# STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12

## South Windsor School District

KATHLEEN M. CARTER, Superintendent

Location: 1737 Main Street South Windsor, Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 291-1205

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 <u>www.sde.ct.gov.</u>

# **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: 94.0%

\*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to <u>www.sde.ct.gov</u> 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, 20114,3455-Year Enrollment Change-13.6%

#### 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	379	8.7	9.1	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	89	2.1	2.0	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	163	3.8	6.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	491	11.3	10.0	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	177	81.6	91.3	79.8
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	89	13.7	11.3	13.0

\*92.0 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

Student Race/Ethnicity					
Race/Ethnicity Number Percent					
American Indian	15	0.3			
Asian American	504	11.6			
Black	255	5.9			
Hispanic	251	5.8			
Pacific Islander	0	0.0			
White	3,314	76.3			
Two or more races	6	0.1			
Total Minority	1,031	23.7			

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

#### **Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 3.0%**

#### **Open Choice:**

84 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:

8.0% 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 48.

#### 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.

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 2011-12 school year we welcomed 94 returning and new Open Choice students to our schools. In addition, 138 students from South Windsor attended twenty-five 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. Nine teachers and five administrators joined other regional districts in a book club sponsored by CREC discussing Boykin and Noguera's "Creating the Opportunity to Learn: Moving from Research to Close the Achievement Gap," discussions centered around how educators and students can overcome racism. At South Windsor High School clubs such as Japanese Culture Club, Interact, Soiree Africane, Gay/Straight Alliance, Model UN, among others are offered as well as an English course, "Alternate Voices," for any student wishing to study diversity. At Timothy Edwards Middle School, trained peer mediators assisted students become aware of economic and cultural stereotypes and conflict resolution. In addition, over 375 students participated in the Empty Bowls Program providing a tool all students can use in working towards the goal of ending hunger. Pleasant Valley School is committed to higher order thinking, developing awareness and appreciation of other cultures through the arts. Orchard Hill School's Cultural Committee, comprised of parents and staff, met monthly to discuss ways to recognize and celebrate the diverse community and held a Cultural Diversity night for students and families. At Wapping Elementary School, all students participate in cultural arts programs each year and for 2011-2012 students participated in interactive programs centered on the music and dance of Brazil, and on the immigrant experience in America. Eli Terry School hosted a cultural fair during the year celebrating the cultural diversity within its school community. Many countries were proudly represented by families giving all the opportunity to view artifacts, taste cultural foods and learn about their rich history. The Philip R. Smith School continues its commitment to Tribes and has been recognized by the Character Education Partnership as a National School of Character.

# 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 an Area	nd CMT Subject	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal	These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable
Grade 3	Reading	73.2	59.2	71.3	tests who were enrolled in the district at the
	Writing	73.0	62.7	61.9	time of testing,
	Mathematics	78.7	66.5	62.5	regardless of the length
Grade 4	Reading	79.9	64.1	75.0	of time they were enrolled in the district.
	Writing	77.6	65.3	60.6	Results for fewer than
	Mathematics	81.0	68.0	63.1	20 students are not
Grade 5	Reading	80.6	67.6	65.1	presented.
	Writing	76.9	68.1	56.5	
	Mathematics	81.7	71.6	56.0	
	Science	79.4	63.9	62.5	For more detailed CMT results, go to
Grade 6	Reading	88.5	74.1	75.9	www.ctreports.
	Writing	81.0	67.4	69.9	
	Mathematics	79.6	69.3	54.8	
Grade 7	Reading	93.3	79.8	81.8	To see the NCLB
	Writing	80.2	65.6	68.9	Report Card for this
	Mathematics	81.9	68.1	67.5	school, go to <u>www.sde.ct.gov</u> and
Grade 8	Reading	91.0	76.8	76.1	click on "No Child Left
	Writing	80.1	68.3	59.4	Behind."
	Mathematics	86.5	67.2	76.7	
	Science	86.7	61.9	90.0	

**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	75.8	47.5	91.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	83.9	63.0	82.1
Mathematics	66.3	49.2	75.2
Science	68.4	47.1	79.1

For more detailed CAPT results, go to <u>www.ctreports.com</u>. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <u>www.sde.ct.gov</u> and click on "No Child Left Behind."

<b>Physical Fitness.</b> The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body	Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District		% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
strength and aerobic endurance.		47.1	50.6	36.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tes	ited	85.4	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	544	505	78.6
	Critical Reading	529	502	67.9
	Writing	527	506	64.9

**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, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2011	90.8	82.7	54.9
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.2	2.6	40.6

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	91.6	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	5.4	9.7

# **RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES**

## DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	284.60
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	13.80
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	48.45
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	108.90
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	9.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs District Central Office School Level	8.50 18.00
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	4.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	21.60
School Nurses	9.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	211.60

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	15.0	14.5	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	90.0	86.9	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.2	17.9	18.5
Grade 2	19.1	19.8	19.7
Grade 5	21.0	21.9	21.6
Grade 7	23.1	20.9	20.3
High School	20.2	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,005	973	993
Middle School	1,035	1,019	1,024
High School	1,004	999	1,024

\*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*	3.8	2.8	2.8
Middle School	2.5	2.1	2.2
High School	3.1	2.3	2.1

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

## DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2010-11

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)	E	Expenditures Per Pupil		
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$37,079	\$8,148	\$8,464	\$8,216	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,555	\$342	\$267	\$249	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,201	\$484	\$487	\$541	\$482
Student Support Services	\$4,614	\$1,014	\$901	\$970	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$6,598	\$1,450	\$1,468	\$1,434	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$6,426	\$1,412	\$1,471	\$1,420	\$1,463
Transportation	\$3,307	\$707	\$735	\$649	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,730	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,136	\$250	\$165	\$166	\$165
Total	\$66,646	\$14,144	\$14,238	\$13,971	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,784	\$612	\$1,290	\$1,120	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$13,177,907	19.8	20.9	21.7

