



BLOOMFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION - REGULAR MEETING

Regular Meeting AT Tuesday, October 13, 2009

Bloomfield Board of Education 1133 Blue Hills Avenue Board Room, 1133 Blue Hills Avenue ,
Bloomfield, CT 06002

1. Establishment of a Quorum and Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Consent Agenda
 - A. Approval of Minutes - Special Meeting - September 1, 2009 2
 - B. Executive Session - September 1, 2009 4
 - C. Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting - September 8, 2009 5
4. Presentations
 - A. 2009 CMT & CAPT Report 9
 - K. Parks
 - B. Discussion of Board Responsibilities
 - C. Chinni
5. Public/PTO Comment
6. Superintendent's Report
 - A. Construction Updates
 - B. Legislative Update
 - C. Financial Report 25
 - D. Munsell
 - D. Other
7. Old Business
8. New Business
 - A. 2010 Board of Education Meeting Schedule 31
 - B. Pending Claims and Litigation (Board may go into Executive Session)
9. Adjournment

BLOOMFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION – SPECIAL MEETING

Tuesday, September 1, 2009
Bloomfield Board of Education
1133 Blue Hills Avenue

PRESENT: J. Michel, Chair D. Dale S. Thompson
 A. Kapsis R. Ike D. Seldon

ABSENT: D. Quinones

ALSO PRESENT: D. Title, Superintendent
 N. Caruso, CABA
 C. Chinni, Esq.

Establishment Of A Quorum And Call To Order - J. Michel, Chair, after determining that a quorum was present, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

N. Caruso, CABA, conducted a workshop on the use of CABA E-meeting software.

At 8:00 p.m. a motion was made by R. Dale and seconded by D. Seldon that the Bloomfield Board of Education together with Dr. Title and Attorney Chinni move into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing pending claims and litigation. The motion passed unanimously.

Upon returning from Executive Session a motion was made by D. Dale and seconded by S. Thompson that the Bloomfield Board of Education authorize the Superintendent through our counsel to file legal action to prevent Hartford from sending Bloomfield children back to Bloomfield, if necessary. The motion passed unanimously.

At 8:30 p.m. a motion was made by S. Thompson and seconded D. Dale to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Derrick Seldon, Secretary

BLOOMFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION – EXECUTIVE SESSION

Tuesday, September 1, 2009
Bloomfield Board of Education
1133 Blue Hills Avenue

PRESENT: J. Michel, Chair D. Dale S. Thompson
 A. Kapsis R. Ike D. Seldon

ABSENT: D. Quinones

ALSO PRESENT: D. Title, Superintendent
 C. Chinni, Esq.

At 8:01 p.m., the Bloomfield Board of Education along with Dr. Title and Attorney Chinni convened into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing pending claims and litigation.

Following a discussion at 8:27 p.m., a motion was made by S. Thompson and seconded by R. Ike to adjourn from Executive Session and reconvene into Regular Session. The motion passed unanimously.

Derrick Seldon, Secretary

BLOOMFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION – REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, September 8, 2009
Wintonbury Early Childhood Magnet School
44 Brown Street
Multi-Purpose Room

PRESENT: J. Michel, Chair D. Quinones, Vice Chair D. Seldon, Secretary
R. Dale A. Kapsis S. Thompson

ABSENT: R. Ike

ALSO PRESENT: D. Title, Superintendent
R. Cormier, Interim Assistant Superintendent
D. Munsell, Director of Business Affairs
J. Tenore, B. Bye

1. ESTABLISH QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER AND 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

J. Michel, Chair, after determining that a quorum was present, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

The Chair requested approval of the previous meeting's minutes. A motion was made by R. Dale and seconded by D. Quinones to approve the minutes of the Thursday, June 11, 2009 Special Session, the Thursday, June 11, 2009 Executive Session, and the Tuesday, June 23, 2009 Special Session.. The motion passed unanimously.

4. PRESENTATIONS

A. WINTONBURY EARLY CHILDHOOD MAGNET SCHOOL

J. Michel called upon J. Tenore, Principal, to provide a report to the Board on the opening of the new Wintonbury Early Childhood Magnet School.

Ms. Tenore reported on the enthusiasm for this new endeavor demonstrated by the teachers and staff. Teachers had been in the school since 8/17/09 busily setting up their classrooms, engaging in curriculum training, and orienting the families prior to the actual beginning of school.

There were no more than two families in any given classroom that missed orientation. Only five or six students from partner districts have dropped out, well below the expected number. Things have been going more smoothly than she anticipated during the first few opening days of school.

Dr. Title called on Ms. B. Bye who has been with this project since its inception. Ms. Bye, a member of the CT House of Representatives, is a proponent of early childhood education. She assisted the district in the planning and use of best practices for early childhood education and this new school.

Ms. Bye congratulated Superintendent Title and Bloomfield for being in the lead for developing this resource, not just in the state, but nationally as well. She commented on the hiring of staff members who know how to teach young children. She noted that young children can easily be over stimulated and she cited the proper mix of classroom work, posters, and displays in keeping with this standard.

R. Dale expressed his appreciation to the Town Council for supporting this effort and to Superintendent Title for his forward thinking in establishing this school. D. Quinones commented favorably on this project.

B. INVEST PROGRAM TEACHER OF THE YEAR-MR. G. BARCHER

Dr. Title called on Mr. N. Montgomery of Travelers to present this award to Mr. Barcher. Mr. Montgomery explained to the Board that InVest is an organization associated with national independent insurance agents.

Its curriculum is taught in high schools and community colleges in 23 states around the country. InVest's mission is to improve insurance literacy and attract quality students to the industry. Mr. Montgomery noted that Mr. Barcher began teaching this program to students starting in 2000. He has taught insurance concepts and principles to over 175 students in that time. Additionally, he has taught students concepts of accounting, business management skills, sales techniques, life lessons in risk-reward options, and how to operate a simulated insurance agency in class.

Mr. Barcher's students have participated in Travelers' job shadow events. They've been exposed to Travelers' forensic labs and the application of physics and chemistry in the pursuit of building safer products as well as investigating fraudulent insurance claims.

Fifteen of Mr. Barcher's students have earned over \$10,000 in scholarship funds from InVest. Additionally, he serves on a national leadership task force. He competed against 88 teachers nationally and was chosen to receive this award.

Mr. Barcher spoke of Travelers' support for his students and classes and their learning efforts. He encouraged Board members to visit the classroom simulations and thanked Travelers and Mr. Montgomery for their continuing support.

C. INTRODUCTION OF NEW CARMEN ARACE MIDDLE SCHOOL
PRINCIPAL-MR. T. ELLIS

Dr. Title called on the Carmen Arace Middle School new administrator, Principal T. Ellis to introduce himself to the Board. Mr. Ellis is a former Bloomfield district student.

Principal Ellis thanked the Superintendent and the Board for their trust in placing him in this position. He reported that Carmen Arace School has made Safe Harbor. The latest CMT test results show a 10% decrease in Non-Proficient students and at least a 10% increase in Proficient and Above students. He said the goal is to achieve Safe Harbor status or better again this year.

R. Dale commented favorably on Principal Ellis's presentation. A. Kapsis expressed his pride in Mr. Ellis and his achievements.

