Connecticut State Department of Education

DISTRICT PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2016–17



Canaan School District

860-824-7791 • http://www.kelloggschool.org

District Information

Grade Range	K-8
Number of Schools/Programs	1
Enrollment	73
Per Pupil Expenditures ¹	\$31,627
Total Expenditures ¹	\$2,435,265

¹Expenditure data reflect the 2015-16 year.



Community Information

<u>CERC Town Profiles</u> provide summary demographic and economic information for Connecticut's municipalities

Related Reports/Publications

CT Reports (CMT/CAPT)

Special Education Annual Performance Reports
SAT®, AP®, PSAT® Report by High School (Class of 2017)
(2017® The College Board)

Contents

Students	1
Educators	2
Instruction and Resources	2
Performance and Accountability	4
Narratives	

Notes

Unless otherwise noted, all data are for 2016-17 and include all grades offered by the district.

In most tables, data are displayed only for the three major race/ethnicity categories. For additional race/ethnicity categories, please visit edsight.ct.gov.

State totals are not displayed as they are not comparable to district totals.

Special Education tables reflect only students for whom the district is fiscally responsible.

* When an asterisk is displayed, data have been suppressed to ensure student confidentiality. N/A is displayed when a category is not applicable for a district or school.

Students

October 1, 2016 Enrollment				
		District	State	
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)	
Female	36	49.3	48.4	
Male	37	50.7	51.6	
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0	0.3	
Asian	0	0.0	5.1	
Black or African American	0	0.0	12.9	
Hispanic or Latino	6	8.2	24.0	
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.1	
Two or More Races	0	0.0	2.9	
White	67	91.8	54.8	
English Learners	*	*	6.8	
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	9	12.3	35.9	
Students with Disabilities ¹	8	11.0	14.3	

¹Students in this category are students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) only. This category does not include students with Section 504 Plans.

Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension/Expulsion

	Chronic		Suspe	ension/
	Absenteeism ²		Expu	llsion ³
	Count	Rate (%)	Count	Rate (%)
Female	*	*	*	*
Male	*	*	0	0.0
Black or African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	0	*
White	*	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	0	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	*	*	0	*
Students with Disabilities	*	*	*	*
District	7	9.5	*	*
State		9.9		6.7

Number of students in 2015-16 qualified as truant under state statute: Fewer than 6 Number of school-based arrests: 0

²A student is chronically absent if he/she misses ten percent or greater of the total number of days enrolled in the school year for any reason. Pre-Kindergarten students are excluded from this calculation.

³The count and percentage of students who receive at least one in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension or expulsion.

Educators

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)¹ Staff

	FTE
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	10.3
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	1.5
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	1.0
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	1.5
Administrators, Coordinators and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	0.0
School Level	1.5
Library/Media	
Specialists (Certified)	0.0
Support Staff	0.6
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers	0.0
Counselors, Social Workers and School Psychologists	0.4
School Nurses	1.0
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services/Support	2.0

¹In the full-time equivalent count, staff members working part-time in the school are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in a school contributes 0.50 to the school's staff count.

Educators by Race/Ethnicity

		District	State
	Count	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0	0.1
Asian	0	0.0	1.0
Black or African American	0	0.0	3.6
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0	3.6
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races	0	0.0	0.1
White	20	95.2	91.4

Classroom Teacher Attendance: 2015-16

	District	State
Average Number of FTE Days Absent Due to Illness or Personal Time	9.4	9.6

Instruction and Resources

Students with Disabilities Who Spend 79.1 to 100 Percent of Time with Nondisabled Peers³

	Count	Rate (%)
Autism	*	*
Emotional Disturbance	*	*
Intellectual Disability	N/A	N/A
Learning Disability	*	*
Other Health Impairment	N/A	N/A
Other Disabilities	N/A	N/A
Speech/Language Impairment	*	*
District	7	*
State		68.2

