Draft

Rush-Henrietta Central School District

DISTRICT PRIORITIES End-of-Year Report 2017-2018

I. ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (LITERACY)

Proficiency rates for last year's New York State ELA assessments are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks. These benchmarks need to be achieved for R-H to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

	All Students									
	2017	2016	2015	2014	Benchmark[1]	Gap	Trend*	County Ranking[2]		
ELA 3: CCR	56%	(54%)	(38%)	(39%)	55%	None	+	5	(7)	(11)
ELA 4: CCR	54%	(50%)	(48%)	(42%)	50%	None	+	6	(11)	(8)
ELA 5: CCR	39%	(39%)	(32%)	(34%)	45%	- 6%	+	11	(10)	(11)
ELA 6: CCR	42%	(44%)	(38%)	(36%)	45%	- 3%	+	7	(7)	(11)
ELA 7: CCR	43%	(53%)	(34%)	(44%)	55%	-12%	-	13	(6)	(13)
ELA 8: CCR	50%	(49%)	(53%)	(42%)	55%	- 5%	+	9	(10)	(6)
ELA 11: Passing	93%	(96%)	(95%)	(95%)	96%	- 3%	-	12	(8)	(7)
CCR:	75%	(87%)	(83%)	(78%)	85%	-10%	-	12	(8)	(---)

*Three-Year Trend

[1]Benchmarks have been adjusted to reflect Monroe County achievement on spring 2017 assessments, including "opt outs."

[2]Target: 1-8

Reflection: At grades 3-6 and grade 8, student achievement improved over a three year period. This improvement has Rush-Henrietta students at grades 3, 4, and 6 performing in the top half of the county. Improved student achievement can be attributed to an instructional focus on foundational literacy skills (word study) and common core learning standards for literacy, specifically analysis of text.

At grade 5, despite student achievement gains over a three year period, student achievement fell below the county average. At grade 7, student achievement also fell below the county average. These patterns of student achievement were consistent with district assessment results during the school year. More consistent implementation of the district curriculum (ReadyGen at 4-6), more frequent progress monitoring, and more targeted interventions for students' not meeting benchmarks are required.

At grade 11, both the passing rate and college/career readiness rate for the Common Core ELA Regents exam were lower than the prior year. This is explained by the fact that a large number of students took the 2005 Comprehensive Regents exam instead of the Common Core Regents exam last year. The slight decline in the passing rate and larger decline in the college/career readiness rate reflects that the common core Regents exam is more difficult. Passing rate and College and Career Readiness rate declines require that vocabulary acquisition and use (Language standard 5) and understanding of craft and structure (Reading Literature standard 5) be strengthened. Additionally, strategies to better support students with disabilities and ENL students need to be explored.

At all grades, students' reading ability needs to improve in order to ensure success in comprehending grade level text. This can be accomplished by using district literacy assessments to diagnose student interventions and inform classroom instruction in a timely manner.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Curriculum Development

a. ELA 10 Honors: Revised curriculum units to align with AP English standards.

2. Classroom Instruction

a. K-6: Used the ELA block guideline to plan daily instruction.
b. K-6: Used integrated curriculum maps to connect content and literacy skills.
c. K- 3: Implemented the Wilson *Fundations* reading program with fidelity.
d. 4-6: Used the resource *ReadyGen* for balanced literacy instruction in reading and writing.
e. 7-9: Implemented revised ELA units as defined by district curriculum maps.
f. ELA 10 Honors: Implemented revised curriculum maps that align with AP English standards.
g. K-12: Expanded classroom teacher and instructional support teachers' use of research based practices to support literacy learning.

3. Learning Assessments

a. K-2: Administered NWEA MAP Growth K-2 to monitor foundational literacy growth and achievement.
b. 4-6: Administered Performance Based Assessments using both *ReadyGen* and NYS rubrics.
c. 7-12: Administered ELA performance tasks to assess ELA and ISTE standards.
d. 7-11: Piloted an online multiple choice assessment in eDoctrina in the second semester.

4. Academic Intervention

a. K-3: Used early literacy reading benchmarks for diagnostic intervention.
b. K-3: Used the Wilson *Fundations* early intervention resource.
c. 4-6: Used the Wilson *Just Words* intervention resources.
d. K-9: Coordinated academic interventions with classroom teachers and service providers to ensure that interventions consistently address identified learning gaps.

