

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**Killingly School District**

WILLIAM M. SILVER, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 779-6600

Location: 369 Main Street
Danielson,
Connecticut

Website: www.killingly.k12.ct.us/

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c) using data and narratives provided by the school district, testing services, or the US Census. Profiles and additional education data, including longitudinal data, are available on the internet at www.sde.ct.gov.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Windham	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$19,779
Town Population in 2000: 16,472	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 25.8%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 3.7%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.6%
Number of Public Schools: 4	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 95.1%

*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

District Reference Group (DRG): G DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment. The Connecticut State Board of Education approved DRG classification for purposes of reporting data other than student performance.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Enrollment on October 1, 2008	2,705
5-Year Enrollment Change	-7.5%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range	PK-12
-------------	-------

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	1,040	38.4	33.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	55	2.1	3.3	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	194	7.2	3.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	360	13.3	12.0	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	129	64.5	77.0	79.7
Homeless	32	1.2	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	68	21.8	21.3	19.0

*0.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	31	1.1
Asian American	59	2.2
Black	99	3.7
Hispanic	94	3.5
White	2,422	89.5
Total Minority	283	10.5

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.9%

Non-English Home Language: 2.2% 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 14.

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 Killingly Public School District has provided many opportunities for teachers and students to gain increased awareness of diversity, greater sensitivity to differences, and personal experiences to connect cultures. The faculty and staff have made conscientious efforts to incorporate diversity in a community that has a limited diverse population. At the high school, all “basic-level” courses have been eliminated in favor of “general-level” courses. Pre-requisites for many advanced-level courses have been eliminated from the Program of Studies. These courses are now available to any student who wishes to access them without previous grade criteria or staff approval. During the past couple of years, Killingly High School students have had the opportunity to participate in the Arts at the Capitol Theater magnet school in Willimantic (3 students) and the Quinebaug Valley Middle College High School magnet school at Quinebaug Valley Community College (12 students). The entire district has moved to a full-inclusion model whereby the vast majority of special education students have been integrated into regular education classes. Many special education and regular education teachers and building and central office administrators have been trained in the Step-by-Step Inclusion Model offered by Stetson and Associates, Inc. To help all students be successful in the regular education program, pyramids of intervention have been strategically developed in all buildings throughout the district. This has given all schools in the district a great foundation for implementing SRBI systems. In addition to traditional interventions that offer before and after school support, interventions such as READ 180, double language arts and mathematics classes, during-the-day support labs and tutorials, Saturday tutorials, and homework programs have been created. The high school A/B Block Schedule has been modified to incorporate an Advisory/Intervention period every other day. One of the goals of the Advisory is to “build community and a sense of belonging.” The district grading policy has been modified to eliminate the use of zeros and incorporate “incompletes” and guidelines for providing expanded opportunities for students to submit work and to retake assessments following academic intervention. Grant dollars continue to assist the district in providing opportunities for students to increase awareness of differences through inter-district activities and after-school programs. The two elementary schools and the middle school will continue to participate in the Positive Behavioral Support (PBS) Program offered by SERC. A fully implemented PBS program will be offered for the fourth year in the two elementary schools while the middle school staff will participate in their second year.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	45.2	54.6	19.5
Writing	50.2	62.5	15.1
Mathematics	49.0	62.8	14.5
Grade 4 Reading	57.1	60.7	26.4
Writing	51.7	64.2	10.9
Mathematics	46.5	63.6	12.2
Grade 5 Reading	60.8	66.0	26.7
Writing	66.3	66.5	35.2
Mathematics	68.1	68.8	34.6
Science	46.7	58.1	15.4
Grade 6 Reading	64.6	68.9	22.7
Writing	56.9	62.2	27.6
Mathematics	67.4	68.8	32.5
Grade 7 Reading	73.8	74.9	32.5
Writing	68.0	62.9	45.2
Mathematics	64.9	66.0	32.5
Grade 8 Reading	68.2	68.4	32.3
Writing	66.1	66.5	31.6
Mathematics	60.3	64.5	27.7
Science	64.4	60.6	35.5

These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. The following results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the school at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the school. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Reading Across the Disciplines	28.2	47.4	15.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	45.8	55.0	21.4
Mathematics	27.4	47.8	14.5
Science	32.4	42.8	22.1

For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Physical Fitness. The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body strength and aerobic endurance.

Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	32.5	36.2	37.4

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		52.2	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	471	507	19.4
	Critical Reading	474	503	19.4
	Writing	474	506	19.4

SAT® I. The lowest possible score on each SAT® I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Class of 2008	82.8	92.1	6.9
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	17.0	6.6	3.6
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	5.4	2.5	5.1

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	59.0	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	34.3	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	188.20
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	32.50
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	27.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	56.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	8.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.00
School Level	12.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.59
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.20
School Nurses	7.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	147.50

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	16.1	14.5	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	76.0	77.2	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.4	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	17.3	18.3	19.3
Grade 5	22.6	20.3	21.0
Grade 7	20.0	19.7	20.5
High School	15.4	19.5	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,020	981	988
Middle School	1,095	1,001	1,016
High School	1,030	1,005	1,007

*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	3.9	3.3
Middle School	2.2	2.8	2.6
High School	1.8	2.6	2.4

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

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	\$20,262	\$7,471	\$7,521	\$7,445	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$789	\$291	\$267	\$227	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,647	\$607	\$461	\$396	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,940	\$715	\$808	\$887	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$3,954	\$1,458	\$1,351	\$1,294	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,279	\$1,209	\$1,382	\$1,360	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,909	\$700	\$649	\$667	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$2,177	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$44	\$16	\$152	\$166	\$151
Total	\$36,002	\$13,115	\$12,869	\$12,779	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$4,751	\$1,752	\$1,791	\$2,153	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$7,866,458	21.8	22.1	20.5