³Ages 6-21

Students with Disabilities by Primary Disability¹

	Di	State	
	Count	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
Autism	*	*	1.7
Emotional Disturbance	*	*	1.0
Intellectual Disability	0	0.0	0.5
Learning Disability	*	*	4.9
Other Health Impairment	0	0.0	2.9
Other Disabilities	0	0.0	1.1
Speech/Language Impairment	*	*	1.8
All Disabilities	9	12.7	13.9

¹Grades K-12

Overall Expenditures: 2015-16

		Per F	Pupil
	Total (\$)	District (\$)	State (\$)
Instructional Staff and Services	1,304,699	17,167	9,663
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	64,805	853	321
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	70,706	930	578
Student Support Services	127,314	1,675	1,103
Administration and Support Services	293,519	3,862	1,861
Plant Operation and Maintenance	390,202	5,134	1,637
Transportation	147,782	1,155	877
Costs of Students Tuitioned Out	20,637	N/A	N/A
Other	15,601	205	201
Total	2,435,265	31,627	16,236
Additiona	al Expenditures		
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	79,509	1,046	1,749

³Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources.

Special Education Expenditures: 2015-16

	Dist	State	
	Total (\$)	Percent of Total (%)	Percent of Total (%)
Certified Personnel	148,364	40.9	34.6
Noncertified Personnel	78,753	21.7	14.6
Purchased Services	19,866	5.5	5.8
Tuition to Other Schools	20,637	5.7	21.8
Special Ed. Transportation	21,113	5.8	8.5
Other Expenditures	74,313	20.5	14.7
Total Expenditures	363,046	100.0	100.0

Expenditures by Revenue Source:⁴ 2015-16

	Percent of Total (%)			
	Including Excluding			
	School	School		
	Construction	Construction		
Local	91.1	91.7		
State	7.1	6.4		
Federal	1.8	1.9		
Tuition & Other	0.0	0.0		

⁴Revenue 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 Correction).

Performance and Accountability

District Performance Index (DPI)

A District Performance Index (DPI) is the average performance of students in a subject area (i.e., ELA, Mathematics or Science) on the state summative assessments. The DPI ranges from 0-100. A DPI is reported for all students tested in a district and for students in each individual student group. Connecticut's ultimate target for a DPI is 75.

	English Langua	English Language Arts(ELA)		h	Science	
	Count	DPI	Count	DPI	Count	DPI
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Asian	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Black or African American	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*	*	0	N/A
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Two or More Races	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
White	45	68.7	45	63.2	13	*
English Learners	*	*	*	*	*	*
Non-English Learners	46	68.8	46	63.0	12	*
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	7	*	7	*	*	*
Not Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	43	71.9	43	65.9	11	*
Students with Disabilities	9	*	9	*	*	*
Students without Disabilities	41	72.5	41	65.3	12	*
High Needs	15	*	15	*	*	*
Non-High Needs	35	74.8	35	68.0	10	*
District	50	68.2	50	62.3	13	*

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Percent At or Above Proficient¹

	NAEP	NAEP 2013		
READING	Grade 4 Grade 8		Grade 12	
Connecticut	43%	43%	50%	
National Public	35%	33%	36%	
MATH	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade 12	
Connecticut	41%	36%	32%	
National Public	39%	32%	25%	

¹NAEP is often called the "Nation's Report Card." It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. This table compares Connecticut's performance to that of national public school students. Performance standards for state assessments and NAEP are set independently. Therefore, one should not expect performance results to be the same across Smarter Balanced and NAEP. Instead, NAEP results are meant to complement other state assessment data. To view student subgroup performance on NAEP, click here.

Physical Fitness Tests: Students Reaching Health Standard²

	Percent of Students by Grade ³ (%)				All Tested Grades	
	4	6	8	10	Count	Rate (%)
Sit & Reach	*	*	*	N/A	22	90.9
Curl Up	*	*	*	N/A	22	86.4
Push Up	*	*	*	N/A	22	90.9
Mile Run/PACER	*	*	*	N/A	22	59.1
All Tests - District	*	*	*	N/A	22	59.1
All Tests - State	52.8	51.4	51.4	50.6		51.6

²The Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment (CPFA) is administered to all students in Grades 4, 6, 8 and 10. The health-related fitness scores gathered through the CPFA should be used to educate and motivate children and their families to increase physical activity and develop lifetime fitness habits.

