#### STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12

# **Glastonbury School District**

ALAN B. BOOKMAN, Superintendent

Telephone: (860) 652-7961

Location: 232 Williams Street Glastonbury, Connecticut

Website: www.glastonburyus.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 <a href="https://www.sde.ct.gov.">www.sde.ct.gov.</a>

#### **COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Hartford

Town Population in 2000: 31,876

1990-2000 Population Growth: 14.2%

1990-2000 Population Growtl Number of Public Schools: 9 Per Capita Income in 2000: \$40,820

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 7.3% Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 1.3% District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 95.2%

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 6,686 5-Year Enrollment Change -1.2%

Grade Range PK - 12

### INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	n Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	529	7.9	9.1	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	73	1.1	2.0	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	548	8.2	6.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	613	9.2	10.0	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	333	87.2	91.3	79.8
Homeless	3	0.0	0.1	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	100	10.8	11.3	13.0

<sup>\*41.8 %</sup> of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

<sup>\*</sup>To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to <a href="www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

#### SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity				
Race/Ethnicity	Percent			
American Indian	12	0.2		
Asian American	566	8.5		
Black	189	2.8		
Hispanic	415	6.2		
Pacific Islander	4	0.1		
White	5,305	79.3		
Two or more races	195	2.9		
Total Minority	1,381	20.7		

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 3.3%

#### **Open Choice:**

48 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:

6.6% 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 45.

#### 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 Glastonbury Public School District has a lengthy history of encouraging programs that promote and celebrate diversity. These efforts include the following opportunities for students and staff: The Great Path Academy, a middle college at Manchester Community College-Four Glastonbury students participated. • A Better Chance Program-Four students from out of state residing in Glastonbury attended Glastonbury High School•Greater Hartford Academy of the Arts-Eighteen high school students attended this magnet school where students interested in the arts vocal and instrumental music, dance, theater, musical theater, is stressed. Medical Professions and Teacher Pre Academy-Three high school students experienced this magnet school. Academy of Aerospace and Engineering-Six high school students had the opportunity to attend this magnet school. Common Ground, Leadership Greater Hartford-Glastonbury High School students participated in this leadership program. Inter-district Middle Magnet School-The Two Rivers Middle Magnet School opened in the fall of 2002. Twenty-one Glastonbury students' grades 6-8 had the opportunity to attend this environmental science magnet school. Public Safety Academy-Five middle and high school students attended this magnet school academy. One hundred and six elementary students from Glastonbury attended the East Hartford-Glastonbury Elementary Magnet School which explored science, global studies, and technology through daily, hands-on immersion experiences. This program will move to their new location in Glastonbury starting the 2012-2013 school year. Participation in the Discovery Center by all grade four and five students, with urban partner schools. Discovery Academy, Montessori Magnet School, and Museum Academy Magnet School-Five students participated in these elementary magnet schools. International Magnet School of Global Citizenship-Twenty-eight elementary students attended this school. Open Choice Program-Forty-six students from Hartford attend Glastonbury Public Schools. Glastonbury was a charter member of the preceding program, Project Concern. In 2007-2008 we expanded our participation to include our newest elementary school. Increased diversity training and student programs at both elementary and secondary levels. This has included training for all administrators and teachers through the Anti-Defamation League.

### 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 an	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	75.6	59.2	78.1	tests who were enrolled in the district at the
	Writing	79.1	62.7	81.3	time of testing,
	Mathematics	81.4	66.5	69.4	regardless of the length
Grade 4	Reading	82.0	64.1	83.1	of time they were enrolled in the district.
	Writing	82.1	65.3	78.8	Results for fewer than
	Mathematics	82.9	68.0	71.9	20 students are not
Grade 5	Reading	83.0	67.6	73.5	presented.
	Writing	80.1	68.1	65.5	
	Mathematics	92.4	71.6	92.9	
	Science	86.9	63.9	88.1	For more detailed CMT results, go to
Grade 6	Reading	88.2	74.1	74.1	www.ctreports.
	Writing	83.7	67.4	77.7	
	Mathematics	89.0	69.3	82.5	
Grade 7	Reading	94.9	79.8	91.2	To see the NCLB
	Writing	84.1	65.6	82.0	Report Card for this
	Mathematics	88.7	68.1	88.8	school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and
Grade 8	Reading	89.3	76.8	69.8	click on "No Child Left
	Writing	82.3	68.3	66.9	Behind."
	Mathematics	83.1	67.2	67.3	7
	Science	83.5	61.9	79.4	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	62.7	47.5	69.2
Writing Across the Disciplines	76.1	63.0	61.2
Mathematics	76.6	49.2	91.0
Science	73.1	47.1	87.3

