

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**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: 89.7%

*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, 2008	10,082
5-Year Enrollment Change	2.3%

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	1,712	17.0	6.4	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	663	6.7	2.2	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	921	9.1	6.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	1,176	11.7	10.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	688	90.3	91.3	79.7
Homeless	7	0.1	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	126	10.2	14.2	19.0

*59.7% 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	1,110	11.0
Black	997	9.9
Hispanic	1,473	14.6
White	6,472	64.2
Total Minority	3,610	35.8

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 5.9%

Open Choice: 89 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: 18.3% 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 67.

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 89 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	64.7	54.6	57.9
Writing	74.4	62.5	64.8
Mathematics	73.2	62.8	59.7
Grade 4 Reading	74.9	60.7	69.3
Writing	77.5	64.2	69.7
Mathematics	77.1	63.6	68.3
Grade 5 Reading	77.7	66.0	65.8
Writing	75.8	66.5	58.0
Mathematics	80.5	68.8	67.9
Science	67.6	58.1	45.7
Grade 6 Reading	78.9	68.9	52.1
Writing	70.7	62.2	52.8
Mathematics	81.4	68.8	62.0
Grade 7 Reading	86.0	74.9	67.5
Writing	71.9	62.9	55.4
Mathematics	79.2	66.0	66.2
Grade 8 Reading	83.1	68.4	68.4
Writing	76.2	66.5	53.5
Mathematics	75.5	64.5	53.5
Science	74.2	60.6	58.1

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	72.1	47.4	86.4
Writing Across the Disciplines	75.7	55.0	80.9
Mathematics	60.5	47.8	60.3
Science	61.1	42.8	72.5

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
	39.4	36.2	55.3

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		86.8	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	533	507	72.9
	Critical Reading	531	503	76.0
	Writing	535	506	76.0

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 2008	94.8	92.1	51.1
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	5.2	6.6	44.5
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.5	2.5	40.9

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	92.2	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.3	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	655.52
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	58.30
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	98.70
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	143.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	27.50
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	1.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	15.85
School Level	40.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	15.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	57.90
School Nurses	19.40
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	452.35

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	12.6	13.7	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	80.1	83.3	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.9	18.4	18.3
Grade 2	19.2	19.4	19.3
Grade 5	24.0	22.0	21.0
Grade 7	21.2	21.6	20.5
High School	20.1	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	989	991	988
Middle School	994	1,018	1,016
High School	933	977	1,007

*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*	3.2	3.4	3.3
Middle School	2.1	2.5	2.6
High School	2.6	2.9	2.4

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

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	\$67,870	\$6,794	\$7,521	\$7,233	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,532	\$153	\$267	\$245	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$4,135	\$414	\$461	\$461	\$446
Student Support Services	\$7,905	\$791	\$808	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$15,824	\$1,584	\$1,351	\$1,342	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$15,921	\$1,594	\$1,382	\$1,386	\$1,377
Transportation	\$4,410	\$418	\$649	\$575	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,525	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,115	\$112	\$152	\$164	\$151
Total	\$122,236	\$12,130	\$12,869	\$12,531	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$8,601	\$861	\$1,791	\$1,180	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$25091955	20.5	19.2	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	82.2	15.5	2.1	0.2
Excluding School Construction	83.1	14.5	2.2	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 each 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	1,180
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	11.7%

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	112	1.1	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	359	3.6	3.5	3.9
Intellectual Disability	23	0.2	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	71	0.7	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	274	2.7	2.1	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	206	2.0	2.1	2.1
Other Disabilities**	135	1.3	0.7	0.9
Total	1,180	11.7	10.2	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 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	95.3	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

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	40.9	30.2	77.4	65.7
	Writing	28.2	19.5	74.5	64.1
	Mathematics	41.8	30.7	77.8	65.7
	Science	37.3	23.8	70.9	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	45.0	14.1	72.1	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	36.9	13.6	75.7	55.0
	Mathematics	27.9	15.4	60.5	47.8
	Science	19.1	10.6	61.1	42.8

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	23.7
	% With Accommodations	76.3
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	25.2
	% With Accommodations	74.8
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		10.7

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	3	0.3
Private Schools or Other Settings	86	7.3

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	757	64.2	75.9	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	301	25.5	17.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	122	10.3	6.9	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2008-09 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 saw growth in CMT and CAPT scores in 2007-08. 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 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 assessment in math, reading, and writing.

Our CMT scores in 2009 were the highest ever - averaging 76.7% in 2009 compared to 74.2% in 2008. Our CAPT were also the highest ever - growing from an average of 64.4% in 2008 to 67.5% in 2009. Our goals for the CMT scores are 78% at mastery and our goals for CAPT are 68% at mastery.

The district's special education program and services maintained their focus on the integration between special and general education, and improving student access and achievement within the general education curriculum and classroom. To this end, the district conducted an independent review of the special education program by the Education Development Center (EDC). This review supported the district's work to transition from two separate systems “silos” to a unified, comprehensive integrated system that effectively educates all students. The Early Learning Center collaborated with general education for NAEYC re-accreditation. A cross-categorical model was developed and implemented in the elementary special needs programs, and co-taught classes were expanded at the middle and high school levels. The district continued its collaboration in professional development in scientific research-based intervention (SRBI), priority standards, effective teaching strategies and data-driven decision making to support the implementation of the District's Improvement Plan and work to close achievement gap.

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.