5. PUBLIC/PTO COMMENT

A. Mr. R. Berman expressed his sentiments concerning the naming of school district rooms, district spending and test scores. He provided the Board with a distribution.

B. Mr. L. Rivers addressed the issue of LEED standards for this new building and the matter of other district buildings' operating efficiencies.

C. Mr. B. Jordan commented on his concerns regarding flooring installation issues in the new school building. He provided a distribution to Board members.

6. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

The Chair called upon the Superintendent to update the Board on the following matters:

A. OPENING OF SCHOOL REPORT

1. Dr. Title noted the enrollment report is skewed because 253 students are now enrolled in the new Wintonbury Early Childhood Magnet School. Pre-K enrollment of 217 children is 190 more than last year. The racial balance of this new school is 40% White, 40% Black, and 20% Other.

The K-4 enrollment is down by about 60 students. This was previously known and is reflected in the budget with a decrease of four elementary school teaching positions. Class sizes are good. The decline is at Metacomet and J.P. Vincent Schools.

Grades 5 and 6 are almost the same enrollment as last year. Grades 7 and 8 are up by 17 students. The High School is up by 24 students and the Big Picture School is up by 7 students. The official numbers will be available as of 10/1/09.

2. Dr. Title reported on the district's efforts to provide the President's address to the nation's students. There were no restrictions on the address.

3. The Superintendent reported there was over 99% compliance with the new uniform policy at the High School on opening day. It went very well. The student body looked very good.

4. The temporary surfacing of the parking lot at Laurel School was well received by the parents using the lot.

5. Project Opening Doors is a state-wide project funded by CBIA. The purpose is to get more students and teachers involved in increasing participation and scores in Advanced Placement (AP) classes. The Superintendent will e-mail a kick-off notice to Board members.

B. CONSTRUCTION UPDATES

The Superintendent commented favorably on the efforts made by W. Casper, the Maintenance and Custodial staff, building contractors, and staff and teachers, to pull together to meet and make the opening day of school a success.

C. STATE BUDGET IMPACT UPDATE

Dr. Title reported there's a resolution to the magnet school tuition problem. It seems there's enough state funding to pay for this. It won't be official until the implemented bill is passed. Additionally CREC received the money it requested for its magnet schools.

The bottom line to the district is there aren't any savings to be had but there aren't any anticipated spending increases either.

D. OTHER

1. Ms. D. Munsell reported in June the district's surplus was \$50K. In August, \$90K was actually returned to the Town.

2. There was some Board discussion concerning the location of the next meeting. The issue will be resolved and notice made in advance of the meeting.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON NAMING SCHOOL DISTRICT ROOMS

The Chair reported on a plan he was to meet with the mayor and establish a rationale and committee to identify a list of names to be considered for this purpose. He preferred this matter be postponed until the next Board meeting.

A motion was made by J. Michel and seconded by R. Dale that the Bloomfield Board of Education postpone action on naming school district rooms until the next Board meeting on 10/13/09. The motion passed unanimously.

B. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON CENTRAL OFFICE PARKING
LOT PROJECT

The Chair reported on the efforts to repair and upgrade the Central Office Parking Lot. In addition to safety concerns, there is an overarching security issue concerning lighting and the nearby offenders' facility which the Town approved. This proximity is creating anxiety among the staff as daylight grows shorter at this time of year and adequate lighting of the lot is not available.

The Superintendent has received a very favorable bid to perform the work but there is no agreement to hold that number. The TPZ has approved the plans, and funds have been appropriated for the project. However, the Town Council has not released the funds to the district to undertake the work.

There was discussion among Board members as to the best way to proceed in this matter. Dr. Title reported the earliest this work could begin is next Spring. There was member agreement to move forward on this issue but any pre-authorization of a contract still will not release the frozen funds. The Town Council must first resolve its issues concerning this matter.

Although major potholes have been temporarily filled by the Town, the traffic flow patterns around the side and rear of the building and their unsafe patterns still must be addressed.

After some further discussion among the Board, it was decided not to take any Board action authorizing the Superintendent to take any action at this time.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:10 p.m., a motion was made by D. Quinones and seconded by D. Seldon to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Derrick Seldon, Secretary

Bloomfield Public Schools

CONNECTICUT STANDARDIZED TESTS REPORT CMT and CAPT Test Administration, March 2009

Presented on October 13, 2009

By Karen Parks
Director of Curriculum and Instruction

The purpose of this report is to examine the change in achievement of Bloomfield Public Schools' students as measured by the Connecticut Mastery Test for those students in grades three to eight and the Connecticut Academic Performance Test in grade ten. Bloomfield's student scores on the Fourth Generation CMT are mixed across grade levels and content areas. In grade three our student scores dropped slightly from 2008 in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics. In grade four, scores also declined in all three content areas from 2008 to 2009, with the largest decline in Writing. In grade five our students showed impressive gains in all levels and in all content areas with the largest gains occurring in Reading and Science. Scores for our 2009 sixth grade students were mixed showing slight gains in Math and Writing over 2008, but dropping slightly in Reading. Student scores in grades seven and eight show gains in both Reading and Math from 2008 to 2009 while Writing scores declined in both grade seven and grade eight. As in grade five from 2008 to 2009, grade eight student scores in Science showed impressive gains in all levels as we work to reduce the achievement gap between our students and other students across the state.

Scores in grade ten on the Connecticut Academic Performance Test show an overall decline in student performance from 2008 to 2009. In all content areas across the district, the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above declined and the percentage of students scoring at Below Basic increased. Only in Reading and Science did the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above rise slightly over the scores from 2008.

Bloomfield's 2009 CMT and CAPT Scores

This report compares the scores from the 2009 CMT 4 administration with the 2007 and 2008 CMT Generation 4 in each content area and at each grade level and the grade ten CAPT Generation 3 administration in 2009 with CAPT 3 administration in 2007 and 2008. It also compares our overall growth in the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above on the CMT 3 and CMT 4 from 2001 to 2009 and on the CAPT 2 and CAPT 3 from 2002 to 2009. CAPT scores for Big Picture High School are shown for only a three-year span, 2007 to 2009, because these are the only years that grade ten students were enrolled. For all comparisons, there are only three levels of performance examined, percentage of students scoring at Below Basic, at Proficient or above, and at Goal or above. These three levels are chosen for reporting because they give us the best information to track our students' achievement. Our goal in Bloomfield is to improve learning for all students and, therefore, we should expect the number of students scoring at Below Basic to decrease over time and those scoring at Proficient or above and at Goal or above to increase.

Commented [k1]:

Commented [k2R2]:

It is important to keep in mind that in each year a different group of students is tested at each grade level. Comparing grade level results from year to year can be dangerous because one needs to account for differences in the complexity of each class. However, comparing scores over time by grade can provide helpful feedback when evaluating our program and test administration in our schools.

Caution should be used in examining percentage gains from one year to the next in our elementary schools and at Big Picture High School. Each of these schools tests a small number of students, so two or three students can make a major impact on the percentage for that school. (some kind of disclaimer).

Comparison of Student Scores over Time

Comparing grade level results from year to year can be dangerous because a different group of students is tested each year; however, comparing scores over time by grade level can provide helpful information when evaluating the program or test administration in our schools.

