

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**Simsbury School District**

DIANE D. ULLMAN, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 651-3361

Location: 933 Hopmeadow Street
Simsbury,
Connecticut

Website: www.simsbury.k12.ct.us/boardofed/index.html

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: \$39,710
Town Population in 2000: 23,234	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 6.9%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 5.5%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.9%
Number of Public Schools: 7	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 89.3%

*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 4,949
5-Year Enrollment Change -1.7%

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	183	3.7	5.3	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	69	1.4	2.2	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	159	3.2	6.2	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	622	12.6	10.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	271	93.1	91.3	79.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	91	11.7	15.5	20.2

*39.6% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	8	0.2
Asian American	238	4.8
Black	179	3.6
Hispanic	138	2.8
White	4,386	88.6
Total Minority	563	11.4

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 3.0%

Open Choice: 97 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: 5.0% 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 39.

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 Simsbury Public Schools are committed to fostering the understanding of various racial, ethnic, and economic groups in our society and world by promoting equity and respect among young people through providing learning experiences through our rigorous and varied academic program as well as through extra-curricular activities. Because Simsbury is a district with a small minority population, it is important that students engage in educational opportunities to understand and appreciate diversity in the world around them. Our school leaders have a strong commitment in providing opportunities to students in order to make progress toward reducing racial, ethnic, and economic isolation in our schools. The Simsbury Public Schools have been part of the Choice program, formerly Project Concern, since its inception for Hartford students to attend suburban schools. During the 2007-2008 school year, our district employed an intervention specialist to better assist our Choice program students districtwide. Various programs that highlight this commitment include, but are not limited to: elementary school-wide PTO sponsored Cultural Enrichment programs that focus on diversity; our social studies curriculum specifically integrates themes and activities which teach about diverse cultures and instill an appreciation for diversity; the elementary and secondary world languages program for students develops student awareness of the social and cultural values of foreign societies; students in the middle school participated in the national Mix-It-Up Day focused on breaking down social boundaries/barriers; almost 30 middle school students participated in an eight week inter-district Arts Program through the Greater Hartford Arts Academy; all grade 8 students took part in a trip to Ellis Island as part of our interdisciplinary immigration unit; SHS students are enrolled in interdistrict programs such as steel pan ensemble, extracurricular ballroom dancing club, Connecticut Forum, and Hartford Stage Productions. Some students also attend classes at the Greater Hartford Academy of Math and Science and the Academy of Performing Arts. The town of Simsbury supports the ABC program in which 10 boys from other urban areas around the country live in a residential experience and attend SHS.

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	66.9	52.0	68.7
Writing	68.5	63.4	42.3
Mathematics	82.0	60.0	86.5
Grade 4 Reading	82.7	55.9	97.5
Writing	85.5	62.9	93.7
Mathematics	86.4	60.3	95.0
Grade 5 Reading	85.4	62.2	91.4
Writing	89.6	64.5	96.3
Mathematics	89.6	65.9	93.8
Science	79.1	54.9	84.0
Grade 6 Reading	90.5	66.3	95.2
Writing	86.6	61.9	95.2
Mathematics	91.5	66.4	96.4
Grade 7 Reading	93.4	71.1	96.8
Writing	87.7	62.0	95.5
Mathematics	89.0	63.0	92.9
Grade 8 Reading	89.3	64.8	93.1
Writing	92.0	63.4	96.9
Mathematics	89.3	60.8	93.1
Science	83.5	58.6	85.5

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	88.0	45.5	100.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	90.8	57.9	98.5
Mathematics	82.2	50.1	93.1
Science	80.7	46.3	97.7

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
	52.3	36.1	89.3

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		98.6	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	573	504	95.4
	Critical Reading	567	502	96.2
	Writing	567	503	95.4

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	98.0	92.6	70.8
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	1.9	6.2	69.9
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.5	1.7	77.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.0	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	4.6	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	292.40
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	30.94
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	41.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	97.39
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	14.31
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	6.00
School Level	22.90
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	15.40
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	24.30
School Nurses	9.29
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	204.01

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	14.1	13.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	83.4	82.7	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	20.7	18.3	18.1
Grade 2	18.6	19.8	19.3
Grade 5	22.9	22.3	20.9
Grade 7	21.2	21.2	20.5
High School	20.0	19.8	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	977	988	987
Middle School	984	1,022	1,017
High School	955	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*	4.4	3.6	3.4
Middle School	4.0	2.7	2.7
High School	2.6	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	\$34,209	\$6,857	\$7,153	\$6,939	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,759	\$353	\$262	\$237	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$2,882	\$578	\$443	\$491	\$429
Student Support Services	\$3,815	\$765	\$764	\$803	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$4,772	\$956	\$1,256	\$1,217	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,860	\$1,175	\$1,329	\$1,365	\$1,322
Transportation	\$2,275	\$458	\$605	\$537	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,615	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$593	\$119	\$147	\$159	\$145
Total	\$57,779	\$11,426	\$12,203	\$11,984	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$4,350	\$872	\$1,875	\$1,397	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$10,507,519
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	18.2%

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	90.7	7.2	1.8	0.2
Excluding School Construction	90.1	7.6	1.9	0.3

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.

