

## West Rutland 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*

### **Note: 2013 NECAP Results:**

For the 2012-2013 school year 27 schools participated in the SBAC field test in lieu of administering the fall NECAP assessments. Participation in the SBAC field test was voluntary. While the state is required to report statewide results, there is evidence to suggest that the exclusion of these 27 schools makes statewide results unrepresentative of all students in the state. Therefore, **2013 NECAP reading, writing and math assessments do not accurately reflect state-level achievement and should be excluded in any state-level comparisons over time.**

It is appropriate to make comparisons at the school level for those schools that did administer the fall 2013 NECAP assessments. It is possible for schools that did participate in the SBAC field to have limited results for the fall 2013 NECAP assessments. This occurs because results are often reported by the school where the learning occurred (teaching school) and not the school where the test was administered (testing school).

## Reading Gr. 3-8

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) WRS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) WRS		Female (%) State		Male (%) WRS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) WRS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) WRS		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	10	10	20	NA	13	2	25	NA	8	9	15	NA	18/4	9/4	27/10	NA	12/0	14/0	23/1	NA
3	56	52	53	NA	64	46	53	NA	48	46	53	NA	61/52	48/30	56/49	NA	61/7	73/0	58/23	NA
2	23	25	17	NA	17	16	15	NA	30	28	20	NA	20/27	15/21	12/24	NA	22/36	33/0	15/33	NA
1	10	13	10	NA	5	16	7	NA	14	18	12	NA	1/18	3/15	5/16	NA	5/57	11/0	5/42	NA

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

## Reading Gr. 11

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) WRS		All Students (%) State		Female (%) WRS		Female (%) State		Male (%) WRS		Male (%) State		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) WRS		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) State		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) WRS		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	23	18	31	37	19	**	39	45	29	**	24	29	**	**	38/17	45/21	**	**	36/1	42/2
3	53	53	43	37	56	**	40	34	36	**	45	40	**	**	43/43	36/39	**	**	46/19	40/19
2	17	24	16	13	19	**	13	11	29	**	19	15	**	**	13/23	10/20	**	**	13/36	12/24
1	8	6	10	13	6	**	8	9	7	**	12	16	**	**	7/17	8/21	**	**	5/44	6/55

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

### Math Gr. 3-8

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	20	15	21	NA	20	16	21	NA	21	14	21	NA	31/10	17/8	29/11	NA	22/0	22/0	24/2	NA
3	45	49	44	NA	49	40	45	NA	43	38	43	NA	49/43	37/25	47/40	NA	49/14	68/0	48/18	NA
2	19	20	17	NA	21	14	18	NA	18	26	17	NA	15/24	8/15	14/22	NA	22/0	22/0	17/21	NA
1	15	16	17	NA	11	5	16	NA	18	22	18	NA	5/23	3/13	10/27	NA	7/86	11/0	11/59	NA

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

### Math Gr. 11

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	3	0	3	3	0	**	2	3	7	**	5	3	**	**	5/1	4/1	**	**	4/0	3/<1
3	27	12	35	32	19	**	36	33	36	**	34	33	**	**	42/20	40/17	**	**	40/3	37/2
2	30	47	24	27	38	**	25	28	21	**	23	25	**	**	24/23	27/25	**	**	26/8	29/8
1	40	35	38	38	44	**	37	37	36	**	38	39	**	**	29/56	28/57	**	**	30/89	30/90

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

### Writing Gr. 5

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	0	0	14	13	**	**	20	21	**	0	8	6	**	0/0	19/6	18/6	**	**	16/1	15/1
3	37	11	37	40	**	**	44	46	**	7	31	34	**	6/5	43/29	44/33	**	**	42/7	44/10
2	42	11	35	31	**	**	29	22	**	7	42	38	**	6/5	30/42	27/35	**	**	35/38	30/31
1	21	4	14	17	**	**	7	11	**	4	20	23	**	1/3	8/22	17/23	**	**	7/54	10/59

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

### Writing Gr. 8

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	25	5	19	6	33	**	28	9	15	**	10	3	35/9	**	24/9	8/2	**	**	22/1	7/0
3	57	58	47	48	53	**	52	58	62	36	43	39	65/45	**	51/41	56/35	**	**	53/16	55/6
2	18	21	24	33	13	**	16	27	23	36	32	38	0/45	**	33/19	28/40	**	**	22/39	31/39
1	0	16	10	14	0	**	4	7	0	27	15	20	0/0	**	6/16	8/22	**	**	4/44	6/54

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

### Writing Gr. 11

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	3	6	4	8	6	**	5	10	0	**	3	7	**	**	5/2	11/3	**	**	4/0	10/<1
3	30	59	43	46	31	**	50	54	29	**	35	39	**	**	49/29	53/34	**	**	48/5	52/10
2	57	47	43	39	56	**	39	32	57	**	47	45	**	**	39/52	32/52	**	**	42/51	36/59
1	10	0	11	6	6	**	6	3	14	**	15	9	**	**	7/17	4/10	**	**	6/44	3/31

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

### Science Gr. 4

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	0	0	2	1	**	**	2	<1	**	**	1	1	**	**	2/1	1/<1	**	**	2/0	1/<1
3	33	27	51	47	**	**	52	50	**	**	50	44	**	**	63/36	58/32	**	**	57/22	52/18
2	56	62	36	39	**	**	35	37	**	**	37	41	**	**	29/45	33/46	**	**	34/47	38/44
1	11	12	11	14	**	**	11	12	**	**	12	15	**	**	6/19	8/22	**	**	7/32	10/37