**Table 1
Comparison of Percentage of Students Scoring at Proficient or Above
Over Eight Years**

CMT Scores in Grades 4, 6, & 8

Grade 4		2001	2009	% Diff.
	MATH	76.3	79.6	+3.3
	READING	58.7	62.1	+3.4
	WRITING	79.8	78.0	-1.8
Grade 6				
	MATH	66.4	85.6	+19.2
	READING	58.3	63.8	+5.5
	WRITING	66.9	79.9	+13.0
Grade 8				
	MATH	49.8	73.1	+23.3
	READING	49.8	64.2	+14.4
	WRITING	59.0	74.1	+15.1

Karen, you need a little commentary here on this chart.

Table 1 above includes student scores at [Proficient or above](#) on Generations 3 and 4 of the CMT [over an eight-year period from 2001 to 2009](#). The data shows [improvement in](#) student scores [across all content areas](#) over the eight-year period. Across all three grades, the largest increase in the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above is in Mathematics. [What is most noticeable over the eight-year period](#) is that the greatest gain in all content areas [occurs in grade eight](#). [This](#) seems to suggest [that the curricular and instructional changes which we continue to implement have an impact on student learning over the long term](#).

Table 2
Comparison of Percentage of Students Scoring at Proficient or Above
Over Seven Years

BHS CAPT Scores 2002 to 2009

BHS Gr. 10	2002	2009	% Diff.
MATH	41.5	49.7	+8.2
READING	52.6	61.6	+9.0
WRITING	58.0	76.4	+18.4

Table 2 above shows scores on Generations 2 and 3 of CAPT over a period of seven years. Improvement in scores in Mathematics, Reading, and Writing is evident. The greatest improvement in student achievement occurs in Writing. Because the CAPT is only administered to students in grade ten, we cannot compare growth in scores over grade levels as can be seen with CMT. However, the data does suggest that our work in curriculum and instruction is improving student achievement over time.

Table 3
Comparison of Percentage of Students Scoring at Goal or Above
Over Several Years

CMT Scores in Grades 4, 6, & 8

Grade 4	2001	2009	% Diff.
MATH	49.2	47.9	-1.3
READING	41.7	45.3	+3.6
WRITING	48.7	57.8	+9.1

Grade 6				
	MATH	32.3	49.7	+17.4
	READING	45.3	43.4	-1.9
	WRITING	40.8	50.3	+9.5
Grade 8				
	MATH	26.8	44.8	+21.5
	READING	37.9	46.3	+8.4
	WRITING	32.9	57.3	+24.4

Table 3 above shows our CMT scores at Goal or above over the same eight-year period as shown in Table 1 and a similar increase in scores is evident. The content areas showing the greatest growth in the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above are Mathematics and Writing. Similarly to the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above, the greatest increase in scores at Goal or above over the eight-year period occurs in grade eight supporting the [conclusion that our curricular and instructional improvements positively impact student achievement over the long term.](#)

Table 4
Comparison of Percentage of Students Scoring at Goal or Above
Over Seven Years

BHS CAPT Scores 2002 to 2009

BHS Gr. 10	2002	2009	% Diff.
MATH	6.9	10.7	+3.8
READING	12.6	10.7	-1.9
WRITING	26.9	27.9	+1.0

CAPT scores at Goal or above over a seven-year period as shown in Table 4 are not as encouraging. Although there is an increase in the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above in 2009 in Mathematics and Writing, the increase is quite small. In Reading the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above decreases from 2002 to 2009 indicating that additional work must be done to improve our students' skills in reading.

Mathematics

CMT 4 and CAPT 3 in [Mathematics](#) both assess student performance on a range of skills, concepts and applications in four broad areas of mathematics: Numerical and Proportional Reasoning, Algebraic Reasoning, Geometry and Measurement, and Working with Data: Probability and Statistics. The skills and concepts are representative of and aligned with the content and performance standards found in the most recent Connecticut's Mathematics Curriculum Framework. While the CMT and CAPT mathematics objectives should not be viewed as a curriculum, Bloomfield's mathematics curriculum includes the skills and concepts assessed on the CMT and CAPT. Daily classroom instruction is not limited to preparation for the state tests; however, we expect high-quality instruction that reflects what is assessed and how it is assessed on both the CMT and CAPT.

MATHEMATICS SCORES ACROSS SCHOOLS AND GRADE LEVELS:

As shown in the tables on the following page, scores across the elementary schools in Mathematics demonstrate inconsistent growth with a general decline in grades three and four across the district from 2008 to 2009.

Table 5

CMT Grade 3 Mathematics									
	% Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
J.P. Vincent	7.4	7.6	6.1	83.3	77.3	79.6	48.1	53.0	51.0
Laurel	3.8	15.1	9.9	83.0	77.4	77.5	66.0	54.7	42.3
Metacomet	2.0	1.9	4.7	84.3	88.5	76.7	51.0	71.2	39.5
Bloomfield	5.0	8.2	7.9	83.0	80.7	77.4	54.7	59.1	43.9
State	10.8	10.6	8.9	80.1	80.7	82.8	59.4	60.2	63.0
% Diff Bfld & State	-5.8	-2.4	-1.0	+2.9	0.0	-5.4	-4.7	-1.1	-19.1

Table 5 above compares the CMT Generation 3 Mathematics scores of third grade students across the district from 2007 to 2009. Over the three-year period the percentage of third grade students scoring at Goal or above and at Proficient or above either decreased or remained about the same

at Metacomet and Laurel Schools. At Vincent Elementary school the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above increased from 2008 to 2009 and although the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above in 2009 is lower than in 2008 it is greater than in 2007.

Table 6

CMT Grade 4 Mathematics									
	% Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
J.P. Vincent	1.9	3.4	7.8	83.0	86.4	89.1	56.6	59.3	57.8
Laurel	9.5	14.0	21.2	73.0	72.0	71.2	42.9	50.0	32.7
Metacomet	10.9	0.0	7.8	72.7	89.4	76.5	49.1	42.6	51.0
Bloomfield	8.6	5.8	12.0	75.3	82.7	79.6	48.9	51.3	47.9
State	9.9	10.2	7.9	80.9	81.5	84.6	62.3	60.5	63.8
% Diff Blfld & State	-1.3	-4.4	+4.1	-5.6	+1.2	-5.3	-13.4	-9.2	-15.9

Table 6 above demonstrates very similar results for our fourth grade students as the results shown in Table 5 for our third grade students. Over the three-year period there is inconsistency in the scores, but at both Metacomet and Laurel the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above in 2009 decreases from 2008. At Vincent the percentage of student scoring at Proficient shows consistent improvement from 2007 to 2009 while the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above remains about the same.

