

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

WILLIAM M. SILVER, Superintendent

Location: 369 Main Street

Telephone: (860) 779-6600

Danielson,  
ConnecticutWebsite: [www.killingly.k12.ct.us/](http://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](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

---

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Windham

Town Population in 2000: 16,472

1990-2000 Population Growth: 3.7%

Number of Public Schools: 4

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$19,779

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000\*: 25.8%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000\*: 0.6%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.7%

---

\*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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, 2010      2,685  
 5-Year Enrollment Change      -6.9%

---

**DISTRICT GRADE RANGE**

Grade Range      K - 12

**INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED**

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	1,127	42.0	40.3	34.1
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	54	2.1	3.8	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	158	5.9	4.0	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	357	13.3	12.3	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	147	74.2	77.1	80.2
Homeless	42	1.6	0.3	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	40	15.4	13.3	13.2

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

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	43	1.6
Asian American	61	2.3
Black	103	3.8
Hispanic	120	4.5
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	2,358	87.8
Two or more races	0	0.0
Total Minority	327	12.2

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 1.2%

**Non-English Home Language:**

4.2% 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 21.

---

### 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 Art Magnet School in Willimantic (3 students) and the Middle College High 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 AB 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, % Goal.** The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal	<p>These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.</p> <p>For more detailed CMT results, go to <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Grade 3 Reading	59.9	58.4	35.6	
Writing	62.7	61.1	41.0	
Mathematics	56.2	63.0	19.9	
Grade 4 Reading	58.0	62.5	23.3	
Writing	59.9	65.5	21.3	
Mathematics	47.6	67.0	9.8	
Grade 5 Reading	45.9	61.4	14.7	
Writing	59.9	66.8	21.5	
Mathematics	58.4	72.5	14.1	
Science	49.1	59.9	18.4	
Grade 6 Reading	81.4	76.0	44.6	
Writing	56.0	65.2	22.6	
Mathematics	69.5	71.3	31.0	
Grade 7 Reading	74.2	77.8	25.5	
Writing	55.0	58.9	31.0	
Mathematics	63.8	68.4	30.8	
Grade 8 Reading	71.0	74.7	25.5	
Writing	63.7	64.8	32.5	
Mathematics	58.8	66.6	23.6	
Science	55.8	63.1	21.0	

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

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal	<p>For more detailed CAPT results, go to <a href="http://www.ctreports.com">www.ctreports.com</a>.</p> <p>To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov">www.sde.ct.gov</a> and click on "No Child Left Behind."</p>
Reading Across the Disciplines	37.8	44.7	33.3	
Writing Across the Disciplines	54.5	61.2	29.3	
Mathematics	27.1	49.5	17.3	
Science	27.9	47.0	16.5	

**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
	35.7	51.0	18.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2010		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		57.8	70.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	485	510	27.5
	Critical Reading	492	505	32.1
	Writing	486	510	25.2

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

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2010	67.5	81.8	9.9
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	7.4	2.8	6.5

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	69.9	84.8
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	8.1	9.1

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	175.80
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	94.00
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	29.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	65.50
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	6.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	4.00
School Level	11.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.60
School Nurses	8.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	152.80

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	17.0	14.8	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	77.7	79.6	79.0

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.2	18.3	18.4
Grade 2	19.6	19.5	19.9
Grade 5	24.9	21.7	21.2
Grade 7	20.7	19.3	20.6
High School	18.7	19.7	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	971	985	992
Middle School	1,087	1,007	1,017
High School	1,035	1,011	1,010

\*State law requires that at least 900 hours of instruction be offered to students in grade 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours to half-day kindergarten students.

Students Per Academic Computer	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School*	3.4	3.5	3.1
Middle School	2.0	2.4	2.4
High School	0.7	2.0	2.2

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

### DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2009-10

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. DRG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$20,780	\$7,751	\$8,232	\$8,256	\$8,237
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$711	\$265	\$299	\$252	\$300
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,848	\$689	\$477	\$379	\$463
Student Support Services	\$2,064	\$770	\$875	\$945	\$872
Administration and Support Services	\$4,042	\$1,508	\$1,433	\$1,360	\$1,459
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,223	\$1,202	\$1,421	\$1,418	\$1,410
Transportation	\$2,287	\$870	\$701	\$705	\$692
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$3,387	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$0	\$0	\$161	\$154	\$159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$38,342</b>	<b>\$14,275</b>	<b>\$13,878</b>	<b>\$13,783</b>	<b>\$13,780</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$26,878	\$10,025	\$1,622	\$1,523	\$1,616

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$10,108,410	26.4	23.2	21.5

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

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	33.6	58.3	6.0	2.1
Excluding School Construction	46.9	39.3	10.2	3.5

---

**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	351
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.9%

---

<b>Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities</b>				
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	<b>State Percent</b>
Autism	45	1.8	1.1	1.1
Learning Disability	71	2.8	3.8	3.9
Intellectual Disability	22	0.9	0.5	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	33	1.3	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	77	3.1	2.3	2.2
Other Health Impairment*	69	2.7	2.4	2.1
Other Disabilities**	34	1.3	1.2	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>11.6</b>

\*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

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Who Graduated in 2009-10 with a Standard Diploma	34.8	62.5
2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.9

## STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	21.4	33.0	64.7	68.6
	Writing	13.5	19.3	59.5	63.7
	Mathematics	16.3	33.4	59.0	68.2
	Science	14.8	21.2	52.2	61.5
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	37.8	44.7
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	54.5	61.2
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	27.1	49.5
	Science	N/A	N/A	27.9	47.0

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com). To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://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	22.4
	% With Accommodations	77.6
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	26.1
	% With Accommodations	73.9
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		13.8

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	4	1.1
Private Schools or Other Settings	47	13.4

### 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	257	73.2	69.3	74.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	32	9.1	15.9	14.9
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	62	17.7	14.8	11.0

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

During the 2010 – 2011 school year, Killingly Public Schools developed a three year District Improvement Plan aimed at increasing student achievement. The plan was developed by a District Data Team comprised of administrators and teaching staff and focused on three specific needs. The first need was to create a holistic accountability plan that would enable all professional staff to be contributing members to an effective data team process. The data driven decision making process, which had been used in various grade levels and content areas for a number of years, is now being used by all staff. Introductory or refresher training in the process was provided for administrators and teachers at all levels, and instructional teams developed and administered common formative assessments related to state standards. Data teams met regularly throughout the school year to analyze data to make informed decisions about their instructional practices. The second need centered on providing students with the necessary comprehension strategies to become critical life-long readers in all content areas. A District Literacy Team was established and identified a menu of best practices related to comprehension strategies. Instructional data teams selected certain strategies and implemented them. The Instructional Rounds process was used at the district and school level to gather data on the effectiveness of instructional strategies. The third prioritized need focused on teachers providing differentiated instruction to students, and building administrators effectively implementing the school district's SRBI plan for academics and behavior. The scope of these plans reach into all grade level and content areas, and will require the three years to be fully implemented. Professional development for all three of these areas is ongoing, and the plans are being closely monitored by the District Data Team and adjusted as needed. Each school in the district has created a School Improvement Plan that aligns with the areas identified in the District Improvement Plan.

---