STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12

Farmington School District

KATHLEEN GREIDER, Superintendent

Telephone: (860) 673-8268

Location: 1 Monteith Drive

Farmington, Connecticut

Website: www.fpsct.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: 23,641

1990-2000 Population Growth: 14.7% Number of Public Schools: 7

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$39,102

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 9.1% Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 2.4% District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 93.2%

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

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Enrollment on October 1, 2011 4.041 5-Year Enrollment Change -4.9%

K - 12 Grade Range

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	319	7.9	9.1	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	64	1.6	2.0	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	68	1.7	6.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	393	9.7	10.0	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	216	85.4	91.3	79.8
Homeless	1	0.0	0.1	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	55	12.5	11.3	13.0

^{*66.2 %} of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

^{*}To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity				
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent		
American Indian	9	0.2		
Asian American	550	13.6		
Black	198	4.9		
Hispanic	202	5.0		
Pacific Islander	0	0.0		
White	3,074	76.1		
Two or more races	8	0.2		
Total Minority	967	23.9		

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 5.0%

Open Choice:

76 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:

11.9% 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 37.

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.

The Farmington Public Schools remain committed to the letter and spirit of the law intended to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation through local and regional school and district programs. Farmington's continuing commitment to the Choice program provides important educational and social experiences for both Hartford and Farmington students. Farmington has participated in Project Concern, now Choice, for more than 44 years and, even with schools at and beyond enrollment capacity, the district continues to welcome approximately 97 Choice students. The Farmington Public Schools participate as an active partner in three interdistrict magnet school programs. Farmington plays a lead role in two interdistrict cooperative grants designed to increase achievement through the arts and four of our seven schools are actively participating in Sister School projects. Farmington's commitment to improving student achievement while simultaneously addressing educational quality and diversity is well established and all indications point to further positive development in future years.

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 ar 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	83.0	59.2	93.8	tests who were enrolled in the district at the
	Writing	89.8	62.7	98.8	time of testing,
	Mathematics	87.8	66.5	88.8	regardless of the length
Grade 4	Reading	85.1	64.1	91.9	of time they were enrolled in the district.
	Writing	87.9	65.3	95.0	Results for fewer than
	Mathematics	85.8	68.0	79.4	20 students are not
Grade 5	Reading	88.3	67.6	88.0	presented.
	Writing	91.7	68.1	97.0	
	Mathematics	90.8	71.6	88.7	
	Science	92.1	63.9	98.8	For more detailed CMT results, go to
Grade 6	Reading	93.6	74.1	94.0	www.ctreports.
	Writing	90.6	67.4	94.6	
	Mathematics	92.8	69.3	95.8	
Grade 7	Reading	92.5	79.8	77.4	To see the NCLB
	Writing	82.1	65.6	75.2	Report Card for this school, go to
	Mathematics	88.5	68.1	87.5	www.sde.ct.gov and
Grade 8	Reading	94.2	76.8	89.9	click on "No Child Left
	Writing	92.8	68.3	93.8	Behind."
	Mathematics	90.9	67.2	89.9	7
	Science	87.3	61.9	91.3	7

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	69.1	47.5	83.5
Writing Across the Disciplines	83.9	63.0	82.1
Mathematics	77.8	49.2	92.5
Science	72.7	47.1	85.8

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		% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	57.9	50.6	67.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tes	sted	97.5	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	551	505	85.5
	Critical Reading	547	502	88.5
	Writing	558	506	89.3

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	94.7	82.7	82.7
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	1.1	2.6	45.7

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	96.9	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	2.5	9.7

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	267.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	30.39
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	32.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	52.90
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	11.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs District Central Office School Level	6.00 16.60
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	4.90
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	19.10
School Nurses	6.70
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	179.66

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	85.4	86.9	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	19.6	17.9	18.5
Grade 2	20.1	19.8	19.7
Grade 5	21.5	21.9	21.6
Grade 7	19.8	20.9	20.3
High School	19.5	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,013	973	993
Middle School	998	1,019	1,024
High School	994	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*	3.1	2.8	2.8
Middle School	2.7	2.1	2.2
High School	2.9	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)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$34,948	\$8,470	\$8,464	\$8,216	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$760	\$184	\$267	\$249	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,632	\$396	\$487	\$541	\$482
Student Support Services	\$3,727	\$903	\$901	\$970	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$4,347	\$1,053	\$1,468	\$1,434	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,537	\$1,342	\$1,471	\$1,420	\$1,463
Transportation	\$2,731	\$587	\$735	\$649	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,401	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$247	\$60	\$165	\$166	\$165
Total	\$56,328	\$13,534	\$14,238	\$13,971	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,559	\$863	\$1,290	\$1,120	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District DRG		State
	\$10,576,927	18.8	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	90.8	4.9	3.0	1.4
Excluding School Construction	91.1	4.3	3.2	1.5

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 Farmington Public Schools' budget is presented to the town after two months of school and program budget reviews and adjustments with principals, central office administrators, program directors, and finally, a thorough study by the Board of Education of the budget recommended for consideration by the Superintendent. The budget is prepared to support the district mission, vision and five-year goals. This process ensures that the budget is allocated appropriately by school and by program and the resource allocation reflects the priorities and goals of the Board of Education.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible 403
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities 9.9%

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	78	1.9	1.3	1.2	
Learning Disability	94	2.3	3.2	3.9	
Intellectual Disability	15	0.4	0.3	0.4	
Emotional Disturbance	32	0.8	0.6	1.0	
Speech Impairment	76	1.9	1.7	2.1	
Other Health Impairment*	81	2.0	2.2	2.2	
Other Disabilities**	27	0.7	0.7	1.0	
Total	403	9.9	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	90.0	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	5.1

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	Students with Disabilities		udents
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	56.5	36.0	89.5	70.4
	Writing	49.2	21.5	89.1	66.3
	Mathematics	50.7	31.8	89.4	68.4
	Science	50.9	23.0	89.5	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	23.1	14.5	69.1	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	31.0	18.2	83.9	63.0
	Mathematics	21.7	15.4	77.8	49.2
	Science	13.8	13.6	72.7	47.1

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	42.4		
	% With Accommodations	57.6		
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	18.2		
	% With Accommodations	81.8		
% Assessed U	Ising Skills Checklist	10.8		

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	1.0		
Private Schools or Other Settings	28	6.9		

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		dents
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	311	77.2	75.7	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	62	15.4	16.5	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	30	7.4	7.8	11.7

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The focus of professional development at all schools is on the implementation of our primary instructional improvement strategy. The newly developed Framework for Teaching and Learning defines Farmington's expectations for students and teachers working together in active learning communities. The Framework defines those principles of learning that advance content understanding and the development of learning skills. Teachers and administrators are examining practices through the lens of the Framework. Teams of teacher and whole school faculties have developed specific professional activities, including collaborative inquiry cycles and classroom peer observations. Content area specific initiatives have occurred and continue at all levels relative to improving teachers' skill based on identified student performance needs. For example, elementary teachers are administering universal screens in mathematics and then developing targeted interventions for groups of students. The school district engages in an annual strategic planning cycle of continuous improvement to support the district mission, vision and goals. Individual schoools create their school improvement plans based on analysis of school-based data and student learning needs. This school improvement process relies upon a school team, which includes parents, to set the improvement plan for the school. The school development process involves annual planning and accountability measures that demonstrate progress toward the goals. School and district plans, as well as annual results and outcomes, are available on our website at www.fpsct.org.