

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**West Hartford School District**

DAVID SKLARZ, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 561-6651

Location: 28 South Main Street
West Hartford,
Connecticut

Website: www.whps.org/

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: \$33,468
Town Population in 2000: 63,589	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.9%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 5.8%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 3.9%
Number of Public Schools: 16	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 89.8%

*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	9,990
5-Year Enrollment Change	3.8%

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	1,507	15.1	5.3	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	650	6.6	2.2	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	905	9.1	6.2	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	1,130	11.3	10.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	647	88.9	91.3	79.2
Homeless	8	0.1	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	147	11.6	15.5	20.2

*60.9% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	29	0.3
Asian American	1,006	10.1
Black	1,007	10.1
Hispanic	1,422	14.2
White	6,526	65.3
Total Minority	3,464	34.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 5.4%

Open Choice: 87 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: 17.7% 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 64.

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.

West Hartford is a diverse community. It is one of the few communities in the state whose percent of minority students and percent of students eligible for free and reduced lunch are both within 15 percentage points of the state average. During our 184 day school year, there are innumerable opportunities during regular instructional time and in the student's normal instructional settings for interactions between students of different races, ethnicity, and socio-economic groups.

Beyond the day-to-day activities available to all students in West Hartford, the district has strong participation in a variety of areas. Over 100 students attend inter-district magnet schools, charter schools, and vocational technical schools. Over 300 students participate in state, federal, or locally funded inter-district programs. West Hartford has two magnet elementary schools with a total enrollment of 700 students and a magnet enrollment of 140 students. Our district has actively recruited minority staff members and participated in two CREC Minority Job Fairs this year. We are an active participant in the Open Choice program with 87 Open Choice students enrolled. Our curriculum is filled with an array of experiences and activities designed to increase student awareness of diversity of individuals and cultures. Every student is touched by one of these activities during the school year - whether the student is an elementary student participating in cultural theme days, a middle school student participating in an international celebration, or a high school student volunteering time and commitment for the Empty Bowls project at both high schools that raised money to combat hunger.

The school board has taken an active role in funding and supporting many of the programs that have seen great success in West Hartford – both in reducing racial, ethnic, and economic isolation and in encouraging student achievement. The Board continues to support magnet schools, Hillcrest Area Neighborhood Outreach Center (HANOC), The Bridge Family Center, William Casper Graustein Memorial Fund Discovery Project, Summer Academy and Summer Prep, and the Alternative Middle and High School programs.

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	65.1	52.0	62.0
Writing	76.0	63.4	66.3
Mathematics	71.9	60.0	64.4
Grade 4 Reading	70.7	55.9	69.0
Writing	71.0	62.9	52.8
Mathematics	71.7	60.3	59.1
Grade 5 Reading	71.6	62.2	48.8
Writing	75.2	64.5	59.9
Mathematics	78.6	65.9	64.2
Science	62.5	54.9	43.8
Grade 6 Reading	74.6	66.3	50.6
Writing	73.7	61.9	66.7
Mathematics	78.7	66.4	63.7
Grade 7 Reading	83.3	71.1	60.6
Writing	72.6	62.0	59.4
Mathematics	75.5	63.0	61.3
Grade 8 Reading	76.1	64.8	57.2
Writing	75.1	63.4	56.0
Mathematics	73.2	60.8	54.1
Science	71.2	58.6	48.4

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	64.0	45.5	74.6
Writing Across the Disciplines	69.8	57.9	56.2
Mathematics	58.9	50.1	53.8
Science	64.1	46.3	67.7

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
	39.1	36.1	55.6

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		89.4	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	541	504	79.2
	Critical Reading	540	502	83.8
	Writing	541	503	83.8

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	95.4	92.6	41.5
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	4.4	6.2	35.3
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.3	1.7	40.7

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	95.0	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.0	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	662.17
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	72.05
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	98.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	106.80
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	28.75
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	1.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	15.75
School Level	41.75
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	11.50
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	57.10
School Nurses	19.40
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	459.25

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	12.2	13.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	78.9	82.7	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.7	18.3	18.1
Grade 2	20.7	19.8	19.3
Grade 5	22.7	22.3	20.9
Grade 7	20.3	21.2	20.5
High School	19.1	19.8	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	989	988	987
Middle School	1,014	1,022	1,017
High School	944	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*	3.5	3.6	3.4
Middle School	2.2	2.7	2.7
High School	2.8	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	\$67,315	\$6,655	\$7,153	\$6,939	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,603	\$158	\$262	\$237	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$8,563	\$847	\$443	\$491	\$429
Student Support Services	\$6,971	\$689	\$764	\$803	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$12,293	\$1,215	\$1,256	\$1,217	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$13,466	\$1,331	\$1,329	\$1,365	\$1,322
Transportation	\$4,191	\$391	\$605	\$537	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,241	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,214	\$120	\$147	\$159	\$145
Total	\$118,857	\$11,653	\$12,203	\$11,984	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$7,947	\$786	\$1,875	\$1,397	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$23,776,228
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	20.0%

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	85.4	12.1	2.3	0.2
Excluding School Construction	85.9	11.4	2.5	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.

