

Proctor Junior/Senior High School School Report Card 2013/2014

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act is federal legislation which was passed in 2001 with the intent of improving education for all children by holding schools responsible for results, promoting teaching methods that work and ushering in a new age of accountability. Just as your student receives a report card that tells you how they are doing in school, this law requires schools to issue a report card to the community each year. This report card contains important information including:

- How your child's school is doing compared to state averages
- The percentage of students working at high levels of academic achievement and the percentage working at lower levels as indicated by the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP)
- How different groups did on the NECAP (boy and girls, students from different economic backgrounds, and students with disabilities)
- How well the school is doing in relationship to meeting Vermont's achievement goals
- Whether or not the school has been identified as in need of improvement based on the composite scores on the NECAP of the students in your school
- If the school has been identified for needing improvement what steps the school is taking to improve
- How many teachers are highly qualified to teach the subjects for which they are responsible
- How many students did not take the statewide tests (NECAP).

Assessment Information: Since 2005, Vermont students have been participating in the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), a series of reading, writing, mathematics and science achievement tests, administered annually, which were developed in collaboration with the Rhode Island and New Hampshire departments of education. The NECAP tests measure students' academic knowledge and skills relative to the Grade Expectations for [Vermont's Framework of Standards and Learning Opportunities](#). Student scores are reported at four levels of academic achievement; Proficient with Distinction, Proficient, Partially Proficient and Substantially Below Proficient. Reading and math are assessed in grades 3-8 and 11, writing is assessed in grades 5, 8 and 11, and science is assessed in grades 4, 8 and 11. The reading, math and writing tests are administered each year in October. The science tests are administered in May. The following information is a summary of the NECAP results for your school for the past two years and comparison between your school and state averages.

4=proficient with Distinction

3=proficient

2=Partially Proficient

1= Substantially Below Proficient

Reading Gr. 8 (Grade 7 assesses Vermont Standards taught in Grade 6 and is not included here. These numbers are for Gr. 8 only)

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
4	19	38	29	28	**	57	37	35	**	17	21	21	**	43/33	37/15	36/15	**	**	34/1	33/1
3	62	38	50	52	**	36	47	51	**	42	54	54	**	50/25	50/52	52/52	**	**	54/33	55/33
2	19	23	14	14	**	7	12	11	**	42	16	17	**	7/42	10/21	9/22	**	**	10/35	10/39
1	0	0	7	6	**	0	4	3	**	0	9	8	**	0/0	3/13	3/11	**	**	2/31	2/27

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

Reading Gr. 11

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
4	24	22	30	31	35	25	38	39	7	18	23	24	25/23	**	36/15	38/17	**	**	34/2	36/1
3	42	61	42	43	39	58	42	40	47	64	43	45	55/25	**	43/40	43/43	**	**	45/21	46/19
2	21	9	16	16	13	8	12	13	33	9	19	19	5/44	**	12/23	13/23	**	**	14/31	13/36
1	13	9	12	10	13	8	8	8	13	9	15	12	18/6	**	8/21	7/17	**	**	7/46	5/44

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

Math Gr. 8 (Grade 7 assesses Vermont Standards taught in Grade 6 and is not included here. These numbers are for Gr. 8 only)

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
4	14	8	22	20	**	7	21	21	**	8	22	19	**	7/8	29/9	27/9	**	**	25/1	23/1
3	48	62	42	44	**	71	44	46	**	50	40	43	**	79/42	44/37	48/38	**	**	47/12	49/15
2	19	27	18	18	**	21	18	17	**	33	19	18	**	14/42	16/23	14/23	**	**	18/23	17/19
1	19	4	19	18	**	0	17	16	**	8	20	20	**	0/8	11/31	11/30	**	**	11/64	10/65

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

Math Gr. 11

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
4	3	0	3	3	4	0	3	2	0	0	4	5	5/0	**	4/1	5/1	**	**	4/0	4/0
3	24	30	33	35	26	25	32	36	20	36	34	34	23/25	**	39/18	42/20	**	**	37/2	40/3
2	29	30	24	24	26	33	26	25	33	27	23	23	36/19	**	25/22	24/23	**	**	27/8	26/8
1	45	39	39	38	43	42	39	37	47	36	39	38	36/56	**	31/59	29/56	**	**	32/90	30/89

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

Writing Gr. 8

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
4	14	19	12	19	**	36	17	28	**	0	7	10	**	29/8	16/5	24/9	**	**	14/0	22/1
3	52	46	47	47	**	50	52	52	**	42	42	43	**	57/33	53/37	51/41	**	**	53/10	53/16
2	19	31	30	24	**	14	24	16	**	50	37	32	**	14/50	25/38	19/33	**	**	27/43	22/39
1	14	4	12	10	**	0	6	4	**	8	14	15	**	0/8	7/20	6/16	**	**	6/46	4/44