Table 7

CMT Grade 5 Mathematics									
	% Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAIS	14.9	15.3	8.0	74.3	68.4	76.7	46.9	41.8	50.0
State	8.8	8.6	6.2	82.5	83.1	85.9	66.0	66.2	69.0
% Diff Blfld & State	+6.1	+6.7	+1.8	-8.2	-14.7	-9.2	-19.1	-24.4	-19.0

Table 8

CMT Grade 6 Mathematics									
	% Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAIS	10.7	9.0	3.9	77.9	81.3	85.6	52.3	53.0	49.7
State	8.5	7.2	5.3	82.7	84.3	86.8	63.9	66.6	69.0
% Diff Blfld & State	+2.2	+1.8	-1.4	-6.4	-3.5	-1.2	-12.6	-13.9	-19.3

Tables 7 and 8 above show the Mathematics scores for grade five and six students at Carmen Arace Intermediate School. These scores show significant gains in both grades from 2008 to 2009, with decreases in the percentage of students scoring at Below Basic and increases in the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above. In grade five, the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above in 2009 shows significant gains over 2008 and 2007. In grade six, the

percentage of students scoring at Goal or above dropped slightly over the three-year period while the percentage of students scoring at Below Basic consistently declines over the three-year period. In 2009 the percentage of sixth grade students scoring at Below Basic fell below the state average showing impressive gains for our lowest achieving students.

Table 9

CMT Grade 7 Mathematics									
	% Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAMS	16.3	15.1	5.5	62.1	67.8	82.8	35.3	34.9	49.7
State	9.4	7.5	5.2	80.2	82.6	85.7	60.3	63.3	66.3
% Diff Bflfd & State	+6.9	+7.6	+0.3	-18.1	-14.8	-2.9	-25.0	-28.4	-16.6

Table 10

CMT Grade 8 Mathematics									
	% Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAMS	14.9	14.1	12.7	61.5	59.9	73.1	23.0	32.3	44.8
State	9.1	8.7	6.1	80.8	81.2	84.5	60.8	61.0	64.7
% Diff Bflfd & State	+5.8	+5.4	+6.6	-19.3	-21.3	-11.4	-37.8	-28.7	-19.9

As shown in Tables 9 and 10 above, Mathematics scores for grades seven and eight students at Carmen Arace Middle School have shown consistent gains from 2007 to 2009. The percentage of students scoring at Below Basic has shown a fairly consistent decline over the three years while the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above and at Goal or above has consistently increased. The percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above in grade seven is only 2.9 percentage points below the state average.

Table 11

CAPT Grade 10 Mathematics									
	% Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
District	29.3	18.1	23.2	35.4	53.1	47.5	6.6	12.4	10.5
State	10.3	8.4	9.4	77.2	79.7	78.4	45.3	50.2	48.0
BHS	28.0	19.2	22.0	38.7	52.6	49.7	8.0	13.5	10.7
BPHS	32.1	9.5	21.1	17.9	57.1	36.8	0.0	4.8	10.5

CAPT Mathematics scores in Table 11 above show a decline in scores from 2008 to 2009; however, the 2009 scores remain higher than the scores in 2007. The percentage of students scoring at Below Basic increases from 2008 to 2009 at both Big Picture High School and Bloomfield High School. The percentages of students scoring at Proficient or above decline from 2008 to 2009 at both high schools but remain higher than the percentages of students scoring at Proficient or above in 2007 for both schools. The percentage of students scoring at Goal or above

declines from 2008 to 2009 at Bloomfield High School while the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above at Big Picture High School increases consistently from 2007 to 2009.

Reading

The CMT 4 Reading test is comprised of two subtests, Degrees of Reading Power, (DRP), and Reading Comprehension. DRP is a multiple choice test of reading ability. It is designed to measure a student's ability to understand nonfiction English prose on a graduated scale of reading difficulty. The Reading Comprehension subtest consists of narrative and informational passages on a variety of topics. It includes passages with multiple choice questions and open-ended questions that require students to write responses. The total reading score that a student achieves is based on these two subtests. The CAPT 3 Reading Across the Disciplines test is comprised of two subtests, Response to Literature, which includes fiction passages, and Reading for Information, which includes non-fiction passages. Both tests require students to extract information from the text and measure students' reading comprehension skills.

READING SCORES ACROSS SCHOOLS AND GRADE LEVELS:

Table 12

	CMT Grade 3 Reading								
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
J.P. Vincent	20.4	28.8	20.0	61.1	62.1	64.0	38.9	37.9	52.0
Laurel	18.9	30.2	29.6	67.9	62.3	46.5	24.5	45.3	28.2
Metacomet	23.5	19.2	26.2	54.9	55.8	66.7	37.3	32.7	33.3
Bloomfield	21.4	26.3	25.8	61.0	60.2	57.1	33.3	38.6	36.8
State	20.1	20.4	17.5	69.3	68.4	71.1	52.3	52.1	54.6
% Diff Blfld & State	+1.3	+5.9	+8.3	-8.3	-8.2	-14.0	-19.0	-13.5	-17.8

Table 13

	CMT Grade 4 Reading								
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
J.P. Vincent	15.1	13.6	19.0	67.9	71.2	66.7	50.9	49.2	54.0
Laurel	20.6	34.0	28.0	61.9	60.0	58.0	44.4	52.0	40.0
Metacomet	36.4	33.3	27.1	49.1	58.3	60.4	25.5	35.4	39.6
Bloomfield	24.7	26.1	24.2	59.2	63.7	62.1	40.2	45.9	45.3
State	20.1	21.5	17.1	70.6	69.7	74.4	57.0	56.0	60.7
% Diff Blfld & State	+4.6	+4.6	+7.1	-11.1	-6.0	-12.3	-16.8	-10.1	-15.4

As shown in Tables 12 and 13 above, average district scores for grades three and four in Reading decline slightly from 2008 to 2009. When compared to the 2007 scores, the 2009 district average for grade three remains about the same but shows a slight increase in grade four. The scores at individual elementary schools show significant variation. In grade three, the percentage of

students scoring at Proficient or above increases at Vincent and Metacomet but decreases over the same three years at Laurel. In grade four, the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above rises slightly from 2008 to 2009 at Metacomet but decreases at Laurel. The percentage of students scoring at Goal or above in grades three and four in Reading also rises at Vincent and Metacomet from 2008 to 2009 while dropping at Laurel in both grades.

Table 14

CMT Grade 5 Reading									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAIS	34.3	28.8	23.2	56.6	55.4	66.0	36.0	41.8	47.9
State	19.5	18.6	15.0	73.4	74.0	77.7	61.5	62.2	66.0
% Diff Blfld & State	+14.8	+10.2	+8.2	-16.8	-18.6	-11.7	-25.5	-20.4	-18.1

Table 15

CMT Grade 6 Reading									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAIS	23.5	21.6	20.4	61.1	64.7	63.8	45.6	47.9	43.4
State	16.4	15.1	12.6	75.7	77.6	80.3	64.3	66.4	69.0
% Diff Blfld & State	+7.1	+6.5	+7.8	-14.6	-12.9	-16.5	-18.7	-18.5	-25.6

Tables 14 and 15 above show that Reading scores at Carmen Arace Intermediate School have significant and consistent gains in grade five from 2007 to 2009, while scores in grade six show a slight decline from 2008. The percentage of students scoring at Below Basic consistently declines over the three years in both grades revealing that our lowest achieving students are making gains in Reading achievement.