**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	75.5	19.2	4.8	0.5
Excluding School Construction	75.5	19.0	5.0	0.5

#### 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 Responsible514Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities11.6%

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	64	1.4	1.3	1.2		
Learning Disability	121	2.7	3.2	3.9		
Intellectual Disability	12	0.3	0.3	0.4		
Emotional Disturbance	12	0.3	0.6	1.0		
Speech Impairment	74	1.7	1.7	2.1		
Other Health Impairment*	179	4.0	2.2	2.2		
Other Disabilities**	52	1.2	0.7	1.0		
Total	514	11.6	10.0	11.7		

\*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 2010-11 with a Standard Diploma	72.3	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	3.9	5.1

Science15.813.668.447.For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.To see the NCLB Report Card for this<br/>school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Laft Pabled."

iled CMT or CAPT results, go to <u>www</u> www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Chile				
in State Assessments of Students wit strict Schools	h Disabilities			
CMT % Without Accommodations 45.1				
% With Accommodations	54.9			
	www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Chilin State Assessments of Students wit trict Schools % Without Accommodations			

% Without Accommodations

% With Accommodations

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.

% Assessed Using Skills Checklist

CAPT

K-12 Students with Disabilities Placed in Educational Settings Other Than This District's Schools

40.0

60.0

8.0

Placement	Count	Percent
Public Schools in Other Districts	14	2.7
Private Schools or Other Settings	46	8.9

# 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	414	80.5	75.7	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	37	7.2	16.5	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	63	12.3	7.8	11.7

**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	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	49.2	36.0	84.9	70.4
	Writing	33.6	21.5	78.3	66.3
	Mathematics	37.1	31.8	81.6	68.4
	Science	45.6	23.0	83.2	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	36.7	14.5	75.8	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	36.8	18.2	83.9	63.0
Ν	Mathematics	10.3	15.4	66.3	49.2
	Science	15.8	13.6	68.4	47.1

#### SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

School-based and community discussions facilitated by the new superintendent during the 2010-11 school year led to the development of a three-year strategic plan, which was adopted by the Board of Education in September 2011. The plan focuses on three critical areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment of Learning; Professional Learning and Staff Evaluation and; Learning Environment. During the 2011-12 school year, many accomplishments were made toward the goals of South Windsor's Strategic Plan. With regard to Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment of Learning, the Board of Education unanimously endorsed a full-day kindergarten program to commence in the fall of 2013. Curriculum documents continue to be aligned with the new Common Core State Standards. The format of our curriculum documents has been standardized to meet the expectations of Connecticut's Guide for Curriculum Development. Teachers are working in collaborative teams to design common assessments for grade-level units of study and courses. In our third year of implementing the Scientific Research-Based Intervention (SRBI) model, a broader menu of options has been developed for interventions in mathematics and literacy. Specifically, three full-time mathematics interventionists were added at the elementary level and funding was procured for 2012-13 for two additional math interventionists and a psychologist to support behavioral interventions. The school board also approved funding for a learning center at the high school for 2012-13, which will support students in mathematics and literacy. Our capacity to monitor student progress has been enhanced through the use of technology applications; specifically, Performance Plus, the curriculum and assessment management tool for all students, and AIMSweb, the progress-monitoring tool for students who have intervention plans. Through the use of grant funding, a new position of student information systems specialist was established to support teachers and administrators in the use of student assessment data. A model for Student Success Plans was developed for all students in grades six through twelve and will be implemented beginning the fall of 2012. South Windsor's Project Worth Young Adult Academy, in its second year, continues to provide students (ages 18-21) with significant disabilities the opportunity to participate in a variety of vocational, social, and independent living skill activities in the greater South Windsor community. The program assists students in acquiring necessary skills to transition from school and pursue employment, educational opportunities, and community activities in our local South Windsor area. With regard to Professional Learning and Staff Evaluation much was accomplished this past year. The Board of Education unanimously approved an early-release day professional development model for the elementary schools, to be implemented in 2013-14. This model will allow for the professional development necessary to successfully transition to the Common Core State Standards and will ensure continuity of programming and instruction across all five elementary schools. A partnership was established with Teachers College at Columbia University to support our elementary teachers with literacy instruction. K-2 teachers participated in on-site professional development in balanced literacy with a staff developer from Teachers College, using our classrooms as laboratory settings. All elementary teachers worked with Cathy Fosnot and colleagues from City College in New York on the topic of conceptually-based mathematics instruction. Middle school teachers continued their professional development on the teaching of writing with noted expert John Collins. High school teachers continued their work with curriculum development and creating common assessments. Administrators engaged in the process of Instructional Rounds (City, Elmore, Fiarman and Teitel) as a focus for their professional learning. A new teacher evaluation program, modeled on the thinking of national expert in the field Kim Marshall, was piloted with a group of teachers in every school. Based on feedback from teachers and administrators a revised model will be implemented with all teachers during the 2012-13 school year. Our district continues to benefit from high levels of volunteerism throughout our schools and community. One of the leading forces is the South Windsor Public Education Foundation which has wide-reaching arms to support our schools, our community, and beyond. The South Windsor Public Education Fund Committee awarded five grants to South Windsor public schools this past year totaling \$14,993. In addition, the foundation is preparing to raise funds to provide a digital video distribution system for South Windsor High School in the near future.