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

Writing Gr. 11

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
4	0	0	5	4	0	0	6	5	0	0	4	3	0/0	**	6/2	5/2	**	**	6/0	4/0
3	50	26	43	43	65	17	50	50	27	36	35	35	59/38	**	49/28	49/29	**	**	48/7	48/5
2	37	61	42	43	30	75	38	39	47	45	46	47	32/44	**	38/54	39/52	**	**	41/52	42/51
1	13	13	10	11	4	8	6	6	27	18	14	15	9/19	**	7/17	7/17	**	**	6/41	6/44

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

Science Gr. 8

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	0	4	1	1	**	8	1	0	**	0	1	1	**	0	2/0	1/0	**	**	2/0	1/0
3	19	20	29	32	**	23	28	33	**	17	29	30	**	33	37/15	41/17	**	**	34/4	36/4
2	52	56	48	47	**	62	49	48	**	50	47	47	**	33	47/49	46/50	**	**	50/34	50/33
1	29	20	22	20	**	8	22	19	**	33	23	22	**	33	14/36	12/33	**	**	15/62	13/64

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

Science Gr. 11

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) PHS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) PHS		Female (%) State		Male (%) PHS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) PHS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) PHS		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) State	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	3	0	2	2	4	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	4/0	**	3/0	2/1	**	**	2/0	2/0
3	13	33	30	30	17	38	31	31	6	27	30	29	17/7	**	37/15	37/15	**	**	35/3	33/1
2	49	42	42	43	39	31	45	45	63	55	40	41	58/33	**	41/45	43/42	**	**	45/26	46/21
1	36	25	25	26	39	31	22	23	31	18	28	28	21/60	**	19/40	18/43	**	**	18/70	19/78

** Indicates that "n" size for group was too small to report.

Accountability Information: Also as part of NCLB, each state must determine a timeline for adequate yearly progress (AYP) towards the goal of all students reaching proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2014 as indicated on the state assessment (NECAP). AYP is intended to be used as a diagnostic tool to help state departments of education determine where financial resources should be allocated. Schools not making AYP are deemed in need of improvement. As the number of years for not making AYP increases, schools move from receiving technical assistance from the state department towards more serious corrective actions mandated by the state department.

The information below is provided to help community members understand where our school is in relation to the Annual Measurable Object (AMO) that determines if a school has made Adequate Yearly Progress. AMOs are set each year to determine the minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the standards on the NECAP. AMOs are applied consistently throughout the state for every school. For further information about Assessment Accountability, visit the Vermont Agency of Education website at: http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/pgm_accountability/ayp_faq.html.

For subgroups less than 40, no information is provided

PHS Reading:

	Participation (% tested)	Annual Measurable Objective (set by state each year; increases as we approach 2014)	PHS Actual Achievement Score (0-500)	Lower Confidence Band (LCB) (if the actual score is \geq to the LCB, AYP is met)	Academic Indicator (% of students in the lowest achievement level on reading test)	Made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)-Reading Index
All Students	100%	468	453	444	YES	YES
Free/Reduced Lunch	100%	468	444	427	N<40	N<40
With Disability	100%	468	**	**	N<40	N<40

**No AYP decision is made for subgroups with less than 40 students.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

PHS Math:

	Participation (% tested)	Annual Measurable Objective (set by state each year; increases as we approach 2014)	PES Actual Achievement Score (0-500)	Lower Confidence Band (LCB) (if the actual score is \geq to the LCB, AYP is met)	Made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)-Math Index
All Students	100%	447	377	418	NO
Free/Reduced Lunch	100%	447	350	398	N<40
With Disability	100%	447	**	**	N<40

**No AYP decision is made for subgroups with less than 40 students.

PHS field-tested the SBAC in 13-14; no NECAP results

Graduation Rate

	Graduation Rate Goal (expected to be met)	2011 Graduation Rate (% graduated)	Met Graduation Rate Goal (Grad. Rate is ≥ 86%)	2010 Graduation Rate (Improvement target. Only applicable if goal is not met)	Graduation Rate Target (based on school previous year rate. Only applicable if goal is not met)	Met 4, 5 or 6-year Graduation Rate Target (meet target if grad. rate is ≥ its target)
4-year Graduation Rate:						
• All students	86.0%	83.3%	NO	92.3%	93.5%	NO
• Free/Reduced Lunch	86.0%	**	N<40	100%	N/A	N/A
• With Disability	86.0%	**	N<40	**	N/A	N/A
5-Yr. Graduation Rate						
• All students	86.0%	92.3%	YES	85.2%	N/A	N/A
• Free/Reduced Lunch	86.0%	100.0%	N<40	86.7%	N/A	N/A
• With Disability	86.0%	**	N<40	**	N/A	N/A
6-Yr. Graduation Rate						
• All students	86.0%	92.3%	NO	90.3%	92.7%	NO
• Free/Reduced Lunch	86.0%	100.0%	N<40	86.7%	N/A	N/A
• With Disability	86.0%	**	N<40	**	N/A	N/A