5. Progress Monitoring

a. K-3: Monitored *Fundations* implementation by conducting regularly scheduled walkthroughs.
b. 4-6: Monitored *ReadyGen* implementation by conducting regularly scheduled walkthroughs.
c. K-12: Developed and administered formative assessments.
d. K-12: Reviewed student assessment data and responded as needed in daily instruction and
e. interventions.
f. K-6: Improved use of diagnostic assessments to identify reading gaps, plan responsive instruction and identify appropriate interventions.
g. K-9: Used newly defined data dialogue protocols to monitor school and district student achievement, initiate appropriate interventions, and identify program improvements.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. Reading

Proficiency rates for NWEA MAP assessments will be reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected college and career readiness rates appear as benchmarks (percent of students scoring at or above the 61% percentile).

Reading		Fall	Winter	Spring	Benchmark	Gap	Trend*
MAP K:	CCR	Not given	51% (NA) (NA)	58% (NA) (NA)	60%	- 2%	+
MAP 1:	CCR	39% (NA) (NA)	40% (NA) (NA)	50% (NA) (NA)	60%	-10%	+
MAP 2:	CCR	59% (46%) (42%)	58% (58%) (48%)	60% (58%) (61%)	60%	0%	+
MAP 3:	CCR	54% (54%) (47%)	55 % (51%) (53%)	53% (56%) (58%)	60%	- 7%	0
MAP 4:	CCR	52% (52%) (50%)	48% (60%) (48%)	49% (55%) (53%)	60%	-11%	-
MAP 5:	CCR	54% (46%) (46%)	50 % (51%) (50%)	55% (50%) (48%)	60%	-5%	0
MAP 6:	CCR	51% (47%) (52%)	53% (48%) (48%)	53 % (52%) (49%)	60%	- 7%	+
MAP 7:	CCR	54% (55%) (52%)	55% (50%) (54%)	50 % (48%) (56%)	65%	-15%	-
MAP 8:	CCR	50% (58%) (60%)	49% (60%) (59%)	47% (57%) (61%)	70%	-23%	-

***2% or more change**

Reflection:
At Kindergarten and grade 1, student achievement and growth on the overall proficiency improved throughout the year, however overall student performance did not meet benchmarks. Programs and interventions will continue to be implemented as prescribed and interventions with be provided to cohorts in need of support. At grade 2 and 3, annual achievement remained flat, however the benchmark was met at grade 2. Practices will be refined to improve literacy skills at grades 2 and 3 and the achievement variations among schools will be addressed. At grades 4-6, achievement remained flat, with a slight decrease at grade 4, and grade levels did not meet benchmarks. Based on item analysis review, comprehension skills are an area of concern. Additional resources and coaching cycles will be implemented in the fall of 2018. At grades 7 and 8, a significant decrease in achievement was evident. Improvement plans are being developed to incorporate a literacy focus on specific comprehension skills across all content areas and support services. In addition, progress monitor practices will be refined to incorporate more formative assessment practices.

Improved literacy achievement, with an increase of more explicit comprehension instruction, will be a high priority for the upcoming school year for all teachers and support service providers. Professional development on comprehension strategies will be embedded into coaching cycles with teachers.

2. Writing (K-8)

Proficiency rates for the district's 2-8 writing assessments (students write in response to text) are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates are not available since these assessments are new. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks (percent of students scoring a 3 or higher).

Reading/Writing		Fall	Spring	Benchmark	Gap	Trend*
2:	CCR	46%	67%	60%	+7%	+21
3:	CCR	35%	63%	60%	+3%	+28
4:	CCR	49%	55%	60%	- 5%	+6
5:	CCR	59%	54%	60%	- 6%	-5
6:	CCR	59%	71%	60%	+11%	+12
7:	CCR	72%	78%	60%	+18%	+6
8:	CCR	81%	76%	60%	+16%	-5

Reflection:
In grades 2-3, significant student achievement growth was made with both grades exceeding benchmark. At grades 4 and 5, student writing scored below benchmark, and grade 5 showed a decrease in achievement Grades 6 and 7 demonstrated an increased proficiency and exceeded the benchmark. Grade 8 decreased in proficiency by 5% but exceeded benchmark. Assessment results will be analyzed to identify areas for instructional improvement and ensure inter-rater reliability in scoring. Teaching teams will use this assessment data to provide targeted writing instruction and to develop intervention plans. The use of consistent writing rubrics will continue to be used to define writing expectations based on NYS writing standards.