Table 16

CMT Grade 7 Reading									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAMS	27.0	28.8	20.7	61.4	56.8	67.6	47.1	42.5	51.0
State	16.2	13.8	10.5	75.5	79.7	83.4	65.9	71.2	74.9
% Diff Blfld & State	+10.8	+15.0	+10.2	-14.1	-22.9	-15.8	-18.8	-28.7	-23.9

Table 17

CMT Grade 8 Reading									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAMS	20.7	22.9	21.6	65.5	63.0	64.2	50.0	41.1	46.3
State	16.1	15.3	12.0	76.4	77.0	80.5	66.6	64.9	68.5

% Diff Blfld & State	+4.6	+7.6	+9.6	-10.9	-14.0	-16.3	-16.6	-23.8	-22.2
----------------------	------	------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

In Tables 16 and 17 above grades seven and eight Reading scores at Carmen Arace Middle School show improvement in both grades from 2008 to 2009. Scores in grade seven show a consistent decline in the percentage of students scoring at Below Basic and a significant increase over the three-years in the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above and at Goal or above. In grade eight, students scoring at Below Basic and at Proficient or above remain about the same over the three years, but the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above shows a slight increase from 2008 to 2009.

Table 18

CAPT Grade 10 Reading									
	% Below Basic			% Proficient or Above			% Goal or Above		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
District	15.6	7.3	10.4	50.0	69.8	62.3	14.4	12.8	14.8
State	7.5	7.4	7.2	79.7	82.6	81.8	45.5	45.5	47.5
BHS	15.8	8.2	10.1	50.0	69.6	61.6	16.4	12.7	15.7
BPHS	15.4	0.0	10.0	50.0	71.4	75.0	3.8	14.3	5.0

The CAPT Reading scores for the district over the three-year period in Table 18 above show a significant amount of variation. At Big Picture High School the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above shows consistent gains from 2007 to 2009 while the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above increases from 2007 to 2008 and then decreases from 2008 to 2009. At Bloomfield High School the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above increases from 2007 to 2008 and then decreases slightly from 2008 to 2009 while the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above decreases from 2007 to 2008 and then increases from 2008 to 2009.

Writing

The CMT 4 Writing test is comprised of two subtests, Direct Assessment of Writing (DAW) and Editing and Revising. Both the Reading and Writing tests draw from content and performance standards delineated in the most recent Connecticut English Language Arts Curriculum Framework. The DAW requires the student to respond to a prompt and is evaluated based on a student's ability to communicate in a coherent manner. The DAW is scored on a 6 point scale, with each paper being scored twice, resulting in a score ranging from 2 to 12 points. The Editing and Revising subtest is a multiple choice test that measures the students' understanding of the conventions of the English language and their ability to read passages and identify errors in organization, syntax and word choice. The CAPT 3 Writing test is comprised of three subtests, two Interdisciplinary Writing tests and one Editing and Revising test. The Interdisciplinary Writing tests are scores similarly to the Direct Assessment of Writing using a 6 point scale with each response being scored twice resulting in a score ranging from 2 to 12 points.

WRITING SCORES:

Table 19

CMT Grade 3 Writing									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
J.P. Vincent	1.9	3.0	9.1	87.0	86.4	67.3	61.1	57.6	45.5
Laurel	1.9	7.5	1.4	92.5	84.9	77.8	69.8	58.5	48.6
Metacomet	2.0	7.7	0.0	92.2	84.6	88.4	68.6	63.5	62.8
Bloomfield	2.5	5.8	3.5	89.9	85.4	77.2	66.0	59.6	50.9
State	7.3	7.3	6.4	82.4	82.9	83.2	60.8	63.5	62.6
% Diff Bflfd & State	-4.8	-1.5	-2.9	+7.5	+2.5	-6.0	+5.2	-3.9	-11.7

Table 20

CMT Grade 4 Writing									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
J.P. Vincent	0.0	5.1	4.4	90.6	89.8	80.9	66.0	64.4	57.4
Laurel	1.6	2.0	13.0	90.5	92.0	77.8	73.0	70.0	66.7
Metacomet	1.8	0.0	11.8	89.1	89.8	74.5	50.9	51.0	49.0
Bloomfield	1.7	2.5	9.2	89.1	90.5	78.0	63.2	62.0	57.8
State	6.4	6.5	6.1	84.1	84.8	85.0	65.1	62.9	64.2
% Diff Bflfd & State	-4.7	-4.0	+3.1	+5.1	+5.7	-7.0	-1.9	-0.9	-6.4

As shown in Tables 19 and 20 above, the elementary Writing scores on average in grades three and four decline across the district over the three years. The percentage of students scoring at Below Basic in grade three decrease at Laurel and Metacomet from 2008 to 2009 and increase at Vincent. Metacomet has no student scoring at Below Basic in Writing in grade three, which exceeds the state average for low achieving students. The percentage of grade three students scoring at Proficient or above decreases over the three-year period at Vincent and Laurel while increasing slightly at Metacomet from 2008 to 2009. The percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above in grade four decreases in all three schools from 2008 to 2009 and the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above in both grades three and four decrease slightly over the three-year period.

Table 21

CMT Grade 5 Writing									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAIS	4.0	4.0	1.3	83.4	84.1	90.1	58.9	57.4	58.9
State	5.0	5.4	4.8	85.7	85.7	86.5	64.6	64.6	66.6
% Diff Bflfd & State	-1.0	-1.4	-3.5	-2.3	-1.6	+3.0	-5.7	-7.2	-8.4

Table 22

CMT Grade 6 Writing									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAIS	4.0	6.6	1.3	85.2	73.7	79.9	57.0	46.1	50.3
State	5.7	5.4	5.9	83.8	82.9	83.1	63.0	61.9	62.2
% Diff Blfld & State	-1.7	+1.2	-4.6	+1.4	-9.2	-3.2	-6.0	-15.8	-11.9

The Writing scores for grades five and six at Carmen Arace Intermediate School in Tables 21 and 22 above show consistent improvement in grade five over the three-year period and slight variation in grade six. In both grades the percentage of students scoring at Below Basic decreases over the three years and the percentage of students scoring at Goal or above remains about the same over the three years. The percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above shows consistent growth in grade five over the three-year period while grade six scores at that level show a slight decline over the three years with some improvement from 2008 to 2009.

Table 23

CMT Grade 7 Writing									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAMS	9.5	6.1	14.3	73.2	69.4	62.3	41.6	45.6	35.7
State	7.0	8.5	8.2	81.1	80.1	80.9	60.4	62.0	62.9
% Diff Blfld & State	+2.5	-2.4	+6.1	-7.9	-10.7	-18.6	-18.8	-16.4	-27.2

Table 24

CMT Grade 8 Writing									
	Below Basic			% At/Above Proficient			% At/Above Goal		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
CAMS	5.2	7.8	8.4	78.7	80.7	74.1	46.6	45.8	57.3
State	7.0	7.5	7.1	82.5	82.7	83.7	64.0	63.4	66.5
% Diff Blfld & State	-1.8	+0.3	+1.3	-3.8	-2.0	-9.6	-17.4	-17.6	-9.2

On average, the scores in Writing at Carmen Arace Middle School in grades seven and eight drop slightly from 2007 to 2009 as shown in Tables 23 and 24 above. The percentage of students scoring at Below Basic increases from 2007 to 2009 for both grades seven and eight, and the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above decreases from 2007 to 2009 in both grades. The percentage of students scoring at Goal or above decreases from 2007 to 2009 in grade seven but increases in grade eight.

