

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2009-10**West Hartford School District**

KAREN L. LIST, Superintendent

Location: 50 South Main Street
West Hartford,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 561-6651

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

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: 90.5%

*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, 2009 10,188
5-Year Enrollment Change 2.5%

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	1,816	18.1	7.7	32.6
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	630	6.1	2.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	954	9.1	6.5	4.1
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	1,133	10.9	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	707	89.6	90.7	80.5
Homeless	15	0.1	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	83	7.7	12.1	13.6

*61.0 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	30	0.3
Asian American	1,155	11.1
Black	999	10.0
Hispanic	1,497	14.9
White	6,507	63.7
Total Minority	3,681	36.1

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 5.1%

Open Choice:

98 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:

18.5% 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 65.

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 183-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 98 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, % 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	70.9	57.0	66.9
Writing	71.4	58.3	69.3
Mathematics	75.4	62.4	65.6
Grade 4 Reading	68.6	59.9	51.6
Writing	74.7	63.6	58.1
Mathematics	77.6	67.0	60.4
Grade 5 Reading	76.0	61.8	65.5
Writing	80.2	68.2	65.1
Mathematics	85.4	72.4	69.3
Science	70.7	59.4	48.2
Grade 6 Reading	84.9	74.9	59.5
Writing	75.3	65.9	57.3
Mathematics	80.6	70.7	57.1
Grade 7 Reading	89.4	77.4	66.9
Writing	70.6	61.2	53.2
Mathematics	82.6	68.5	64.9
Grade 8 Reading	81.9	73.3	56.7
Writing	72.8	62.6	54.1
Mathematics	77.0	67.3	54.1
Science	69.7	62.8	41.4

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 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	68.5	45.9	81.1
Writing Across the Disciplines	75.4	59.6	69.9
Mathematics	62.7	48.7	62.9
Science	63.0	45.3	69.7

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
	63.2	50.7	78.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2009		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		74.4	68.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	548	508	82.2
	Critical Reading	552	503	87.6
	Writing	553	506	86.0

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 2009	95.4	91.3	57.7
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.5	3.0	41.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	92.0	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	3.6	10.4

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	668.78
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	62.30
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	98.60
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	140.40
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	28.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	1.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	15.00
School Level	40.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	15.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	57.80
School Nurses	21.40
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	435.35

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.

Teachers and Instructors	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Education	13.0	14.2	13.8
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.0	84.7	77.8

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.8	18.4	18.5
Grade 2	20.3	19.6	19.7
Grade 5	21.0	21.8	21.1
Grade 7	20.2	21.7	20.8
High School	20.7	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	983	990	992
Middle School	1,026	1,023	1,018
High School	928	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*	2.9	3.3	3.2
Middle School	2.0	2.5	2.5
High School	2.5	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	\$71,603	\$7,105	\$7,819	\$7,576	\$7,829
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$2,368	\$235	\$274	\$268	\$279
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$6,490	\$644	\$474	\$503	\$459
Student Support Services	\$8,339	\$827	\$863	\$912	\$859
Administration and Support Services	\$14,901	\$1,479	\$1,405	\$1,364	\$1,426
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$13,822	\$1,371	\$1,469	\$1,412	\$1,462
Transportation	\$5,454	\$508	\$701	\$617	\$694
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$4,231	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,190	\$118	\$163	\$159	\$162
Total	\$128,398	\$12,591	\$13,458	\$13,145	\$13,386
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$7,181	\$713	\$1,864	\$1,228	\$1,825

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
		\$27,087,015	21.1	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	81.5	15.5	2.5	0.5
Excluding School Construction	82.1	14.8	2.6	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.

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	1,130
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.1%

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	128	1.3	1.1	1.0
Learning Disability	337	3.3	3.4	3.9
Intellectual Disability	23	0.2	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	60	0.6	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	242	2.4	2.0	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	216	2.1	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	124	1.2	0.7	0.9
Total	1,130	11.1	10.1	11.6

*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

**Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2008-09 with a Standard Diploma	85.3	81.0
2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	3.7	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	45.0	31.6	78.3	67.5
	Writing	25.5	19.6	74.2	63.3
	Mathematics	42.3	32.9	79.7	68.1
	Science	24.0	23.7	70.2	61.1
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	28.6	13.8	68.5	45.9
	Writing Across the Disciplines	32.5	16.8	75.4	59.6
	Mathematics	34.9	16.7	62.7	48.7
	Science	22.4	13.0	63.0	45.3

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	17.0
	% With Accommodations	83.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	28.0
	% With Accommodations	72.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		10.2

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	8	0.7
Private Schools or Other Settings	84	7.4

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	744	65.8	77.2	73.4
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	271	24.0	15.8	15.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	115	10.2	7.0	11.3

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2009-10 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 2008-09 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 2009-10. At the district level, we undertook a detailed analysis of the data. Building leaders received reports on their school's performance relative to our internal goals and the performance of individual teachers. Classroom teachers received reports showing the achievement of their students on the 2008 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 assessments in math, reading, and writing. Our CMT scores in 2010 were the highest ever - averaging 77.6% in 2010 compared to 76.7% in 2009. Our CAPT were also the highest ever - growing from an average of 67.4% in 2009 to 67.6% in 2010. Our goals for the CMT scores are 78% at mastery and our goals for CAPT are 68% at mastery. The District's special education programs and services continue to build on its work to improve the integration between general education and special education resulting in improved access and achievement for students with disabilities. This work was evidenced in all schools with subgroups greater than 40 students achieving AYP or accomplishing Safe Harbor on the CMT/CAPT statewide assessments. The department developed an implementation plan for students with disabilities based on the independent review by the Education Development Center (EDC). The plan's primary objective is to transition from a program-based model to a service - based model that provides services and interventions which result in the educational benefit of all students. The special education program continued to implement and improve the cross categorical model across the elementary special needs program, reallocating resources from the elementary adjusted curriculum program, and improving co-teaching K-12. The District continued its collaboration and collective practice with general education in the development and implementation of Scientific Research-Based Intervention (SRBI) model/initiative. This collaboration included progress monitoring (AIMSWeb), Student Success Teams (SSTs), Individual Performance Plan (IPPs) and developing universal assessments. The District conducted (CPDC) Program Reviews/evaluations of the Early Learning Center (ELC), school psychology department and the school social work department which resulted in establishing goals, benchmarks and action plans. Additionally, the department received its NAYEC accreditation. The department continues to strengthen its collaboration with the special education parent teacher association (SEPTA). The District developed a mission, framework and model for Continuous Improvement focusing on closing the achievement gap and improving the delivery of services for all students