3. Writing (9-11) –

Proficiency rates for the district's 9-11 writing assessments (students write in response to text) are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks (percent of students scoring a 65% passing, 75% CCR).

Reading/Writing	Quarter 2(Mid-term)	Quarter 4 (Final)	Benchmark	Gap	Trend
9: Passing	95 (92%) (100%)	93% (91%) (86%)	95%	-2	-
CCR	77 (61%) (73%)	80% (73%) (60%)	75%	+5	+
10: Passing	90 (95%) (88%)	85% (93%) (92%)	95%	-10	-
CCR	76 (76%) (63%)	68% (73%) (61%)	75%	-7	-
11: Passing	92 (93%) (90%)	91% (93%) (96%)*	95%	-4	0
CCR	82 (85%) (81%)	77% (79%) (87%)*	75%	+2	-

*Quarter 4 is the ELA 11 Regents Exam

Reflection:

At grade 9, achievement is close to meeting district benchmarks. Grade 9 students will analyze complex texts and complete rigorous writing tasks. The grade 10 proficiency dropped from Q2 to Q4 as did the CCR score. The data from this assessment will be further analyzed to determine the cause for this decline and instructional adjustments will be made. At grade 11, the proficiency score is consistent with last year, but is not meeting the benchmark of the 95%ile. CCR scores dropped from Q2 to Q4. This is the second year administration of the ELA Common Core (CC) 11 Regents exam, curriculum refinements continue as we analyze how student respond to the rigor of the ELA Common Core 11 Regents exam. At all grades, an emphasis will be placed on emphasizing the use of complex text , while at the same time increasing student engagement and analysis of text.

4. NYS ELA Assessments –

Proficiency rates for this year's New York State ELA assessments will be reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks. These benchmarks need to be achieved for R-H to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

	All Students								
	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	Benchmark[1]	Gap	Trend*	County Ranking
ELA 3: CCR	___	(56%)	(54%)	(38%)	(39%)	55%			__ (5) (7) (11)
ELA 4: CCR	___	(54%)	(50%)	(48%)	(42%)	50%			__ (6) (11) (8)
ELA 5: CCR	___	(39%)	(39%)	(32%)	(34%)	45%			__ (11) (10) (11)
ELA 6: CCR	___	(42%)	(44%)	(38%)	(36%)	45%			__ (7) (7) (11)
ELA 7: CCR	___	(43%)	(53%)	(34%)	(44%)	55%			__ (13) (6) (13)
ELA 8: CCR	___	(50%)	(49%)	(53%)	(42%)	55%			__ (9) (10) (6)
ELA 11: Passing	91%	(93%)	(96%)	(95%)	(95%)	95%	-4	-	__ (12) (8) (7)
CCR:	77%	(79%)	(87%)	(83%)	(78%)	85%	- 8	-	__ (12) (8) (--)

*Three-Year Trend

[1]Benchmarks have been adjusted to reflect Monroe County achievement on spring 2017 assessments, including "opt outs."

[2]Target: 1-8

Reflection:

New York State grades 3-8 assessments are not available at this time.

At grade 11, the proficiency score is consistent with last year, but is not meeting the benchmark of the 95%ile. CCR scores dropped from Q2 to Q4. This is the second year administration of the ELA Common Core (CC) 11 Regents exam, curriculum refinements continue as we analyze how student respond to the rigor of the ELA Common Core 11 Regents exam.

College/Career Readiness rates and Monroe County averages for NYS Regents Exams are not available at this time.

