

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2002-03

Litchfield School District
JOHN S TINDALL-GIBSON, Superintendent

Telephone: 860-567-7500



This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c).

COMMUNITY DATA

County: LITCHFIELD	Public School Enrollment as a Percent of Town Population: 16.7%
2000 Population: 8,316	Public School Enrollment as % of Total Student Population: 89.1%
1990-2000 Population Growth: -0.6%	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000: 10.1%
2000 Per Capita Income: \$30,096	Adult Education Enrollment in 2001-02 School Year: 15
Number of Public Schools: 3	Number of Adults Receiving Diplomas in 2001-02 School Yr.: 4
Number of Nonpublic Schools: 4	

Education Reference Group (ERG): C ERG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment.

DISTRICT NEED

Current and Past District Need	Year	District	ERG	State
% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2002-03	4.8	4.2	25.4
% of K-12 Students with Non-English Home Language	2002-03	0.6	1.5	12.2
	1998-99	0.4	1.7	12.3
% of Elementary and Middle School Students who Attended the Same School the Previous Year	2002-03	95.2	93.0	87.5
	1997-98	93.2	92.0	85.2
% of Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School, or Headstart	2002-03	59.0	83.7	75.9
	1997-98	83.3	80.8	70.4
% of Juniors and Seniors Working More Than 16 Hours Per Week	2002-03	24.6	26.7	25.7
	1997-98	30.6	31.0	30.3

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY**Enrollment**

Grade Range	PK-12
Total January Enrollment	1,411
5-Year Oct. Enrollment Change	7.0%
Projected Oct. 2007 Enrollment	
Elementary	762
Middle School	0
High School	706
Prekindergarten, Other	20

Race/Ethnicity (Jan.)	Number	Percent
American Indian	8	0.6
Asian American	9	0.6
Black	1	0.1
Hispanic	16	1.1
White	1,362	96.5
Other	15	1.1
Total Minority 2002-03	49	3.5
Total Minority 1997-98	28	2.1

EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION


Connecticut law requires that school districts provide educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. This may occur through magnet school programs, public school choice programs, charter schools, minority staff recruitment, inter- or intradistrict programs and projects, distance learning, or other experiences. Below is the description submitted by this school district of how it provides such experiences.

Litchfield Public Schools has developed numerous programs that provide students and staff with rich opportunities to increase awareness and appreciation of differences in racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. One of the earliest efforts to reduce barriers to diversity was the sister schools relationship with Rawson Elementary School in Hartford. Center School (grades pre-K through 3) is stocked with 1,500 books, many of which have been selected because of their positive messages dealing with racial and ethnic themes. At Litchfield Intermediate School (grades 4 through 6) all students study multicultural themes in a cross-disciplinary format. But the strongest of all of our programs has been Project Poetry Live! This program brings students face-to-face, from Litchfield, Thomaston, Torrington, Waterbury, Watertown, Wamogo, Bloomfield, and Winsted, to celebrate diversity. One hundred seventh graders from Litchfield participated last year. Students work in groups to produce unique works of art, a dance program, a beautiful set design panel, and an anthology of poems. The dance facilitators for Project Poetry Live!, the Earl Mosley Diversity of Dance, come from New York City. This year saw the introduction of a new program at the seventh grade level, Arts Connect. Arts Connect brought many artists of diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds to school to work with our students. Nationally known, successful artists, such as saxophonist Don Braden, generated exciting, meaningful dimensions to the curriculum, and also served as special role models for our students. We have a very active American Field Service organization. In previous years they have hosted students and their teacher from Spain. Although the student trip to Spain scheduled for last April was cancelled due to the outbreak of hostilities in Iraq; we hope to continue with that program next school year. Also, one of our families hosted a student from Ecuador this year.

Litchfield High School is involved with two other interdistrict cooperative grant programs, Impressionism: Seasons of Change, and Pathways to Understanding Ourselves Through the Arts and Sciences, joining students from inner city, suburban, and rural schools in activities that emphasize understanding and embracing diversity. The Peer Educators at LHS are an important group of young people seeking to understand and help others appreciate pressing issues for teenagers, including diversity. Our science students participate in two special programs, Partners in Science sponsored by Boeringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals of Ridgefield, CT, and the University of CT Health Center Mini-Med School. Litchfield Public Schools continues an aggressive program of technological development that includes the development of curricular units and instructional methodologies that make effective and appropriate use of the latest technologies. This allows our students at all grade levels to participate in the global community with its full range of diversity. We are aware of the nature of our student population and its isolated location from other areas of greater cultural, ethnic, and economic diversity. We continually make significant, creative improvements in the abilities of our students to participate in the greater community.