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
	57.6	50.6	67.0

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Te	ested	92.3	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	580	505	93.1
	Critical Reading	559	502	91.6
	Writing	556	506	87.8

**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	96.4	82.7	93.2
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.1	2.6	90.6

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	96.4	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	3.0	9.7

# RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

## **DISTRICT STAFF**

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	410.90
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	61.80
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	49.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	88.10
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	22.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs District Central Office School Level	15.40 24.85
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	2.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	29.00
School Nurses	12.90
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	320.40

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	14.0	14.5	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	86.9	86.9	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.7	17.9	18.5
Grade 2	20.0	19.8	19.7
Grade 5	19.8	21.9	21.6
Grade 7	20.6	20.9	20.3
High School	19.1	20.1	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	997	973	993
Middle School	978	1,019	1,024
High School	997	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*	3.8	2.8	2.8
Middle School	2.0	2.1	2.2
High School	3.1	2.3	2.1

<sup>\*</sup>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	\$50,267	\$7,384	\$8,464	\$8,216	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,829	\$269	\$267	\$249	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$4,665	\$685	\$487	\$541	\$482
Student Support Services	\$4,990	\$733	\$901	\$970	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$9,898	\$1,454	\$1,468	\$1,434	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$9,435	\$1,386	\$1,471	\$1,420	\$1,463
Transportation	\$4,981	\$675	\$735	\$649	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$4,986	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,096	\$161	\$165	\$166	\$165
Total	\$92,147	\$13,011	\$14,238	\$13,971	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$8,705	\$1,279	\$1,290	\$1,120	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		•
		District	DRG	State
	\$16,958,674	18.4	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	85.2	11.1	3.1	0.6
Excluding School Construction	87.7	8.2	3.4	0.6

### 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 Glastonbury Board of Education policy regarding distribution of district resources ensures that each school within the district receives an equitable level of material and financial resources. The level of support that each school receives is determined by the approved school board budget for the year and the student enrollment. Once this amount is established, the funds budgeted for instruction is distributed equitably among the seven elementary schools, the middle school, and the high school.

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible 616
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities 9.1%

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	79	1.2	1.3	1.2	
Learning Disability	157	2.3	3.2	3.9	
Intellectual Disability	15	0.2	0.3	0.4	
Emotional Disturbance	57	0.8	0.6	1.0	
Speech Impairment	104	1.5	1.7	2.1	
Other Health Impairment*	154	2.3	2.2	2.2	
Other Disabilities**	50	0.7	0.7	1.0	
Total	616	9.1	10.0	11.7	

<sup>\*</sup>Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

<sup>\*\*</sup>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	80.3	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	0.0	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	45.9	36.0	85.6	70.4
	Writing	27.8	21.5	81.9	66.3
	Mathematics	41.1	31.8	86.3	68.4
	Science	42.5	23.0	85.2	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	13.6	14.5	62.7	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	18.5	18.2	76.1	63.0
	Mathematics	21.4	15.4	76.6	49.2
	Science	17.0	13.6	73.1	47.1

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to <a href="www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools			
CMT	% Without Accommodations	48.7	
	% With Accommodations	51.3	
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	31.8	
	% With Accommodations	68.2	
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.7	

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	13	2.1		
Private Schools or Other Settings	37	6.0		

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	484	78.6	75.7	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	79	12.8	16.5	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	53	8.6	7.8	11.7

#### SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

We continue to support the renewal and refinement of curriculum to align with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) grade level expectations and ensure vertical alignment across grade levels and disciplines. In addition, the development of universal screening tools and assessment processes in literacy and mathematics continues along with the review of common assessments in all content areas. Schools in our district are refining the uses of early intervention and Student Intervention Team (SIT) processes to provide needed instructional supports for all students. This includes a focus on any students with attendance issues at all grade levels. In addition, all schools are working to integrate Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) lessons and strategies to enhance behavioral supports for all students and maximize academic and social development. We continue special education teachers co-teaching in general education classes and the inclusion model for delivery of special education services at the elementary level to remain current with changes in curricula and assessment, and ensure access to a rigorous general education curriculum for all students. Professional development for special education teachers focused on Strategic Instruction Model Strategies, and training was provided to all district special education paraprofessionals on promoting independence and providing instructional support. In February 2012, the Glastonbury Public Schools completed the fourth generation strategic planning process for the 2012-2017 school years. Staff, parents, and community members were involved in goal setting through surveys, focus groups, or committee involvement. The plan includes major revisions that reflect changing expectations in learning, instruction, technology integration, 21st century skills, and post-secondary readiness. This new plan will drive all district and school initiatives over the next five years.