³Only students assessed in all four areas are included in this calculation.

Next Generation Accountability Results

Connecticut's Next Generation Accountability System is a broad set of 12 indicators that help tell the story of how well a district/school is preparing its students for success in college, careers, and life. It moves beyond test scores and graduation rates to provide a more holistic, multifactor perspective of district and school performance.

Indi	cator	Index/Rate	Target	Points Earned	Max Points	% Points Earned	State Average Index/Rate
FLA Deuferment Leden	All Students	68.2	75	45.5	50	90.9	67.1
ELA Performance Index	High Needs Students	N/A	75	0.0	0	0.0	55.9
Math Performance Index	All Students	62.3	75	41.5	50	83.0	62.2
Math Performance muex	High Needs Students	N/A	75	0.0	0	0.0	50.5
Science Performance	All Students	N/A	75	0.0	0	0.0	55.3
Science Performance	High Needs Students	N/A	75	0.0	0	0.0	45.2
El A Appeloneia Cupunth	All Students	49.8%	100%	49.8	100	49.8	55.4%
ELA Academic Growth	High Needs Students	N/A	100%	0.0	0	0.0	49.8%
Math Academic Growth	All Students	52.8%	100%	52.8	100	52.8	61.7%
	High Needs Students	N/A	100%	0.0	0	0.0	53.7%
Chronic Absenteeism	All Students	9.5%	<=5%	41.1	50	82.2	9.9%
Chronic Absenteeism	High Needs Students	15.0%	<=5%	30.0	50	60.0	15.8%
Duamanation for CCD	% Taking Courses	N/A	75%	0.0	0	0.0	70.7%
Preparation for CCR	% Passing Exams	N/A	75%	0.0	0	0.0	43.5%
On-track to High School G	raduation	N/A	94%	0.0	0	0.0	87.8%
4-year Graduation All Stud	dents (2016 Cohort)	N/A	94%	0.0	0	0.0	87.4%
6-year Graduation - High Needs Students (2014		N/A	94%	0.0	0	0.0	82.0%
Postsecondary Entrance (Class of 2016)		N/A	75%	0.0	0	0.0	72.0%
Physical Fitness (estimated part rate) and (fitness		95.7% 59.1%	75%	39.4	50	78.8	92.0% 51.6%
Arts Access	Arts Access		60%	0.0	0	0.0	50.5%
Accountability Index			300.0	450	66.7		

Gap Indicators	Non-High Needs Rate ¹	High Needs Rate	Size of Gap	State Gap Mean +1 Stdev ²	Is Gap an Outlier? ²
Achievement Gap Size Outlier?					N
ELA Performance Index Gap	74.8	N/A		16.7	
Math Performance Index Gap	68.0	N/A		18.7	
Science Performance Index Gap		N/A		16.6	
Graduation Rate Gap					

¹ If the Non-High Needs Rate exceeds the ultimate target (75 for Performance Index and 94% for graduation rate), the ultimate target is used for gap calculations.

 $^{^{2}}$ If the size of the gap exceeds the state mean gap plus one standard deviation, the gap is an outlier.

Sul	oject/Subgroup	Participation Rate (%) ³	
ELA	All Students	96.3	³ Minimum
ELA	High Needs Students		participation standard is 95%.
Math	All Students	96.3	
Math	High Needs Students		
Science	All Students		
	High Needs Students		

Connecticut's State Identified Measurable Goal for Children with Disabilities (SIMR)

Increase the reading performance of all 3rd grade students with disabilities statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index.

Grade 3 ELA Performance Index for Students with Disabilities:

District: * State: 50.2

Supporting Resources

Two-page FAQ

Detailed Presentation

Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement: comprehensive documentation and supports

Narratives

School District Improvement Plans and Parental Outreach Activities

Our school follows a Strategic Plan for School Improvement that is clear and outlines the goal areas of improving formative and summative assessment to achieve a guaranteed and viable curriculum; improving student achievement as measured by multiple data sources; implementing teacher and school leader evaluation plans; and promoting social and emotional health and well being for all students. We believe in the importance of having students become leaders of their own learning. Professional development focuses upon improving students' learning through enhancing instructional and research based practices in the classroom.