DISTRICT RESOURCES

Staff Count (Full-Time Equivalent)

# of Certified Staff		
Teachers		108.1
Administrators		7.0
Library/Media Staff		2.0
Other Professionals		12.7
% Minority 2002-03		0.0
% Minority 1997-98		0.0
# Non-Certified Instructional		30.3

Average Class Size		District	ERG	State
Grade K	2002-03	13.8	16.4	18.3
	1997-98	14.6	17.6	19.0
Grade 2	2002-03	16.6	17.8	19.5
	1997-98	20.0	19.7	20.5
Grade 5	2002-03	21.5	20.7	21.6
	1997-98	20.3	19.4	21.6
Grade 7	2002-03	19.4	19.7	21.7
	1997-98	21.4	21.0	21.9
High School	2002-03	16.1	18.3	20.1
	1997-98	15.8	18.6	20.1

Professional Staff Experience and Training	District	ERG	State
Average Number of Years Experience in Connecticut	15.0	13.6	13.5
% with Master's Degree or Above	83.3	78.2	77.8
% Trained as Mentors, Assessors, or Cooperating Teachers	22.7	28.3	25.0

DISTRICT RESOURCES, continued

Total Hours of Instruction Per Yr.*	Dist	ERG	State
Elementary	1,025	988	986
Middle School	N/A	N/A	N/A
High School	1,058	1,018	1,000

*State law requires at least 900 hours for gr. 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours for half-day kindergarten.

Resource Ratios	District	ERG	State
Students Per Academic Computer	4.2	3.9	4.0
Students Per Teacher	13.1	13.3	13.7
Teachers Per Administrator	15.4	13.8	13.8

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Physical Fitness	District	ERG	State
% Passing All 4 Tests	45.0	41.0	34.8

Connecticut Mastery Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal: The state goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. 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.

Connecticut Mastery Test, 3 rd Gen. % Meeting State Goal	District 2000-01	District 2002-03	ERG 2002-03	State 2002-03
Grade 4 Reading	72	66.7	69.8	55.9
Writing	58	70.4	69.9	61.5
Mathematics	67	75.9	70.7	60.4
All Three Tests	43.7	57.6	52.5	42.1
Grade 6 Reading	77	84.6	80.0	64.1
Writing	76	71.2	72.9	60.8
Mathematics	65	73.6	74.6	61.0
All Three Tests	53.7	60.8	60.1	46.2
Grade 8 Reading	84	85.4	82.0	68.1
Writing	75	74.0	72.4	60.0
Mathematics	65	65.9	72.0	56.1
All Three Tests	57.7	56.9	60.0	45.2
Participation Rate	97.6	98.7	98.2	96.5



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, 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.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE, continued

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Second Generation, % Meeting State Goal: The state Goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. Students receive certification of mastery for each area in which they meet or exceed the Goal. 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.




Conn. Academic Performance Test, 2 nd Gen. % Grade 10 Meeting State Goal	District 2000-01	District 2002-03	ERG 2002-03	State 2002-03
Reading Across the Disciplines	66	70.9	61.1	47.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	70	62.1	64.6	52.8
Mathematics	58	57.6	62.8	45.1
Science	63	58.1	61.3	43.2
All Four Tests	41.2	39.0	38.0	26.6
Participation Rate	100.0	100.0	96.3	93.2



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, 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.

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test	Class of 1997	Class of 2002		
	District	District	ERG	State
% of Graduates Tested	88.0	78.2	83.2	76.8
Mathematics: Average Score	560	534	532	503
Mathematics: % Scoring 600 or More	34.8	27.9	27.7	22.3
Verbal: Average Score	561	535	532	502
Verbal: % Scoring 600 or More	36.4	25.0	26.7	20.4

Dropout Rates	District	ERG	State
Cumulative Four-Year Rate for Class of 2002	0.0	5.1	10.8
2001-02 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	0.7	1.4	2.4
1996-97 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	0.6	1.9	3.9

Activities of Graduates	Class of	# in District	District %	ERG %	State %
 Pursuing Higher Education	2002	64	73.6	84.1	79.7
	1997	61	81.4	80.6	75.6
 Employed or in Military	2002	22	25.3	11.5	16.3
	1997	12	16.0	16.9	18.6
 Unemployed	2002	0	0.0	0.4	0.9
	1997	0	0.0	0.1	1.4