Revenue Sources, % of Expenditures from Source. Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	42.1	51.3	2.9	3.7
Excluding School Construction	46.3	46.4	3.2	4.1

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

Killingly Public Schools allocate resources to ensure equity and address needs each year, primarily during the budget process. Principals and program directors work with staff and school site teams to create a financial plan for the following year. As part of this process, principals and directors present their budget to the Superintendent of Schools, and then to a fiscal Subcommittee of the Board of Education. Also, as part of the budget-development process, “decision packages” representing requests for new staff, programs and/or equipment may be submitted to the Superintendent for review. Decision packages are compiled and presented to the entire administrative team to be prioritized before they are sent to the Fiscal Subcommittee.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	350
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.7%

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	20	0.8	0.9	0.8
Learning Disability	85	3.3	3.8	3.9
Intellectual Disability	14	0.5	0.5	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	41	1.6	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	85	3.3	2.6	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	80	3.1	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	25	1.0	1.1	0.9
Total	350	13.7	12.3	11.6

*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

**Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	N/A	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

STATE ASSESSMENTS

Percent of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. These results are for students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

- **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation.** The CMT reading, writing and mathematics tests are administered to students in Grades 3 through 8, and the CMT science test to students in Grades 5 and 8.
- **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), Third Generation.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students.

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	20.1	30.2	61.8	65.7
	Writing	14.5	19.5	60.0	64.1
	Mathematics	22.4	30.7	59.4	65.7
	Science	16.7	23.8	56.2	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	28.2	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	45.8	55.0
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	27.4	47.8
	Science	N/A	N/A	32.4	42.8

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools		
CMT	% Without Accommodations	21.5
	% With Accommodations	78.5
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	59.3
	% With Accommodations	40.7
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		10.2

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	0	0.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	37	10.6

Number and Percentage of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible by the Percentage of Time They Spent with Their Non-Disabled Peers				
Time Spent with Non-Disabled Peers	Count of Students	Percent of Students		
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	237	67.7	70.2	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	50	14.3	14.6	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	63	18.0	15.2	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

During the 2008-2009 school year, the high school continued to address a comprehensive literacy action plan aimed particularly at the teachers in the Freshman Transition Program – now in its 6th year, but also expanding to include teachers of sophomores. The district Language Arts Coordinator and High School Literacy Facilitator continued to work weekly with teams of core subject teachers emphasizing non-fiction writing and reading comprehension strategies. A relentless focus on timely intervention took place throughout the year including parent involvement. Upper classmen (Link Crew) were trained as mentors by the Director of the Freshman Program and utilized to assist struggling freshmen. As a result of these efforts, the percent of students who passed English 9 with a C or better increased from 90% to 92% and the percent of students who earned passing grades in all four core subject areas remained constant between 85% and 86%. As a significant part of the literacy action plan, three classes of READ 180 were implemented at the high school and READ 180 began in the middle school as well. On-going in-service to general and special education teachers in both schools supported the success of these programs. The high school's 4 x 4 Block schedule has been changed to an AB Block that now includes an Advisory/Intervention period that will meet every other day. A primary function of the Advisory is to monitor student progress and increase communications with parents about their child's progress. Also, an integral part of this period is KHS READs, a sustained silent reading program. Upper classmen (Link Crew) have been trained to work as mentors and have been assigned to freshman advisories. Each school in the district is working on an SRBI implementation plan with the help of the CSDE and SERC. Differentiated instruction, three-tiered intervention and universal screening will be the focus of our work. The district assembled a committee of teachers and administrators to design a rigor & relevance rubric. This rubric continues to be used by teachers as a planning tool and by administrators and teachers alike to provide timely feedback following classroom walk-throughs. The middle school and high school are entering the fifth year with a new grading policy that has eliminated the use of zeros, instituted an "incomplete" and has provided expanded opportunities for students to submit work and retake assessments after intervention. This policy has been successful in lowering the percent of failures in each of the buildings. As part of a "success-for-all" goal, the middle school has added to their intervention model the doubling of language arts and math classes for struggling students in these subject areas. The middle school has also compacted the math curriculum with the goal of all students taking Algebra I in 8th grade. The number of students successfully passing Algebra I has doubled in the past year. A creative support plan has been put in place by the principal to ensure student success. The district wide Curriculum Council has created an up-dated curriculum framework paralleling the CSDE curriculum frameworks. A new cycle of curriculum renewal will begin this year. The district will continue to in-service teams of teachers in Making Standards Work (MSW). Five district professionals have participated in MSW Certification Training by the Leading and Learning Center. Identifying Power Standards, unwrapping the standards, identifying Big Ideas and Essential Questions will continue to take center stage in the curriculum development process. Teachers will also continue to design common assessments at the unit, quarter and course levels. The use of common formative assessments will also be an area of concentration. Data teams in all buildings will continue to be trained in the Data-Driven Decision-Making process. Literacy coaches have been hired at both elementary schools. Their role will be to provide reading and writing in-service, model lessons, design assessments, and work on curriculum. As part of the SRBI program, teachers at the elementary school are re-examining the literacy block to place greater emphasis on the amount of time our challenged readers are receiving direct reading instruction. Both elementary schools and the middle school will be fully engaged in the Positive Behavioral Support Program. In an effort to increase parent participation in planning their student's educational program, the Department of Pupil Services has teamed with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Group (CPAC). In this collaborative effort, the hope is to develop better and stronger relationships between school and family. Efforts are being made to improve communication and the sharing of information. Killingly has launched a new web-site that will provide greater access by parents of information regarding school programming and their children's daily progress.
