

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2010-11**Farmington School District**

KATHLEEN GREIDER, Superintendent

Location: 1 Monteith Drive

Telephone: (860) 673-8268

Farmington,
ConnecticutWebsite: 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: 93.8%

*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, 2010 4,124
5-Year Enrollment Change -5.6%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range K - 12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	319	7.7	8.4	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	73	1.8	2.0	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	79	1.9	6.4	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	411	10.0	10.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	235	86.4	91.3	80.2
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	68	10.9	12.1	13.2

*75.9 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	7	0.2
Asian American	521	12.6
Black	203	4.9
Hispanic	191	4.6
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	3,197	77.5
Two or more races	5	0.1
Total Minority	927	22.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 4.8%

Open Choice:

78 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:

11.7% 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 38.

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 81 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 and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal	<p>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.</p> <p>For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Grade 3 Reading	80.6	58.4	90.0	
Writing	88.7	61.1	98.1	
Mathematics	82.8	63.0	87.0	
Grade 4 Reading	82.8	62.5	84.0	
Writing	87.5	65.5	92.1	
Mathematics	85.1	67.0	82.9	
Grade 5 Reading	83.2	61.4	87.7	
Writing	89.7	66.8	96.9	
Mathematics	92.6	72.5	92.0	
Science	89.3	59.9	98.2	
Grade 6 Reading	89.8	76.0	74.4	
Writing	82.3	65.2	79.8	
Mathematics	88.8	71.3	78.6	
Grade 7 Reading	91.9	77.8	81.5	
Writing	80.8	58.9	84.2	
Mathematics	89.8	68.4	87.2	
Grade 8 Reading	91.1	74.7	83.4	
Writing	88.3	64.8	90.4	
Mathematics	92.4	66.6	95.5	
Science	90.1	63.1	97.5	

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	<p>For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Reading Across the Disciplines	76.2	44.7	92.4	
Writing Across the Disciplines	88.4	61.2	92.5	
Mathematics	80.2	49.5	91.7	
Science	75.9	47.0	91.7	

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
	59.2	51.0	65.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		83.5	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	558	510	85.5
	Critical Reading	539	505	79.4
	Writing	546	510	80.9

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 2010	91.7	81.8	69.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.8	2.8	55.4

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	94.2	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	3.5	9.1

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	264.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	27.94
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	32.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	51.80
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	10.50
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	6.00
School Level	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	178.10

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	14.4	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	87.1	86.1	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.1	17.5	18.4
Grade 2	19.6	19.8	19.9
Grade 5	22.5	22.1	21.2
Grade 7	22.0	21.3	20.6
High School	19.0	20.2	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,013	992	992
Middle School	998	1,019	1,017
High School	994	987	1,010

*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*	3.7	3.1	3.1
Middle School	2.9	2.3	2.4
High School	2.9	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	\$32,914	\$7,929	\$8,232	\$7,924	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,006	\$242	\$299	\$277	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,671	\$403	\$477	\$512	\$463
Student Support Services	\$3,689	\$889	\$875	\$936	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$4,246	\$1,023	\$1,433	\$1,373	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,675	\$1,367	\$1,421	\$1,384	\$1,410
Transportation	\$2,729	\$603	\$701	\$623	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,922	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$383	\$92	\$161	\$162	\$159
Total	\$54,235	\$12,972	\$13,878	\$13,518	\$13,780
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$3,985	\$960	\$1,622	\$1,178	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$9,402,967	17.3	20.5	21.5

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	91.3	4.9	2.7	1.0
Excluding School Construction	91.6	4.3	2.9	1.1

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	419
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.2%

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	71	1.7	1.2	1.1
Learning Disability	108	2.6	3.3	3.9
Intellectual Disability	17	0.4	0.3	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	31	0.8	0.5	1.0
Speech Impairment	92	2.2	1.8	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	80	1.9	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	20	0.5	0.7	0.9
Total	419	10.2	10.0	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 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma	76.5	62.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	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	51.0	33.0	86.9	68.6
	Writing	38.9	19.3	86.1	63.7
	Mathematics	51.7	33.4	88.7	68.2
	Science	55.8	21.2	89.7	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	32.1	14.1	76.2	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	40.6	17.3	88.4	61.2
	Mathematics	19.2	15.8	80.2	49.5
	Science	30.3	13.1	75.9	47.0

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	23.3
	% With Accommodations	76.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	25.0
	% With Accommodations	75.0
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		11.3

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	0.5
Private Schools or Other Settings	32	7.6

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	338	80.7	78.0	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	52	12.4	14.9	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	29	6.9	7.1	11.0

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 practice through the lens of the Framework. Teams of teachers 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 schools 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.