Table 25

CAPT Grade 10 Writing									
	% Below Basic			% Proficient or Above			% Goal or Above		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
District	9.9	2.2	3.7	63.5	79.6	75.7	14.8	28.2	25.9
State	7.1	3.8	4.3	82.2	88.1	86.5	53.0	57.9	55.1
BHS	9.2	2.5	2.4	65.8	80.5	76.4	16.3	27.0	27.9
BPHS	14.8	0.0	5.0	51.9	76.2	80.0	7.4	38.1	10.0

The average scores for the district in grade ten on CAPT Writing vary across years as shown in Table 25 above. The percentage of grade ten students scoring at Below Basic at both Big Picture High School and Bloomfield High School decrease significantly from 2007 to 2008 and increase slightly from 2008 to 2009, just as the percentages varies at this level across the state. The percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above at Bloomfield High School also mirror the state’s increase in scores from 2007 to 2008 and slight decrease from 2008 to 2009 while the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above at Big Picture High School shows consistent increase over the three-year period. The percentage of students scoring at Goal or above increases over the three-year period at Bloomfield High School while increasing at Big Picture from 2007 to 2009 but decreasing from 2008 to 2009.

Science

This is the second year that students are tested in Science on the CMT. The grade five Science CMT assesses students on their cumulative knowledge of science content and skills learned in kindergarten through grade five. The Science CMT administered in grade eight tests students on their cumulative knowledge of science content and skills learned in grades six to eight. The CAPT Science tests students on their cumulative knowledge of science content and skills from kindergarten through grade ten. The skills and concepts are representative of and aligned with the content and performance standards found in the most recent Core Science Curriculum Framework. Students are expected to understand and explain concepts in earth, life, and physical science and how those concepts relate to the real world. Science Performance Tasks, developed by the State Department of Education and administered during the school year as part of the science curriculum, form the basis for many of the CMT and CAPT questions which focus on students’ understanding of science inquiry, literacy and numeracy.

SCIENCE SCORES:

Table 26

CMT Grade 5 Science						
	Below Basic		% At/Above Proficient		% At/Above Goal	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
CAIS	11.3	6.0	65.5	75.5	23.2	34.4
State	7.8	7.0	81.1	82.9	55.2	58.3
% Diff Blmflld &	+3.5	-1.0	-15.6	-7.4	-32.0	-23.9

State

Table 27

CMT Grade 8 Science						
	Below Basic		% At/Above Proficient		% At/Above Goal	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
CAMS	30.7	24.5	51.0	47.6	23.4	31.5
State	14.8	13.7	75.2	76.6	58.9	60.9
% Diff Blmfld & State	+15.9	+10.8	-24.2	-29.0	-35.5	-29.4

As shown in Tables 26 and 27 above, over the two years that the Science CMT has been administered, our students' scores in grades five and eight have shown dramatic improvement. In both grades five and eight, the percentage of students scoring at Below Basic decreases over the two years and the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above and at Goal or above shows significant increases.

Table 28

CAPT Grade 10 Science									
	% Below Basic			% Proficient or Above			% Goal or Above		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
District	21.9	12.4	20.7	51.9	62.4	52.8	7.5	10.7	11.9
State	7.6	9.4	11.2	81.4	80.5	78.4	44.5	46.5	43.0
BHS	19.2	11.5	19.5	55.8	63.5	55.6	9.0	11.5	13.0
BPHS	32.1	14.3	20.0	35.7	57.1	35.0	0.0	4.8	5.0

Our tenth grade students' scores in Table 28 above on the Science CAPT unfortunately have not shown the same increases over the past three-year period as those of our grade five and eight students from 2008 to 2009. Across the district, the percentage of students scoring at Proficient or above increases from 2007 to 2008 but decreases from 2008 to 2009, as do the state average scores at this level. The percentage of students scoring at Goal or above increases across all three years in both Bloomfield High School and Big Picture High School even though the state average scores at Goal or above decline from 2008 to 2009.

Next Steps – Improvement Strategies

The elementary, intermediate, middle and high schools' staff each continues to focus on CMT and CAPT scores as part of their school improvement plans. All of our schools have implemented standards-based curricula in all major content areas and continue to focus on effective instructional strategies to improve student learning. Curriculum is revised every six to seven years to ensure that content standards and skills are updated to comply with changing state standards. During the current year, teachers across grades kindergarten to grade six are implementing the new Language Arts Curriculum and reading and writing materials to improve the teaching of reading comprehension and writing skills. To support the teachers in the use of these new materials, we have added the position of Language Arts Curriculum Implementation

Coach, whose sole responsibility is to train and support the teachers in the use of the new *Making Meaning* and *Being a Writer* programs. Another important focus during the 2009-10 school year is the implementation of Scientifically Research Based Interventions (SRBI) in reading, writing, and mathematics. This process will identify students who are at risk in reading, writing, and mathematics and match them with the necessary and appropriate instructional support and interventions to reduce their achievement gaps.

Ongoing and diverse professional development opportunities provide staff with choices for professional growth to meet their specific instructional needs and to enhance student learning. Administrators, instructional coaches and teacher leaders participate in classroom visitations across the district to refine their knowledge and understanding of instructional pedagogy and staff needs. In all of our schools, principals are using staff meetings for discussions and modeling of effective teaching strategies.

–The implementation of the data team process as a result of our Strategic Plan and the use of our new *Bloomfield Data Team Manual* enhance the work in all content areas and on grade level teams. In each content area, scores are analyzed to pinpoint areas of student weakness and to develop instructional strategies focused on improving learning for all students. Common student weaknesses in each content area have been identified across the district and are receiving more intense instructional focus. In mathematics across all grades student scores demonstrate low achievement in approximating measures and estimation, fractions and decimals, proportions, solving word problems, algebraic reasoning, and mathematical applications. All of our schools are responding to these needs in various ways. Some examples are: the Math Workshop Model, leveled instruction and heterogeneous classes, the use of Success Maker and ALEKS software in math, math teaching exhibitions and math classes at Goodwin or Capital Community College, and the use of diagnostic assessments in all grade levels to monitor students' attainment of specific standards-based skills in math. In reading, there is a consistent focus across all grades to improve students' comprehension skills, particularly in non-fiction text. Some examples of our schools' responses to these needs in reading are: the newly adopted *Making Meaning* program materials in grades kindergarten through grade six which focus on reading comprehension, the addition of guided and independent reading materials in all grades, two-hour literacy blocks, sustained silent reading with high interest reading materials, focus on vocabulary in all grades, and more non-fiction reading in all content areas. In writing, students' main weakness across all grade levels lies in composition. Some examples of instructional strategies to improve our students' achievement in writing are: student journal writing, the new Language Arts materials in grades kindergarten to grade six entitled *Being a Writer*, implementation of a forty-five minute writing block, community building and communication skills training for students, and weekly letter writing. In many content areas and grade levels, teachers are working together on data teams to develop and administer common formative assessments which frequently monitor student learning and identify students who require additional support. The district is participating in the CREC Common Assessment Consortium, which convenes teachers from over 30 districts in the Hartford area to build assessment items which are aligned with the state standards. During this process, teacher leaders from each school receive valuable training in the development and use of common formative assessments to monitor student learning.