DISTRICT REVENUES/EXPENDITURES 2001-02

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. ERG 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	ERG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$7,374	\$5,263	\$5,790	\$5,378	\$5,786
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$393	\$281	\$254	\$264	\$256
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$740	\$528	\$383	\$315	\$376
Student Support Services	\$1,024	\$731	\$548	\$579	\$544
Administration and Support Services	\$1,151	\$822	\$997	\$982	\$1,006
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$1,151	\$822	\$946	\$893	\$938
Transportation	\$610	\$402	\$446	\$485	\$445
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$263	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$241	\$172	\$119	\$117	\$117
Total	\$12,947	\$9,130	\$9,703	\$9,296	\$9,663
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$420	\$299	\$1,025	\$1,491	\$1,059
Adult Education	\$6	\$306	N/A	\$540	\$776

Revenue Sources, % 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
With School Construction	88.0	9.8	1.7	0.6
Without School Construction	88.8	8.9	1.7	0.6

Selected Regular Education Expenditures, Amount Per Pupil and Percent Change from Prior Year. Selected regular education expenditures exclude costs of special education and land, building, and debt service.

Expenditures by Grade Level	District		ERG		State	
	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change	Per Pupil	% Change
Elementary and Middle						
Total	\$7,004	9.7	\$7,372	5.0	\$8,015	4.5
Salaries and Benefits	\$5,683	11.3	\$5,932	5.0	\$6,589	5.2
Supplies	\$527	-1.1	\$424	6.5	\$425	-1.2
Equipment	\$209	194.4	\$141	-8.4	\$130	-6.5
High School						
Total	\$9,343	7.0	\$8,973	7.4	\$8,899	3.7
Salaries and Benefits	\$7,371	5.4	\$6,914	7.0	\$7,142	3.9
Supplies	\$646	-7.1	\$553	6.1	\$495	-3.1
Equipment	\$343	146.8	\$222	25.4	\$173	4.2

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.

It is the practice of the Litchfield Board of Education to ensure the equitable distribution of resources among the three schools in the system. The Board works with the administration to ensure that all necessary programs, supplies, and services are provided in a fair and uniform manner in order to meet the standard, diverse, or unique learning needs of all students. Additionally, each of the district schools serves different grade levels, so inequalities in the allocation of resources between schools serving the same grades cannot occur. The budget process begins in October and lasts until April. A zero based budget is developed that accounts for every dollar requested. Every employee in the system has an opportunity to request the materials and supplies that they need to do their jobs. Supervisory personnel review departmental requests and add personnel requests as needed. The superintendent reviews all line items in each school budget with each respective principal. District budget issues are then discussed and reviewed by the core team of district and central office administrators. The completed budget request is submitted to the Board of Education for further consideration. The Board of Finance presents the Board of Education's budget request to the town at a hearing, and consequently, may make additional adjustments. Once the budget is adopted, the Board of Education continues to review and approve expenditures at Board and committee meetings throughout the year to further ensure equity in the distribution of resources. An elementary renovation project was completed in 1988, and a secondary renovation/expansion project is currently be studied.

EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED IMPROVEMENTS IN STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Below is a summary, submitted by this school district, of the major trends in student performance and accomplishments that indicate sustained improvement over time. Also, areas of need are identified and plans to address these needs are presented.

Litchfield's class of 6th graders showed significant academic growth in all three essential areas of the CMT; gains of 12.6% in Reading, 13.2% in Writing, and 6.3% in Math, over their 4th grade scores. Growth in reading and writing may be attributed in large part to our eight-year long relationship with Columbia University Teachers College. Lucy Calkins and her professional developers visit our elementary classrooms about five times a year to work with our teachers and students. Academic achievement gains for 8th graders were modest with an improvement of 3.2% in "All Three Tests", 56.9% at mastery in 8th grade as opposed to 53.7% at mastery in 6th grade.

CAPT scores for Litchfield High School students remained strong, especially in the area of Science, which showed gains for the third consecutive year. Litchfield High School continues to require 11th graders to retest in CAPT areas where they have not met goal. Seniors have a choice to retest.

Our number of AP courses offered is growing, as well as the number of students participating in the exams. Additional offerings include AP Physics, AP Environmental Science, and AP Human Geography. The average SAT scores for the class of 2000 were 534 in Math (up from 520 in 1999) and 535 in Verbal (up from 517 in 1999). Curricular changes in science sequencing should provide students with a greater foundation with which to attack the four areas on the science portion of the CAPT. An inquiry approach is also being utilized in 7th, 8th, and 9th grade to address the current trends in science education. The introduction of a new elective course, Critical Thinking/Prolem Solving, taught by a Language Arts and Math teacher, should better prepare students for the PSAT, SAT, and CAPT.

Strategic School Profiles may be viewed on the internet at www.state.ct.us/sde . A more detailed, searchable SSP database, data tables, and additional CT education facts are also available at this site.
