

Proctor Junior/Senior High School School Report Card 2016/2017

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) is federal legislation which was passed in 2015 with the intent of improving education for all children by holding schools responsible for results and promoting teaching methods that work. 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 Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) assessment
- How different groups did on the SBAC (boy and girls, students from different economic backgrounds)
- Whether or not the school has been identified as in need of improvement based on the composite scores on prior assessments

Assessment Information: The SBAC assessments, administered in grades 3-8 and 11, measure students’ academic knowledge and skills relative to the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy and Math. Student scores are reported at four levels of academic achievement; Novice, Developing, Proficient, and Advanced. The following information is a summary of the SBAC results for your school for last year and a comparison between your school and state averages. School’s disaggregated data on economically disadvantaged students is currently not available.

4=Proficient with Distinction

3=Proficient

2=Partially Proficient

1= Substantially Below Proficient

ELA 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
	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016
4	5	19	11	23	0	14	11/0	25/8	**	
3	32	39	44	43	20	35	56/10	43/32	**	
2	16	23	22	20	10	25	11/20	19/29	**	
1	47	18	22	12	70	24	22/70	12/29	**	

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

ELA 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
	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016
4	33	27	33	33	0	22	36/30	33/12	**	
3	25	29	50	31	33	27	29/20	31/25	**	
2	21	21	17	20	25	22	21/20	19/27	**	
1	21	20	0	14	42	27	14/30	15/33	**	

Math 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
	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016
4	0	23	0	23	0	22	0/0	30/10	**	
3	16	20	22	21	10	19	33/0	23/15	**	
2	32	26	33	27	30	25	33/30	24/30	**	
1	53	29	44	26	60	32	33/70	21/43	**	

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
	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016	2015/2016
4	0	15	0	15	0	15	0/0	19/5	**	
3	30	22	25	24	36	19	31/30	25/13	**	
2	52	24	67	25	36	23	54/50	25/22	**	
1	17	37	8	34	27	40	15/20	29/58	**	

PHS is in Year 2 of School Improvement for Math.

In an attempt to improve outcomes for all students, RCSU has adopted a research-based, Learner-Centered approach to education, which distills and integrates the effective pedagogical elements common to proficiency based, project based, inquiry based, and formative assessment based learning systems, and targets the new Vermont EQS expectations around Proficiency Based Graduation Requirements, flexible pathways, and Personalized Learning Plans. The objective of this model is to cultivate self-direction in students so that they learn to learn on their own. Teachers are working to implement the following best practices:

- Clarifying learning intentions
- Checking for understanding
- Providing effective feedback around proficiencies
- Engaging students in cooperative learning
- Engaging students in the analysis of their own performance data (assessment error analyses, tracking progress against proficiencies, etc)
- Differentiating
- Scaffolding learning
- Providing opportunities for student revision & reflection
- Engaging students in in-depth inquiry
- Making learning authentic
- Providing opportunities for students to share their learning with public audiences
- Taking a proficiencies-based, blended approach to homework
- Providing students with choices in how to access their learning
- Providing students with choices in how to demonstrate their learning
- Enabling students to work at their own pace
- Reporting out on proficiencies & performance indicators, not tasks & assessments