During the budgeting process, the West Hartford Board of Education and administration carefully evaluate the needs of each individual school and program. The funding decisions are based on certain key criteria, some of which are uniform across the district, while others are based on special needs at the building level.

Staffing Levels: Student-teacher ratios are established at the district level and staff are allocated among the schools based on the enrollment at that school and, at the high school level, the number of students taking a particular course. There are reduced student-teacher ratios at two of our elementary schools based on the educational needs of those students. Support staffs are also allocated based on the educational needs of the students.

Instructional Supplies: Many textbooks and supplies are purchased centrally. In addition each building receives a per-pupil allocation for locally identified instructional needs.

Building Operating Expenses: The operating and maintenance expenses at each building are centrally funded to insure an adequately maintained school and a safe and appropriate environment for instruction.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	1,157
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.6%

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	102	1.0	0.9	0.7
Learning Disability	335	3.4	3.5	4.0
Intellectual Disability	28	0.3	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	71	0.7	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	291	2.9	2.2	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	205	2.1	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	125	1.3	0.6	0.9
Total	1,157	11.6	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	85.9	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	3.0	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	26.7	20.4	73.6	62.1
	Writing	24.8	19.3	73.9	63.0
	Mathematics	31.1	22.6	74.8	62.7
	Science	22.0	22.2	66.7	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	23.9	11.4	64.0	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	26.1	16.3	69.8	57.9
	Mathematics	19.1	14.7	58.9	50.1
	Science	21.5	14.4	64.1	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	17.9
	% With Accommodations	82.1
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	-3.4
	% With Accommodations	100.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.9

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	4	0.3
Private Schools or Other Settings	101	8.7

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	799	69.1	75.0	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	256	22.1	17.7	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	102	8.8	7.3	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2007-08 we continued our effort, begun the previous to year, to build a systemic district-wide approach to improving student achievement. As a district identified as “in need of improvement” we developed a District Improvement Plan (DIP) that focused on four key areas – setting Priority Standards, deployment of Effective Teaching Strategies, development of Common Formative Assessments, and implementation of Data-Based Decision Making. This plan was developed with the input of teachers, administrators and parents. The plan was approved in February and implementation of the plan began during the spring of 2008 and continues through the upcoming school year. As the plan was being developed we continued the successful strategies implemented last year. At the district level, we undertook a detailed analysis of the data. Building leaders received reports on their schools performance relative to our internal goals and the performance of individual teachers. Classroom teachers received reports showing the achievement of their students on the 2007 CMT and CAPT. Individual schools met during professional development time (every Wednesday) under the leadership of the building principals, department supervisors, and curriculum specialists to review those results and extend the data analysis to the classroom level. All schools that did not meet their internal goals were required to develop detailed school improvement plans at both the building and classroom levels. The resulting plans that were developed were tied into the performance objectives that each principal established with their evaluator. The classroom level plans were tied into the objectives for each teacher. Central Office staff met with building leadership in the month of October to review the plans and determine where additional assistance was needed. In addition to interim assessments developed by the buildings and classroom teachers, the district offered a comprehensive set of interim assessment in math, reading, and writing. Our CMT scores in 2008 maintained the strong performance shown in 2007 - averaging 74.2% in 2008 compared to 74.4% in 2007. Our CAPT scores showed another strong increase, growing from an average of 62.8% in 2007 to 64.4% in 2007. Our goals for the CMT scores are 78% at mastery and our goals for CAPT are 66% at mastery. In the area of special education we maintained our focus on priority areas including addressing student achievement, disproportionality and overrepresentation of minorities in special education, IEP development and LRE/inclusion practices. The district increased the access to the general education classroom and curriculum for students identified as intellectually disabled (ID). The district increased the number and scope of its co-taught classes at the secondary level. The district implemented a web-based program (IEP Direct) to improve the development of student’s IEP’s. This program strengthens the alignment of the student’s IEP goals and objectives with the Connecticut standards and general education curriculum. Other initiatives included the collaboration with general education to develop a district-wide response to intervention (RTI) model, increased consultation for Autistic Spectrum Disorders providing parent training through our special education PTA (SEPTA), development of a handbook for para-educators, and the expansion of the district’s elementary ABA programs. All of the schools in our district have completed the school improvement planning process. The process began with the formation of the school improvement planning team which consisted of 20 individuals – approximately half parents and half teachers. This group initially met over a two day period to review the district’s strategic plan and achievement data relevant to each individual school. During the two days, the team developed a mission statement for the school, analyzed the schools strengths and weaknesses, developed a series of objectives for the school and suggested tactics to help achieve those. While this process was completed several years ago, the parental involvement in the planning and improvement process continues through the implementation of the action plans developed as a consequence of that process. In addition, we survey the parent community in each school every other year to measure their perception of the school and instructional climate.

Filename: DIST104.DOC
Directory: J:\SSPbox\SSP Internet 2007-08
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\cloudr\Application
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: 155-00
Subject:
Author: csde
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 12/2/2008 11:33 AM
Change Number: 1
Last Saved On: 12/2/2008 11:33 AM
Last Saved By: csde
Total Editing Time: 0 Minutes
Last Printed On: 12/2/2008 2:50 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 9
Number of Words: 3,487 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 19,533 (approx.)