6,828	\$7,521	\$7,233	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,756	\$356	\$267	\$245	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,703	\$345	\$461	\$461	\$446
Student Support Services	\$3,977	\$806	\$808	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$5,990	\$1,214	\$1,351	\$1,342	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,155	\$1,045	\$1,382	\$1,386	\$1,377
Transportation	\$3,423	\$676	\$649	\$575	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,586	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,199	\$243	\$152	\$164	\$151
Total	\$59,466	\$11,704	\$12,869	\$12,531	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,390	\$687	\$1,791	\$1,180	\$1,759

Special Education	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education				
Expenditures		District	DRG	State		
	\$10683475	18.0	19.2	20.5		

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	73.9	24.1	1.8	0.1
Excluding School Construction	74.2	23.7	1.9	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 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	572
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 P					
Autism	53	1.1	1.0	0.8	
Learning Disability	131	2.7	3.5	3.9	
Intellectual Disability	16	0.3	0.3	0.5	
Emotional Disturbance	19	0.4	0.6	1.0	
Speech Impairment	110	2.2	2.1	2.3	
Other Health Impairment*	194	4.0	2.1	2.1	
Other Disabilities**	49	1.0	0.7	0.9	
Total	572	11.7	10.2	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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	87.1	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

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 wit	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	45.1	30.2	81.2	65.7
	Writing	28.1	19.5	76.5	64.1
	Mathematics	37.5	30.7	80.3	65.7
	Science	45.6	23.8	81.1	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	20.0	14.1	65.5	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	27.9	13.6	74.4	55.0
	Mathematics	22.5	15.4	69.6	47.8
	Science	20.5	10.6	65.1	42.8

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 34.2					
	% With Accommodations	65.8			
CAPT	CAPT % Without Accommodations				
	% With Accommodations 37.0				
% Asse	ssed Using Skills Checklist	10.6			

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 nondisabled 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	10	1.7			
Private Schools or Other Settings	49	8.6			

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 Count of Percent of Students					
Peers	Students	District	DRG	State	
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	458	80.1	75.9	72.7	
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	55	9.6	17.2	16.1	
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	59	10.3	6.9	11.2	

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 continued 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 18 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.
- •Monthly Change Leadership meetings for all K-12 administrators have focused on creating a Response to Intervention model for our district and at the same time sharpen our common vision of good teaching through workshops on Effective Teaching Strategies. A team of administrators became trained as trainers for the Data Team Process and provided this training to the entire administrative team. We have created a Professional Learning Community with all K-12 "lead learners" as a model for building-level PLCs.
- •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.
- •Our high school continues to address recommendations from a recent NEAS & C report with a focus on strengthening the curriculum and range of course offerings for students.
- •The middle school conducts weekly content area meetings facilitated by the curriculum specialist. All content teams at the middle school have completed rewriting their curriculum using the Backward by Design model to ensure that all units are aligned with state standards.
- •A common format for all district curriculum guides has been created to ensure that all curriculum areas are standards-driven. Our goal is to provide clarity to a guaranteed and viable curriculum K-12.
- •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).