For more information on graduation rates visit: http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/data/dropout/cohort_99_00_overview.html

Proctor Junior/Senior High School did not make Adequate Yearly Progress for the “all students” category in math. The subgroups were not large enough for AYP decisions to be made. PHS is in Year 1 of School Improvement. In an attempt to improve outcomes for all students, PHS has taken the following action steps this year:

Reading:

- Introduce English Language Arts (ELA) Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for all subjects
- Familiarity with ELA CCSS for all ELA teachers
- Shifts in Reading & Writing Workshops (gr. 6-8, 9-12)
- Development of an Supervisory Union-wide Writing Rubric
- Identification of Power Standards, unpacking and curriculum mapping (through Rubicon, an electronic mapping tool) with ELA CCSS
- Required Reading Intervention course for Junior High students in need

Math:

- CCSS Math Workshops 7-12 (including a school level action planning series)

- Familiarity with CCSS for all math teachers
- Identification of Power Standards, unpacking and curriculum mapping (through Rubicon, an electronic mapping tool) with math CCSS
- Implementation and analysis of STAR Math Assessments grades 7-12
- 8 Mathematical Practices training for teachers
- Required Math Intervention course for Junior High students in need

Writing:

- Introduce ELA CCSS for all subjects
- Familiarity with ELA CCSS for all teachers
- Shifts in Reading & Writing Workshops (gr. 6-8, 9-12)
- Development of an SU Writing Rubric
- Identification of Power Standards, unpacking and curriculum mapping with ELA CCSS
- Writing for Understanding training for teachers
- Required Writing Intervention course for 7th grade students in need

Rutland Central Supervisory Union has four schools in Year 1 of School Improvement: Proctor Elementary School, Proctor Jr./Sr. High School, Rutland Town School and West Rutland School.

Teacher Quality Information:

The federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) requires that all public school teachers of “core” academic subjects (English language arts, math, social, studies, science, reading, art, music, foreign languages and special educators who provide primary instruction in one of these areas) meet the “highly qualified teacher” (HQT) requirements of the Act. The Vermont Agency of Education determines if a teacher is highly qualified. All PHS teachers in core subjects are highly qualified.

National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) Data for the State of Vermont: The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the largest continuing and nationally representative assessment of what our nation's students know and can do in core subjects. The results of NAEP are released as *The Nation's Report Card*. In Vermont, students in grades 4 and 8 participate in the NAEP assessment every other year. Following are the results for the 2011 NAEP results for the state of Vermont.

Math:

Overall Results

In 2013, the average score of eighth-grade students in Vermont was 295. This was higher than the average score of 284 for public school students in the nation. The average score for students in Vermont in 2013 (295) was not significantly different from their average score in 2011 (294) and was higher than their average score in 1996 (279). The score gap between higher performing students in Vermont (those at the 75th percentile) and lower performing students (those at the 25th percentile) was 47 points in 2013. This performance gap was not significantly different from that in 1996 (42 points). The percentage of students in Vermont who performed at or above the NAEP Proficient level was 47 percent in 2013. This percentage was not significantly different from that in 2011 (46 percent) and was greater than that in 1996 (27 percent). The percentage of students in Vermont who performed at or above the NAEP Basic level was 84 percent in 2013. This percentage was not significantly different from that in 2011 (82 percent) and was greater than that in 1996 (72 percent).

Reading:

Overall Results

In 2013, the average score of eighth-grade students in Vermont was 274. This was higher than the average score of 266 for public school students in the nation. The average score for students in Vermont in 2013 (274) was not significantly different from their average score in 2011 (274) and was higher than their average score in 2002 (272). The score gap between higher performing students in Vermont (those at the 75th percentile) and lower performing students (those at the 25th percentile) was 43 points in 2013. This performance gap was not significantly different from that in 2002 (42 points). The percentage of students in Vermont who performed at or above the NAEP Proficient level was 45 percent in 2013. This percentage was not significantly different from that in 2011 (44 percent) and was greater than that in 2002 (40 percent). The percentage of students in Vermont who performed at or above the NAEP Basic level was 84 percent in 2013. This percentage was not significantly different from that in 2011 (82 percent) and in 2002 (82 percent).