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

**Science Gr. 8**

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	0	0	1	1	**	**	1	<1	**	**	1	1	**	**	2/0	1/<1	**	**	2/0	1/0
3	52	55	29	32	**	**	28	33	**	**	29	30	**	**	37/15	41/17	**	**	34/4	36/4
2	38	41	48	47	**	**	49	48	**	**	47	47	**	**	47/49	46/49	**	**	50/34	50/32
1	10	5	22	20	**	**	22	19	**	**	23	22	**	**	14/30	12/34	**	**	15/62	13/64

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

**Science Gr. 11**

Proficiency Level	All Students (%) <b>WRS</b>		All Students (%) <b>State</b>		Female (%) <b>WRS</b>		Female (%) <b>State</b>		Male (%) <b>WRS</b>		Male (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Compared to Economically Disadvantaged (%) <b>State</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>WRS</b>		Non-Disabled Students Compared to Students w/Disabilities (%) <b>State</b>	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4	3	3	2	2	0	0	2	1	7	7	2	2	**	**	3/0	2/1	**	**	2/0	2/0
3	27	24	30	30	19	20	31	31	36	29	30	29	**	**	37/15	37/15	**	**	35/3	43/1
2	30	52	42	43	38	60	45	45	21	43	40	41	**	**	41/45	43/42	**	**	45/26	46/21
1	40	21	25	26	44	20	22	23	36	21	28	28	**	**	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](http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/pgm_accountability/ayp_faq.html).

**WRS Reading:**

	Participation (% tested)	Annual Measurable Objective (set by state each year; increases as we approach 2014)	WRS 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 the reading test)	Made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
All Students	100%	500	436	500	YES	NO
Free/Reduced Lunch	100%	500	405	500	N<40	NO
With Disability	100%	500	452	500	N<40	N<40

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

**WRS Math:**

	Participation (% tested)	Annual Measurable Objective (set by state each year; increases as we approach 2014)	WRS 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)
All Students	100%	500	420	500	YES
Free/Reduced Lunch	100%	500	377	500	NO
With Disability	N<40	500	243	500	N<40

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

## Graduation Rate

	<b>Graduation Rate Goal</b> (expected to be met)	<b>2012 Graduation Rate</b> (% graduated)	<b>Met Graduation Rate Goal</b> (Grad. Rate is $\geq$ 86%)	<b>2011 Graduation Rate</b> (Improvement target. Only applicable if goal is not met)	<b>Graduation Rate Target</b> (based on school previous year rate. Only applicable if goal is not met)	<b>Met 4, 5 or 6-year Graduation Rate Target</b> (meet target if grad. rate is $\geq$ its target)
<b>4-year Graduation Rate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students</li> <li>Free/Reduced Lunch</li> <li>With Disability</li> </ul>	88.3%	86% 86% 86%	No N<40 N<40	96.6% 93.8% **	N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A
<b>5-Yr. Graduation Rate</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students</li> <li>Free/Reduced Lunch</li> <li>With Disability</li> </ul>	NA	86% 86% 86%	NO N<40 N<40	80.6% 91.7% 73.7%	87.0% N/A N/A	NO N/A N/A
<b>6-Yr. Graduation Rate</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students</li> <li>Free/Reduced Lunch</li> <li>With Disability</li> </ul>	NA	86% 86% 86%	NO N<40 N<40	80.6% 91.7% 73.7%	NA N/A N/A	NO N/A N/A

For more information on graduation rates visit: [http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/data/dropout/cohort\\_99\\_00\\_overview.html](http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/data/dropout/cohort_99_00_overview.html)

West Rutland School did not make Adequate Yearly Progress in Reading for all students nor for free/reduced lunch students. WRS did not make Adequate Yearly Progress in Math for free/reduced lunch students. Therefore, WRS is in Year 1 of School Improvement. In an attempt to improve outcomes for all students, WRS has taken the following action steps this year:

### Reading:

- Implemented the English Language Arts (ELA) Common Core State Standards (CCSS)
- All teachers are utilizing ELA CCSS
- Supervisory Union-wide Writing Rubric, focus on opinion/argument
- Completion of identifying Power Standards, unpacking and curriculum mapping (through Rubicon, an electronic mapping tool) with ELA CCSS
- 1.5 FTE Interventionists Title I



- Use of Fountas & Pinnell Reading Assessments and STAR assessments three times a year with data used to target needed interventions/ LLI intervention system

#### Math:

- Utilization of CCSS for all Math teachers
- Completion of identifying Power Standards, unpacking and curriculum mapping (through Rubicon, an electronic mapping tool) with math CCSS
- Implementation and analysis of STAR Math Assessments grades 3-12 3 times per year/ Math Navigator intervention system
- Implementation and analysis of Primary Numbers and Operations Assessment (PNOA) tests for K-2 3 times per year

#### Writing:

- Implementation of ELA CCSS for all subjects
- Utilization of ELA CCSS for all teachers
- Supervisory Union-wide Writing Rubric, focus on opinion/argument
- Completion of identifying Power Standards, unpacking and curriculum mapping with ELA CCSS

Rutland Central Supervisory Union has four schools in Year 2 of School Improvement: Proctor Elementary 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. 100% of the teachers at West Rutland School are HQT in their field of instruction.

**National Assessment of Educational 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 2013 NAEP results for the state of Vermont.