As part of its annual budget development process, the Simsbury Board of Education allocates funds to each school on a per-student basis in areas such as textbooks, instructional supplies, library books, audiovisual materials, staff development, building maintenance, and early literacy and numeracy programs. Each year principals have the opportunity to request additional funding for building-based needs in areas such as staffing, building improvements, adoption of new programs, or health and safety issues during their budget preparation; and based on these requests, additional resources may be allocated to insure adequate funding levels to address these specific needs. It continues to be the practice of the Board of Education and central office administrators to ensure equitable allocation of resources among all of the district's schools. The district is in a multi-year plan to provide technology equipment in every classroom as well as upgrading the computer networks serving all seven schools and the Board of Education offices. Significant progress was made during the 2007-2008 school year.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	650
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.0%

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	57	1.1	0.9	0.7
Learning Disability	279	5.6	3.5	4.0
Intellectual Disability	23	0.5	0.3	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	29	0.6	0.6	1.0
Speech Impairment	139	2.8	2.2	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	90	1.8	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	33	0.7	0.6	0.9
Total	650	13.0	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	70.0	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	1.4	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	45.1	20.4	85.0	62.1
	Writing	45.6	19.3	85.2	63.0
	Mathematics	52.6	22.6	88.1	62.7
	Science	41.7	22.2	81.4	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	52.9	11.4	88.0	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	57.6	16.3	90.8	57.9
	Mathematics	39.4	14.7	82.2	50.1
	Science	45.5	14.4	80.7	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	32.4
	% With Accommodations	67.6
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	25.8
	% With Accommodations	74.2
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.8

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	2	0.3
Private Schools or Other Settings	55	8.5

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	529	81.4	75.0	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	95	14.6	17.7	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	26	4.0	7.3	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

The Simsbury Public Schools believe that the school community must, through reflection, strive for continuous improvement in order to become a center of educational excellence. We believe in preparing students for a global, interconnected society, which requires facility with relationships, higher order thinking, technology, and languages. Our teachers are experts in instruction and content knowledge and they use curriculum to instill joy and excitement about learning. Collectively we believe that commitment to and implementation of continuous learning leads to improved student performance. During the 2007-2008 school year we focused efforts on establishing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) districtwide. At the elementary level, grade-level teacher teams, with support from Language Arts and Math consultants, special education teachers, and administrators, collaborated weekly in PLCs to analyze student work to inform their instruction, and strategy groups were formed to instruct students according to need. At the secondary level, content-like teachers used data gathered from formative assessments which are aligned with the school's goals and logically embedded with course curricula as the basis for their collaborative conversations. Collaborative content area teams meet to analyze student work, review levels of achievement, and identify strengths or weaknesses in student performance. Collectively teacher teams discuss instructional strategies and interventions needed in order to improve student performance. Each year student performance data is used to determine school-wide achievement goals, define professional growth plans for teachers and to inform teaching. Intervention strategies for individual students and professional development activities for staff are focused on areas requiring support. Opportunities for teachers to share "best practices" are provided at both the building and district levels. We continue to carefully analyze student achievement data from the CMT, CAPT, SAT, and AP exams in our continuous improvement cycle.

As a way to include various stakeholders in reviewing and monitoring our continuous planning, principals have created Leadership Teams that consist of teachers, parents, administrators, and students at the secondary level. In addition, principals have engaged these teams in writing and revising school mission statements that are aligned with the District Vision and Core Beliefs and that guide the work at each building. We believe that partnerships with parents are essential to our success and we continue to have extremely active Parent Teacher Organizations at each building that support our continuous improvement efforts. In addition our principals utilize this important forum to give updates on school goals throughout the year.

To insure students' continued academic success, two programs are provided for students requiring additional help: basic skills tutoring for students in kindergarten through grade 12, and TLC tutoring (Teaching for Literacy Competence) for first grade students who experience difficulty with beginning reading. In addition, paraprofessionals are provided in kindergarten classrooms to allow teachers to work with small groups of students, particularly in the area of literacy. The balanced literacy reading program for primary grades stresses a comprehensive student assessment component which impacts both teaching and learning. A partnership with Teachers College at Columbia University provides elementary teachers with on-site, classroom-based professional development.

Our special education program follows an inclusive model so that students with disabilities are receiving the majority of their instruction within the regular education classroom. Special education and regular education teachers meet daily to review and monitor student progress. Our district has developed a Pyramid of Interventions that supports the State's Response to Intervention (RTI), a scientifically research-based intervention (SRBI) initiative. The intent of this effort is to provide a systematic approach to early intervention within the regular education classroom with ongoing use of progress monitoring data in order to reduce inappropriate and unnecessary referrals to special education.
