

## West Hartford Public School District

**Agenda Item:** Strategic School Profiles

**Meeting Date:** February 29, 2012

**From:** Eileen S. Howley, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction and Curriculum

**Through:** Karen L. List, Superintendent

### **Background:**

The Strategic School Profiles (SSP) for the 2010-2011 school year have been published.

There is one strategic school profile for each school as well as an overall profile for the district. The data contained in these reports come from information the school district has provided to the state and from the results of standardized tests. The district and each school's report is split into several sections: Community Data (district report), Indicators of Educational Need, Program and Instruction (school reports), School/District Diversity, Student Performance and Behavior, Resources and Expenditures (district report), and Special Education (district report.) These sections present the data in a standardized format for all schools. There are several narrative sections on the report: Home and School Communication and Support (schools only), Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic, and Economic Isolation; School Improvement Plans and Activities, Supplemental School Information (schools) and Equitable Allocation of Resources (district only). Each school writes these narrative sections. We have also included the AYP report for the district and the schools in each section of the binder.

The district's strategic school profile has been attached.

Dr. Eileen S. Howley and Mr. Chip Ward will present a brief summary and then be available to answer questions.

**Agenda Item:  
VI.B.2**

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11****West Hartford School District**

KAREN L. LIST, Superintendent

Location: 28 South Main Street  
West Hartford,  
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 561-6651

Website: [www.whps.org/](http://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](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Hartford

Town Population in 2000: 63,589

1990-2000 Population Growth: 5.8%

Number of Public Schools: 16

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$33,468

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 9.9%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 3.9%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 90.4%

\*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, 2010	10,207
5-Year Enrollment Change	2.7%

**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	1,900	18.6	8.4	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	570	5.7	2.0	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	994	9.7	6.4	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	1,101	10.8	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	640	91.7	91.3	80.2
Homeless	12	0.1	0.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	92	8.6	12.1	13.2

\*61.3 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	25	0.2
Asian American	1,078	10.6
Black	915	9.0
Hispanic	1,542	15.1
Pacific Islander	4	0.0
White	6,366	62.4
Two or more races	277	2.7
Total Minority	3,841	37.6

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 5.4%

**Open Choice:**

112 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:**

18.7% 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 68.

---

### 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 182-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 programs that promote reduced racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. 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 600 students and a magnet enrollment of 140 students. Our district has actively recruited minority staff members and participated in CREC Minority Job Fairs this year. We are an active participant in the Open Choice program with 112 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/West Hartford Early Childhood Partnership, Summer Connections and Summer ESOL Program, and the Alternative Middle and High School programs.

---

### 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	71.5	58.4	66.9
Writing	74.0	61.1	66.5
Mathematics	76.4	63.0	72.0
Grade 4 Reading	77.7	62.5	69.9
Writing	77.8	65.5	59.8
Mathematics	81.4	67.0	69.5
Grade 5 Reading	73.5	61.4	61.3
Writing	80.5	66.8	66.9
Mathematics	83.3	72.5	63.2
Science	68.2	59.9	46.6
Grade 6 Reading	86.0	76.0	61.3
Writing	79.2	65.2	70.2
Mathematics	82.8	71.3	62.5
Grade 7 Reading	86.6	77.8	54.8
Writing	70.7	58.9	59.5
Mathematics	79.5	68.4	57.7
Grade 8 Reading	81.8	74.7	45.9
Writing	72.5	64.8	44.6
Mathematics	78.8	66.6	54.8
Science	74.0	63.1	49.0

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	68.4	44.7	84.8
Writing Across the Disciplines	79.6	61.2	75.9
Mathematics	62.2	49.5	63.9
Science	69.0	47.0	81.2

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
	63.1	51.0	74.1

<b>SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010</b>		<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores</b>
% of Graduates Tested		82.8	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	533	510	69.5
	Critical Reading	539	505	79.4
	Writing	539	510	77.1

**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, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2010	92.0	81.8	72.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.4	2.8	33.8

<b>Activities of Graduates</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	91.5	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	7.0	9.1

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

<b>Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff</b>	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	647.22
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	62.80
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	97.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	158.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	29.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	1.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	15.45
School Level	40.37
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	15.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	58.50
School Nurses	21.40
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	447.63

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	13.0	14.4	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	84.2	86.1	79.0