Across the district, all of our schools have implemented character education and Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Programs which, when combined with additional academic support, should enhance our students' learning. In addition, our new Language Arts Program for grades kindergarten through six incorporates community building and social skills training for students. Through the use of *Making Meaning* and *Being a Writer*, students must participate in student-to-student dialog and responsible and respectful behaviors, both of which should lead to improved oral language skills and improved learning in all content areas.

The new resources in the middle, intermediate, and high school libraries and the continuous additions to classroom libraries with leveled readers and high interest materials enhance and enrich the learning of our students in all content areas and across all grade levels. The ongoing renovation plans for all of our schools will provide better technology and classroom and laboratory facilities to enhance students' critical thinking, experimentation, and presentation skills and support more effective teaching and learning.

The key to improved standardized test scores lies in the improved learning of our students at all levels of their education. The opening of the Wintonbury Early Childhood Magnet School this fall will better prepare our students for success in all aspects of learning by teaching standards based curriculum for preschool and kindergarten students. Starting in preschool, continued improvements in curriculum, instruction, and facilities will enhance learning and improve our students' achievement in the classroom and on standardized tests.

Bloomfield

BOE EXPENDITURE REPORT BY OBJECT

Account Number / Description	Adopted Budget 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Expenses YTD 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Encumbrances 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance Before Req's Sub. 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Submitted Requisitions 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance After Req's Sub	Percent Remaining 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010
1110 SALARIES, TEACHER	\$14,396,318	\$2,408,179	\$11,686,185	\$301,954	\$0	\$301,954	2%
1115 SALARIES, ADMIN	\$2,085,270	\$626,022	\$1,417,203	\$42,045	\$0	\$42,045	2%
01 CERTIFIED SALARIES	\$16,481,588	\$3,034,201	\$13,103,388	\$343,999	\$0	\$343,999	2%
1210 SALARIES, PROFESSIONAL STAFF	\$334,160	\$74,644	\$260,458	\$(942)	\$0	\$(942)	0%
1215 SALARIES, JROTC	\$95,255	\$(27,280)	\$113,307	\$9,228	\$0	\$9,228	10%
1220 SALARIES, TUTOR	\$352,697	\$49,080	\$342,498	\$(38,881)	\$0	\$(38,881)	(11)%
1230 SALARIES, PARA	\$421,978	\$62,311	\$380,005	\$(20,338)	\$0	\$(20,338)	(5)%
1235 SALARIES, NURSES	\$340,602	\$56,531	\$281,065	\$3,006	\$0	\$3,006	1%
1240 SALARIES, CLERICAL	\$1,450,040	\$338,087	\$1,087,728	\$24,225	\$0	\$24,225	2%
1250 SALARIES, BUSINESS OFFICE	\$294,909	\$85,001	\$207,961	\$1,947	\$0	\$1,947	1%
1255 SALARIES, TECHNICAL SUPPORT	\$240,460	\$81,724	\$167,884	\$(9,148)	\$0	\$(9,148)	(4)%
1257 SALARIES, RESIDENCY OFFICER	\$54,583	\$11,554	\$68,564	\$(25,535)	\$0	\$(25,535)	(47)%
1260 SALARIES, CUSTODIAN	\$1,280,341	\$294,312	\$875,787	\$110,242	\$0	\$110,242	9%
1265 SALARIES, MAINTENANCE	\$623,771	\$175,217	\$446,513	\$2,041	\$0	\$2,041	0%
1270 SALARIES, MONITOR	\$229,302	\$25,517	\$179,540	\$24,245	\$0	\$24,245	11%
1275 SALARIES, CROSSING GUARD	\$20,170	\$2,451	\$17,604	\$115	\$0	\$115	1%
1280 SALARIES, SUPPORT	\$17,800	\$700	\$0	\$17,100	\$0	\$17,100	96%

Bloomfield

BOE EXPENDITURE REPORT BY OBJECT

Account Number / Description	Adopted Budget 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Expenses YTD 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Encumbrances 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance Before Req's Sub. 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Submitted Requisitions 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance After Req's Sub	Percent Remaining 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010
1290 OVERTIME, SUPPORT	\$151,561	\$43,318	\$0	\$108,243	\$0	\$108,243	71%
02 NON-CERTIFIED SALARIES	\$5,907,629	\$1,273,167	\$4,428,914	\$205,548	\$0	\$205,548	3%
2100 HEALTH INSURANCE	\$4,868,419	\$33,167	\$0	\$4,835,252	\$0	\$4,835,252	99%
2150 LIFE INSURANCE	\$180,000	\$39,308	\$112,415	\$28,277	\$0	\$28,277	16%
2170 INSURANCE BUY-OUT	\$30,800	\$7,700	\$25,200	\$(2,100)	\$0	\$(2,100)	(7)%
2200 SOCIAL SECURITY	\$858,351	\$173,341	\$638,716	\$46,294	\$0	\$46,294	5%
2300 PENSION	\$534,539	\$0	\$0	\$534,539	\$0	\$534,539	100%
2410 SEVERANCE	\$84,398	\$34,921	\$0	\$49,477	\$0	\$49,477	59%
2500 COURSE REMUNERATION	\$30,000	\$3,800	\$26,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
2600 UNEMPLOYMENT COMP	\$126,982	\$14,011	\$89,049	\$23,922	\$0	\$23,922	19%
2700 WORKERS' COMP	\$197,900	\$48,123	\$144,369	\$5,408	\$0	\$5,408	3%
2800 PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS - DISTRICT	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000	100%
03 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	\$6,913,389	\$354,371	\$1,035,949	\$5,523,069	\$0	\$5,523,069	80%
3100 ADMIN SERVICES	\$61,000	\$3,781	\$13,758	\$43,461	\$0	\$43,461	71%
3200 PROF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES	\$519,937	\$32,460	\$139,081	\$348,396	\$300	\$348,096	67%
3260 TESTING	\$26,500	\$0	\$1,380	\$25,120	\$0	\$25,120	95%
3300 PROF DEVELOPMENT	\$57,000	\$19,218	\$20,798	\$16,984	\$0	\$16,984	30%

