

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10****South Windsor School District**

ROBERT KOZACZKA, Superintendent

Location: 1737 Main Street  
South Windsor,  
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 291-1205

Website: [www.swindsor.k12.ct.us](http://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](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Hartford

Town Population in 2000: 24,412

1990-2000 Population Growth: 10.5%

Number of Public Schools: 7

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$30,966

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 9.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 1.6%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.5%

\*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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, 2009      4,654  
5-Year Enrollment Change      -8.3%

**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	401	8.6	7.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	112	2.4	2.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	88	1.9	6.5	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	563	12.1	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	172	70.2	90.7	80.5
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	90	18.4	12.1	13.6

\*65.9 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	13	0.3
Asian American	414	8.9
Black	285	6.1
Hispanic	262	5.6
White	3,680	79.1
Total Minority	974	20.9

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 3.3%

**Open Choice:**

88 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:**

3.6% 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 45.

### 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 is committed to providing opportunities for students and teachers to interact with individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. During the 2009-10 school year we welcomed 90 new and returning Open Choice students to our schools. In addition, 129 students from South Windsor attended seventeen different magnet schools. 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 of our schools have embraced "Tribes," a process that transforms the school environment to an inclusive and caring culture. Over the summer nine staff members were trained as Tribes trainers. Educators from other states and countries, including Columbia, South America and Toronto, Canada, came to South Windsor which served as the host site for this training. The South Windsor staff continues to initiate and participate in programs which afford cross-cultural experiences. Eli Terry School continued its commitment to using the Tribes model to ensure that structures and strategies are in place in each classroom to celebrate the diversity within each classroom as well as in the entire school community. Pleasant Valley School entered its tenth year as a Higher Order Thinking (H.O.T) School through a grant from the Connecticut Commission on Culture and Tourism, Arts Division. Students participated in residencies with master teaching artists emphasizing diverse cultural perspectives. Five staff members also attended a week-long H.O.T. School Summer Institute which offered workshops on creating peaceful and respectful classrooms. P. R. Smith School facilitated community discussions in which learning experiences regarding diversity and/or bias reduction are infused into the school culture. Orchard Hill School was pleased to welcome Hartford students participating in the Open Choice program to its community for the first time. Wapping School students participated in numerous fund raising activities to benefit the people of Haiti as well as the South Windsor food pantry. Timothy Edwards Middle School trained peer mediators to be aware of economic and cultural stereotypes in order to assist them in helping other students resolve student-to-student conflict. South Windsor High School offered a new English elective course to students who are interested in studying diversity. The curriculum fosters discussions about intellectual ideas that surround the topic of diversity which help construct an awareness and sensitivity to the world around us. Students are expected to participate and collaborate on the development of student-driven activities, especially the multicultural fair, an impressive, inclusive event open to students and the community.

### STUDENT PERFORMANCE

**Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % 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	58.8	57.0	36.2
Writing	63.5	58.3	49.7
Mathematics	63.4	62.4	40.5
Grade 4 Reading	72.6	59.9	60.4
Writing	75.1	63.6	60.0
Mathematics	83.8	67.0	80.5
Grade 5 Reading	74.4	61.8	63.6
Writing	79.6	68.2	63.9
Mathematics	85.0	72.4	66.9
Science	72.3	59.4	54.8
Grade 6 Reading	93.0	74.9	90.2
Writing	81.2	65.9	71.3
Mathematics	88.3	70.7	77.3
Grade 7 Reading	95.0	77.4	90.9
Writing	74.3	61.2	62.3
Mathematics	88.6	68.5	84.4
Grade 8 Reading	90.1	73.3	85.4
Writing	79.3	62.6	75.8
Mathematics	83.2	67.3	72.0
Science	76.5	62.8	59.9

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.com](http://www.ctreports.com).

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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 scorable 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	67.1	45.9	78.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	78.2	59.6	76.7
Mathematics	66.4	48.7	71.2
Science	67.7	45.3	83.3

For more detailed CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com). To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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
	52.1	50.7	50.3

<b>SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009</b>		<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores</b>
% of Graduates Tested		82.5	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	538	508	76.0
	Critical Reading	519	503	58.9
	Writing	523	506	58.9

**SAT® I.** The lowest possible score on each SAT® I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates</b>
Graduation Rate, Class of 2009	94.7	91.3	50.8
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.0	3.0	55.9

<b>Activities of Graduates</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.1	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.6	10.4

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

<b>Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff</b>	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	284.70
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	13.80
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	46.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	103.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	10.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.50
School Level	17.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	22.80
School Nurses	9.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	206.35

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.

<b>Teachers and Instructors</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>DRG</b>	<b>State</b>
Average Years of Experience in Education	15.0	14.2	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	86.4	84.7	77.8

<b>Average Class Size</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>DRG</b>	<b>State</b>
Grade K	18.1	18.4	18.5
Grade 2	21.1	19.6	19.7
Grade 5	22.8	21.8	21.1
Grade 7	24.4	21.7	20.8
High School	21.2	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,005	990	992
Middle School	1,035	1,023	1,018
High School	1,030	981	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*	4.5	3.3	3.2
Middle School	2.5	2.5	2.5
High School	3.6	2.6	2.3