<b>Average Class Size</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>DRG</b>	<b>State</b>
Grade K	19.4	17.5	18.4
Grade 2	20.4	19.8	19.9
Grade 5	21.4	22.1	21.2
Grade 7	20.4	21.3	20.6
High School	20.2	20.2	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	977	992	992
Middle School	1,009	1,019	1,017
High School	924	987	1,009

\*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*	2.7	3.1	3.1
Middle School	1.9	2.3	2.4
High School	2.4	2.5	2.2

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

### DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2009-10

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	\$75,278	\$7,392	\$8,232	\$7,924	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$2,033	\$200	\$299	\$277	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$6,149	\$604	\$477	\$512	\$463
Student Support Services	\$8,700	\$854	\$875	\$936	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$15,057	\$1,478	\$1,433	\$1,373	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$13,088	\$1,285	\$1,421	\$1,384	\$1,410
Transportation	\$5,647	\$509	\$701	\$623	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$5,048	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,188	\$117	\$161	\$162	\$159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$132,187</b>	<b>\$12,701</b>	<b>\$13,878</b>	<b>\$13,518</b>	<b>\$13,780</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$7,016	\$689	\$1,622	\$1,178	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
		\$28,981,912	21.9	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	81.2	13.2	5.2	0.4
Excluding School Construction	81.4	12.7	5.5	0.4

---

**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 ensure 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	1,106
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.7%

---

<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	140	1.4	1.2	1.1
Learning Disability	323	3.1	3.3	3.9
Intellectual Disability	26	0.3	0.3	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	54	0.5	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	211	2.0	1.8	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	231	2.2	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	121	1.2	0.7	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,106</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>10.0</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 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma	85.5	62.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	2.8	3.9

**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	49.8	33.0	79.4	68.6
	Writing	28.4	19.3	75.8	63.7
	Mathematics	48.9	33.4	80.4	68.2
	Science	30.1	21.2	70.9	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	39.1	14.1	68.4	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	38.8	17.3	79.6	61.2
	Mathematics	28.1	15.8	62.2	49.5
	Science	27.2	13.1	69.0	47.0

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	19.9
	% With Accommodations	80.1
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	7.9
	% With Accommodations	92.1
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		11.9

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	7	0.6
Private Schools or Other Settings	83	7.5

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	800	72.3	78.0	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	194	17.5	14.9	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	112	10.1	7.1	11.0



---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2010-11 we continued our multi-year effort to build a systemic district-wide approach to improving student achievement. As a district identified as “in need of improvement” we updated our 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. Implementation of the plan began in 2007-08 and continued in 2010-11 with a focus on Effective Teaching Strategies and Common Formative Assessment. In addition to the DIP efforts we continued the successful strategies that resulted in our highest CMT and CAPT scores ever in 2010-11. 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 2010 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 2011 were the highest ever - averaging 78.6% in 2010 compared to 77.7% in 2010. Our CAPT were also the highest ever - growing from an average of 67.6% in 2010 to 69.9% in 2011. Our goals for the CMT scores are 78% at mastery and our goals for CAPT are 68% at mastery. The district’s educational programs for students with disabilities maintained their focus on the integration between general and special education. To this end, the district developed a departmental Development and Performance Plan (DDP) as a blueprint and data driven process that builds upon the district’s previous work to guide our collective practice to improve the access and achievement for all students. The DDP is based on the district’s mission and model of Continuous Improvement, and incorporates the SRBI framework/initiative and the expectations, recommendations and requirements of an Independent EDC Report, the State Performance Plan, and the District’s Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). The impact/results of the district’s work to integrate the “silos” of general and special education is evidenced in the district’s achieving AYP and Safe Harbor for all students in special education programs. The development of SRBI Behavioral Tiered Intervention, the planning and implementation of PBIS in one middle and two elementary schools, the effective implementation of cross-categorical programs at the elementary level, and conducting a review of co-teaching and instructional teaming across levels are all efforts to reach and meet the needs of all children. Additionally, the district focused on: Assistive Technology pilot using ipads was developed and we conducted a self-study of our Post-secondary program. The district has continued its collaboration in providing Professional Development in SRBI Behavioral Intervention, Progress Monitoring, (Aimsweb) Data-driven Decision Making, Common Core State Standards, PBIS, revised LD Guidelines, and Inclusion practices for staff, parents and para-educators.

---