

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08**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: 94.9%

*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, 2007 2,708
5-Year Enrollment Change -9.6%

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	964	35.6	31.0	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	65	2.5	3.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	97	3.6	3.3	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	338	12.5	11.8	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	128	69.2	74.1	79.2
Homeless	40	1.5	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	57	19.0	24.8	20.2

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	31	1.1
Asian American	64	2.4
Black	88	3.2
Hispanic	98	3.6
White	2,427	89.6
Total Minority	281	10.4

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.9%

Non-English Home Language: 2.5% 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 15.

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. In preparation for the 2008-2009 school year, many pre-requisites for advanced-level courses have been eliminated from the Program of Studies. Many advanced-level courses are now available to any student who wishes to access them without previous grade criteria or staff approval. 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. In addition to traditional interventions that offer after and before 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 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. The two elementary schools and, this year, the middle school will participate in the Positive Behavioral Support (PBS) Program offered by SERC. A fully-implemented PBS program will be offered for the third year in the two elementary schools while the middle school staff will participate in a year of training and preparation. Several administrators have participated in training in the Response to Intervention (RTI) Model which is designed to provide more effective and efficient intervention to students in the regular education program. This model will change the way students are identified to receive specialized instruction under the special education umbrella.

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	48.2	52.0	28.2
Writing	54.7	63.4	16.0
Mathematics	47.6	60.0	14.1
Grade 4 Reading	57.1	55.9	39.2
Writing	53.4	62.9	16.4
Mathematics	52.6	60.3	24.5
Grade 5 Reading	58.6	62.2	24.7
Writing	59.1	64.5	23.5
Mathematics	57.7	65.9	21.6
Science	41.8	54.9	14.8
Grade 6 Reading	72.6	66.3	44.6
Writing	75.1	61.9	69.6
Mathematics	75.1	66.4	52.4
Grade 7 Reading	69.3	71.1	29.0
Writing	61.4	62.0	34.8
Mathematics	61.8	63.0	32.3
Grade 8 Reading	62.3	64.8	29.6
Writing	61.6	63.4	32.1
Mathematics	53.3	60.8	23.9
Science	53.8	58.6	27.7

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	28.7	45.5	16.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	41.4	57.9	16.2
Mathematics	33.3	50.1	17.7
Science	34.1	46.3	23.1

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
	34.9	36.1	40.1

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		69.9	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	479	504	26.2
	Critical Reading	483	502	25.4
	Writing	479	503	21.5

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 2007	81.1	92.6	5.4
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	16.5	6.2	3.8
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.1	1.7	10.4

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	64.2	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	29.5	12.3

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	189.30
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	32.25
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	28.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	52.00
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	7.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	5.00
School Level	13.20
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	5.59
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.40
School Nurses	7.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	156.90

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	15.9	14.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	67.6	76.5	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	15.4	17.1	18.1
Grade 2	17.7	18.2	19.3
Grade 5	20.3	19.9	20.9
Grade 7	20.7	19.7	20.5
High School	18.3	20.4	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,020	983	987
Middle School	1,095	1,006	1,017
High School	1,000	997	1,006

*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*	3.9	4.3	3.4
Middle School	2.4	3.0	2.7
High School	2.0	3.0	2.7

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2006-07

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	\$19,327	\$6,980	\$7,153	\$7,108	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$664	\$240	\$262	\$235	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,602	\$579	\$443	\$365	\$429
Student Support Services	\$1,740	\$629	\$764	\$785	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$3,994	\$1,442	\$1,256	\$1,216	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$3,424	\$1,237	\$1,329	\$1,287	\$1,322
Transportation	\$1,732	\$634	\$605	\$613	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$1,984	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$19	\$7	\$147	\$147	\$145
Total	\$34,487	\$12,330	\$12,203	\$12,064	\$12,151
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$1,646	\$594	\$1,875	\$2,074	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$7,350,918
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	21.2%

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	45.4	46.5	3.6	4.4
Excluding School Construction	46.3	45.6	3.4	4.6

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS

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

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	334
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	13.2%

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	16	0.6	0.7	0.7
Learning Disability	79	3.1	3.7	4.0
Intellectual Disability	14	0.6	0.6	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	42	1.7	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	75	3.0	2.6	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	83	3.3	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	25	1.0	1.0	0.9
Total	334	13.2	12.1	11.5

*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 2006-07 with a Standard Diploma	52.9	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	5.8	2.8

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	17.8	20.4	61.7	62.1
	Writing	24.1	19.3	61.1	63.0
	Mathematics	14.9	22.6	58.3	62.7
	Science	17.6	22.2	48.0	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	4.2	11.4	28.7	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	13.0	16.3	41.4	57.9
	Mathematics	0.0	14.7	33.3	50.1
	Science	0.0	14.4	34.1	46.3

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	19.3
	% With Accommodations	80.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	26.9
	% With Accommodations	73.1
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		7.4

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	33	9.9

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	210	62.9	66.9	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	53	15.9	15.0	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	71	21.3	18.1	11.8

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

During the 2007-2008 school year, the high school continued to address a comprehensive literacy action plan aimed particularly at the Freshman Transition Program – now in its 5th year. The district Language Arts Coordinator and High School Literacy Facilitator continued to work weekly with teams of freshman 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 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 85% to 90% and the percent of students who earned passing grades in all four core subject areas increased from 82% to 86%. As a significant part of the literacy action plan, three classes of READ 180 were implemented. The success of this program was supported by on-going in-service to four key teachers, including two special education teacher. Read 180 has been purchased for the middle school for the 2008-2009 school year. Also, the high school Literacy Council was instrumental in the design and use of a common writing rubric. This rubric was implemented by all teaching staff. Plans are being made to create additional common rubrics during the next school year in the area of writing.

The district assembled a committee of teachers and administrators to design a rigor & relevance rubric. This rubric, now tied to a web-based data collection system, will be used by administrators and teachers alike to provide timely feedback from classroom walk-throughs. It will also be useful to teachers in developing rigorous and relevant lesson sequences. An implementation plan is currently being developed.

The middle school and high school are entering the fourth 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 taking Algebra I this fall has already doubled and a creative support plan has been put in place by the principal to ensure student success.

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 team leaders in all buildings will continue to be trained in the Data-Driven Decision-Making process.

Literacy coaches have been hired at both elementary schools and the middle school. Their role will be to provide reading and writing in-service, model lessons, design assessments, and work on curriculum.

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.