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

### DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2008-09

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	\$35,512	\$7,411	\$7,819	\$7,576	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,298	\$271	\$274	\$268	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,699	\$355	\$474	\$503	\$459
Student Support Services	\$4,128	\$862	\$863	\$912	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$6,150	\$1,283	\$1,405	\$1,364	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,306	\$1,107	\$1,469	\$1,412	\$1,462
Transportation	\$3,623	\$734	\$701	\$617	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,287	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,268	\$265	\$163	\$159	\$162
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$62,272</b>	<b>\$12,527</b>	<b>\$13,458</b>	<b>\$13,145</b>	<b>\$13,386</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,287	\$686	\$1,864	\$1,228	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
		\$11,670,010	18.7	19.8

**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	73.8	24.0	1.8	0.3
Excluding School Construction	73.9	23.8	1.9	0.3

---

## 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 South Windsor Board of Education recognizes its responsibility to ensure an equitable allocation of resources among all of its schools. To that end, a systematic, multilevel process involving teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists and central office staff 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, including new staff and program requests, and supporting rationale. Recommendations are then reviewed by the superintendent and central office administrators. In addition, a five-year continuous cycle of curriculum review ensures 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 appropriately distributed. Each year, a historical analysis of resource usage is undertaken. Pupil allocation levels are determined for both past and present expenditures and serve as a guide for the development of the overall program budget. Therefore, each school receives a proportional share of the budget reflective of its enrollment. Finally, an annual assessment of each school facility addresses particular building and technology equipment needs. Identified needs are either included in the district budget or referred to the joint capital projects program which is a collaborative committee comprised of Board of Education and Town Council officials.

---

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	575
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.1%

---

<b>Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities</b>				
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	<b>State Percent</b>
Autism	61	1.3	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	126	2.7	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	14	0.3	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	16	0.3	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	106	2.2	2.0	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	201	4.2	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	51	1.1	0.7	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>11.6</b>

\*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

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Who Graduated in 2008-09 with a Standard Diploma	75.0	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	2.2	4.1

**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	46.4	31.6	81.1	67.5
Writing	33.3	19.6	75.8	63.3
Mathematics	43.8	32.9	82.5	68.1
Science	31.0	23.7	74.4	61.1
CAPT Reading Across the Disciplines	31.8	13.8	67.1	45.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	37.8	16.8	78.2	59.6
Mathematics	25.0	16.7	66.4	48.7
Science	24.4	13.0	67.7	45.3

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com). To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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	29.2
	% With Accommodations	70.8
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	63.8
	% With Accommodations	36.2
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		12.4

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	48	8.3

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	456	79.3	77.2	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	56	9.7	15.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	63	11.0	7.0	11.3

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

Many improvement plans were accomplished this year in the area of curriculum, instruction, special education and parent involvement. Most of our curriculum and instruction improvements were directly related to the implementation of South Windsor's Scientific Research-Based Intervention (SRBI) model. Using recommendations from a recent district-wide SRBI audit we accomplished several tasks including the development of clear curriculum documents in grades 1-8 for science, mathematics and literacy that are unit based, aligned to the state standards and grade-level expectations, include common formative and summative assessments and are formatted in alignment with the Connecticut Curriculum Development Guide. Under the leadership of our new high school principal and curriculum leaders the high school staff used delayed opening days throughout the year to develop the same level of clarity to course curriculum documents. This work will continue during the 2010-11 school year. We established universal screening assessments K-9 in mathematics and literacy and administered these three times a year to determine which students were in need of intervention. Research-based interventions and progress monitoring tools were identified and used with students and reporting practices were established for communicating student progress to parents. Interventionists were hired for the elementary and middle school levels to support the work of the SRBI model and intervention labs for math and literacy were established at the middle school and high school. An Academic Literacy course was added to every 6th grader's schedule providing them with additional instructional time to develop their literacy skills. An audit was conducted of our early childhood programs and work has begun to strengthen our pre-school and kindergarten programs with a focus on curriculum documents, assessment calendars, and research about Full-day Kindergarten programs. We have also expanded our Advanced Placement offerings over the past two years from 11 offerings to 14. The participation rate in Advanced Placement exams has grown from 111 students taking 166 exams to 143 students taking 218 exams. We have assessed our district's overall organizational structure for technology to better meet the new work of schools. This audit has led to reclassifying positions to provide a Director of Technology Systems and Programs, a Director of Literacy, Assessment and Instructional Improvement, and a Student Data Support Specialist. Each of these positions will offer centralized leadership in using technology systems to support instructional improvements. In the area of special education, supports to all students have increased as a result of implementing the SRBI model. Therefore, more students are receiving targeted assistance earlier in the process, prior to making a referral to special education. We have expanded co-teaching settings at all schools. Each elementary school has a co-taught classroom at each grade level 2-5; middle school resource teachers co-teach language arts and mathematics and all special education teachers at the high school co-teach at least one and as many as three sections. With the establishment of a district-wide Autism consultant during the 2009-10 school year, South Windsor took the opportunity to create Autism Task Forces at each school. The task force is comprised of building administrators, special educators, and support staff. They work with the district coordinator to plan for specific student programming and to receive professional development on a variety of topics related to Autism Spectrum Disorders. Topics have included social skills training, data collection, behavior intervention planning, discreet trial training, and transition planning. The creation of the Autism Task Force has allowed building staff to be better prepared to program for students with Autism Spectrum Disorders. Finally, parent involvement continues to be strong throughout our school district with a notable improvement at the high school level. Through the encouragement of our new high school principal and the dedication of talented and energetic parent leaders, a Parent Advisory Council was established and many more parents are meaningfully engaged in shared leadership opportunities at the high school. For the 2010-11 school year, we plan to include parent and board of education membership on our districtwide leadership council, which oversees the curriculum review process as well as our district's professional learning plan.

---