Bloomfield

BOE EXPENDITURE REPORT BY OBJECT

Account Number / Description	Adopted Budget 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Expenses YTD 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Encumbrances 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance Before Req's Sub. 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Submitted Requisitions 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance After Req's Sub	Percent Remaining 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010
3400 OTHER PROF SERVICES	\$75,000	\$725	\$5,200	\$69,075	\$0	\$69,075	92%
3500 TECHNICAL SERVICES	\$96,807	\$79,334	\$22,178	\$(4,705)	\$0	\$(4,705)	(5)%
3520 COPIER COSTS	\$132,394	\$26,027	\$82,981	\$23,386	\$0	\$23,386	18%
4300 MAINTENANCE & REPAIR	\$87,572	\$14,746	\$15,525	\$57,301	\$0	\$57,301	65%
4310 PURCHASED SERVICES BUILDINGS	\$299,081	\$25,229	\$104,466	\$169,386	\$800	\$168,586	57%
4320 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE & REPAIR	\$50,294	\$2,262	\$252	\$47,780	\$0	\$47,780	95%
04 CONTRACTED SERVICES	\$1,405,585	\$203,782	\$405,619	\$796,184	\$1,100	\$795,084	57%
5100 TRANSPORTATION, PUPIL	\$2,345,703	\$49,697	\$1,764,990	\$531,016	\$0	\$531,016	23%
5820 FIELD TRIPS	\$80,177	\$2,759	\$12,150	\$65,268	\$0	\$65,268	81%
05 PUPIL TRANSPORTATION	\$2,425,880	\$52,456	\$1,777,140	\$596,284	\$0	\$596,284	25%
5200 PROPERTY/LIABILITY INSURANCE	\$220,000	\$54,225	\$162,674	\$3,101	\$0	\$3,101	1%
5290 OTHER INSURANCE	\$6,673	\$6,673	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
06 INSURANCE	\$226,673	\$60,898	\$162,674	\$3,101	\$0	\$3,101	1%
5300 COMMUNICATIONS	\$19,890	\$8,461	\$53,190	\$(41,761)	\$0	\$(41,761)	(210)%
5310 POSTAGE	\$53,949	\$7,832	\$1,000	\$45,117	\$0	\$45,117	84%
5400 ADVERTISING	\$40,000	\$13,010	\$13,545	\$13,445	\$0	\$13,445	34%
5500 PRINTING	\$93,200	\$23,365	\$21,029	\$48,806	\$0	\$48,806	52%

Bloomfield

BOE EXPENDITURE REPORT BY OBJECT

Account Number / Description	Adopted Budget	Expenses YTD	Encumbrances	Balance Before	Submitted	Balance After	Percent
	7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Req's Sub. 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Requisitions 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Req's Sub	Remaining 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010
07 COMMUNICATIONS	\$207,039	\$52,668	\$88,764	\$65,607	\$0	\$65,607	32%
5600 TUITION, PUBLIC	\$1,068,624	\$0	\$391,457	\$677,167	\$0	\$677,167	63%
5630 TUITION, PRIVATE	\$720,180	\$70,885	\$963,948	\$(314,653)	\$0	\$(314,653)	(44)%
5690 TUITION, MAGNET	\$432,412	\$0	\$6,000	\$426,412	\$0	\$426,412	99%
08 TUITION	\$2,221,216	\$70,885	\$1,361,405	\$788,926	\$0	\$788,926	36%
5810 STAFF TRAVEL	\$41,221	\$5,816	\$25,066	\$10,339	\$0	\$10,339	25%
5814 CONFERENCES & MEETINGS	\$58,355	\$1,777	\$7,548	\$49,030	\$550	\$48,480	84%
09 OTHER PURCHASED SERVICES	\$99,576	\$7,593	\$32,614	\$59,369	\$550	\$58,819	60%
6110 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	\$432,447	\$77,421	\$76,258	\$278,768	\$1,938	\$276,830	64%
6115 OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$65,400	\$15,316	\$10,846	\$39,238	\$0	\$39,238	60%
6116 LIBRARY / AV SUPPLIES	\$24,732	\$3,487	\$2,062	\$19,183	\$324	\$18,859	78%
6117 COMPUTER SUPPLIES	\$40,000	\$692	\$15,881	\$23,427	\$0	\$23,427	59%
6120 SOFTWARE	\$197,704	\$79,178	\$74,558	\$43,968	\$0	\$43,968	22%
6900 OTHER SUPPLIES	\$30,660	\$1,871	\$12,762	\$16,027	\$0	\$16,027	52%
10 SUPPLIES	\$790,943	\$177,965	\$192,367	\$420,611	\$2,262	\$418,349	53%
6125 FACILITY SUPPLIES	\$87,022	\$47,528	\$22,444	\$17,050	\$0	\$17,050	20%
6130 FACILITY MATERIALS	\$85,783	\$11,529	\$35,651	\$38,603	\$0	\$38,603	45%

Bloomfield

BOE EXPENDITURE REPORT BY OBJECT

Account Number / Description	Adopted Budget	Expenses YTD	Encumbrances	Balance Before	Submitted	Balance After	Percent
	7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Req's Sub. 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Requisitions 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Req's Sub	Remaining 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010
6200 HEAT	\$638,567	\$16,794	\$543,528	\$78,245	\$0	\$78,245	12%
6220 ELECTRICITY	\$851,303	\$119,886	\$612,582	\$118,835	\$0	\$118,835	14%
6290 WATER SERVICES	\$37,228	\$4,461	\$28,979	\$3,788	\$0	\$3,788	10%
7200 BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS	\$75,850	\$46,457	\$5,500	\$23,893	\$0	\$23,893	32%
11 OPERATION & MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS	\$1,775,753	\$246,655	\$1,248,684	\$280,414	\$0	\$280,414	16%
6410 TEXTBOOKS	\$207,300	\$21,251	\$8,824	\$177,225	\$0	\$177,225	85%
6420 LIBRARY BOOKS, PERIODICALS	\$50,000	\$12,477	\$5,875	\$31,648	\$9,995	\$21,653	63%
6430 PROF BOOKS	\$9,398	\$2,685	\$785	\$5,928	\$0	\$5,928	63%
12 TEXTBOOKS/LIBRARY BOOKS/OTHER SUPPL	\$266,698	\$36,413	\$15,484	\$214,801	\$9,995	\$204,806	81%
7300 NEW EQUIPMENT	\$89,067	\$27,779	\$16,374	\$44,914	\$0	\$44,914	50%
7320 REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT	\$82,780	\$23,702	\$11,376	\$47,702	\$0	\$47,702	58%
7340 COMPUTER EQUIP	\$137,423	\$10,670	\$12,733	\$114,020	\$0	\$114,020	83%
13 EQUIPMENT	\$309,270	\$62,151	\$40,483	\$206,636	\$0	\$206,636	67%
8100 DUES & FEES	\$55,062	\$43,938	\$8,057	\$3,067	\$1,372	\$1,695	6%
8800 ATHLETIC PROGRAMS	\$95,403	\$26,696	\$31,470	\$37,237	\$3,176	\$34,061	39%
8900 STUDENT ACTIVITIES	\$29,400	\$961	\$450	\$27,989	\$0	\$27,989	95%
14 MISCELLANEOUS	\$179,865	\$71,595	\$39,977	\$68,293	\$4,548	\$63,745	38%

Bloomfield

BOE EXPENDITURE REPORT BY OBJECT

Account Number / Description	Adopted Budget 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Expenses YTD 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Encumbrances 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance Before Req's Sub. 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Submitted Requisitions 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010	Balance After Req's Sub	Percent Remaining 7/1/2009 - 6/30/2010
GRAND TOTAL	\$39,211,104	\$5,704,800	\$23,933,462	\$9,572,842	\$18,455	\$9,554,387	24%

**BLOOMFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION
2010 MEETING SCHEDULE**

DATE	TYPE OF MEETING	LOCATION
January 12, 2010	Regular	Board Room
February 11, 2010	Regular	Board Room
February 18, 2010	Special Budget Meeting	Board Room
March 23, 2010	Regular	Board Room
April 15, 2010	Regular	Board Room
May 18, 2010	Regular	Board Room
June 15, 2010	Regular	Board Room
September 14, 2010	Regular	Board Room
October 19, 2010	Regular	Board Room
November 16, 2010	Regular	Board Room
December 14, 2010	Regular	Board Room