We engage families in student learning in a number of other ways, as well. Our school has Open House night, family events, four evenings of Student Led and Student Involved Conferences (students invite the parents and then lead the conference for their parents and teacher(s), and two nights a year when all parents and any community members are invited to be a part of School Community Partnership meetings, for the purpose of engaging parents and families in the school programs. Three to four topics from the school's Strategic Plan for School Improvement are discussed at these two night meetings and we strive to have a two-way discussion regarding student achievement and programs.

Region One School Shared Services provides special education services to our school. The student to teacher ratio is low, as it is generally 5-7 students to one teacher. Additionally, as we develop and review every student's IEP to determine auxiliary services, we match these to the student's needs. Through Shared Services, we provide Speech and Language Services, Physical Therapy, and Counseling services to those students whose IEPs require this. Our district continuously reviews and analyzes student achievement data in all areas, including ELA and math literacy, as well as behavioral data. A Leadership Team - Data Team exist for the purpose of determining when students should be receiving SRBI Services and identifying when we need to be served at Level 2 and when students should be referred fir evaluation to determine Special Education.

Truancy is not a prevalent problem at Kellogg School. In isolated cases, we have personalized communication with families that include home visits with the school psychologist and principal to problem solve in an effort to get the student back to school.? Parents are encouraged to engage with their children in an academic context. Books are sent home for family read-alouds, and quick links to interactive computer based learning activities to promote mastery are posted on our school website. Teachers reach out to individual parents for meetings to discuss specific support strategies that can be used at home to increase achievement. All parents of students in grades 5-8 have access to the Power School Parent Portal where they can access their child's grades on a daily basis. This encourages and increasing parent to child, and parent to teacher communication.

Efforts to Reduce Racial, Ethnic and Economic Isolation

Economic isolation is not a concern for students at Kellogg School. Although we are a rural community, our proximity to the Metro-North Train line and consequently New York City contributes to a diverse socio-economic population. We have families living below the poverty line, as well as those that own apartments in New York or come to Falls Village to enjoy their weekend home in the country. We make efforts to expose our students to diverse cultures through the use of literature. For example, our 3rd and 4th graders read The Single Shard as a piece in a broader study of world cultures. Our 5th – 8th graders learn about the plight of refugees all over the world in their study of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Our school librarian is committed to updating our collection with books on diverse cultures as well as stories and non-fiction literature exposing our students to racial and ethnic groups from all over the world.

In class activities are used to expose our students to other perspectives. For example, our Spanish teacher has reached out to families of our English Language Learners. Parents from Spain have shared stories, games, food and other traditions with our students. ?Field trips are another avenue for helping to bridge the divide. Our 3rd and 4th graders traveled to Hartford to visit the capital. Our 5th graders participate in Immigration Nation, our 6th graders participate in Project Tree and our 7th graders participate in The Writing Project. These are all state-grant funded programs for the very purpose of reducing racial, ethnic and economic isolation through the guise of field trips to various sites across the state. ?Our 6th and 7th graders attended Nature's Classroom for a week on the shore, partnering with another school from another state. Our 8th graders travel to Quebec City for a week, immersing them in the culture of the French Canadian. Our school also now has the support of an EL teacher who focuses on ways to help EL students successfully integrate into the classrooms and helps to communicate various aspects of the students' cultures that need to be recognized and honored.

Equitable Allocation of Resources among District Schools

Lee H Kellogg School from the Town of Canaan is its own school in its own district. In other words, we are the only school in the district of Canaan. The townspeople, who are also our taxpayers, have traditionally been supportive of the education of their children. Recently, we held an all community meeting to invite parents and citizens to express their ideas on the future of our school. Overwhelmingly, participants voted to keep a school in our town, regardless of any declining enrollment we might face. The town wants to attract more families and students to our community and school. Our school is fortunate to have a community that allocates resources for the school and is generous with funding when needs are identified and communicated.