II. MATHEMATICS

A. The Problem:

Proficiency rates for last year's New York State math assessments are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks. These benchmarks need to be achieved for R-H to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

		All Students									
		2017	2016	2015	2014	Benchmark[2]	Gap	Trend*	County Ranking[3]		
NYS Math 3	CCR	67%	57%	(62%)	(64%)	65%	None	+	3	(7)	(7)
NYS Math 4	CCR	62%	62%	(64%)	(60%)	65%	- 3%	+	7	(9)	(9)
NYS Math 5	CCR	55%	55%	(54%)	(50%)	65%	-10%	+	10	(8)	(10)
NYS Math 6	CCR	55%	56%	(60%)	(56%)	55%	None	0	8	(10)	(6)
NYS Math 7	CCR	44%	55%	(48%)	(51%)	55%	-11%	-	14	(9)	(10)
NYS Math 8[1]	CCR	10%	22%	(31%)	(20%)	20%	-10%	-	14	(10)	(8)
Algebra I	Passing	90%	91%	(79%)	(85%)	95%	- 5%	+	11	(8)	(12)
(CCLS)	CCR	53%	53%	(24%)	(49%)	65%	-12%	+	13	(7)	(---)
Geometry	Passing	89%	85%	(80%)	(----)	85%	None	+	5	(7)	(9)
(CCLS)	CCR	43%	31%	(33%)	(----)	40%	None	+	6	(11)	(---)
Algebra II	Passing	96%	97%	(----)	(----)	95%	None	+	7	(5)	(5)
(CCLS)	CCR	63%	59%	(----)	(----)	60%	None	-	7	(11)	(---)

*Three-Year Trend
[1]Accelerated math students do not take grade 8 state math assessments
[2]Benchmarks have been adjusted to reflect Monroe County achievement on spring 2017 assessments, including "opt out."
[3]Target: 1-8

Reflection: At grades 3, 4, and 5 student achievement improved over a three year period. This can be attributed to an instructional focus on common core learning standards and improved progress monitoring.

At grade 6 student achievement was unchanged. At grades 7-8 student achievement declined and student achievement fell below county averages. This concern can be addressed by initiating the use of a new resource, *Eureka Math*. Additionally, at grades K-9, embedded professional development is needed to continue to deepen knowledge of math progressions and grade level focus standards.

Student achievement on the Algebra I and Geometry Regents exams improved compared to the prior year, and student achievement on the Algebra II Regents exam remained strong. This can be attributed to the implementation of curriculum and assessment revisions better aligned to common core standards. In addition, a Math Coach worked closely with Algebra I and Algebra II teachers on best instructional practices aligned with common core learning standards. Also noteworthy is that most students who completed the High School Math Prep Course in grade 9 and then took Algebra I in grade 10 passed the Algebra Regents exam.

B. The Improvement Plan

1. Curriculum Development

a. K-6: Curriculum maps were developed with scope/sequence aligned to *Eureka Math* modules.
b. 7-8: Eureka Math Program was piloted. (Burger - grade 7 and Roth - grade 8)
c. Algebra I: Explored the possibility of an Applied Algebra I course that prepares student for the Regents examination.

2. Classroom Instruction

a. K–6: Teachers implemented newly developed curriculum maps and the instructional resource *Eureka Math* to ensure consistent and coherent instruction.
b. 7-8: Curriculum maps were developed with a defined scope and sequence for math standards and use of grade level program materials (*Eureka Math*) and piloted by teacher teams.
c. K-8: Extensive professional development was provided to teachers to support their use of Eureka Math.

3. Learning Assessments

a. K-6: Administered new unit assessments aligned with the new curriculum.
b. K-2: Administered the NWEA MAP Growth K-2 to monitor foundational math growth and achievement.
c. 2-3: Developed and administered interim cumulative assessments to monitor student understanding and retention of grade level critical concepts.

4. Academic Intervention

a. K-9: Classroom and math specialists coordinated academic interventions to ensure that interventions consistently addressed identified learning gaps.
b. K-9: Math specialists worked through a professional learning community (PLC) to improve their capacity to diagnose learning gaps and provided appropriate intervention practices.

5. Progress Monitoring

a. K-6: Principals and the Math director monitored the *Eureka Math* implementation by conducting regularly scheduled walkthroughs.
b. K-12: Teachers are developed and administered formative assessments, recorded their assessment data in eDoctrina, and used this data to plan responsive instruction.
c. K-12: Teacher teams monitored student progress by reviewing student assessment data and responded as needed in daily instruction and interventions.
d. K-12: Professional development was provided to enhance teachers' capacity to use student assessments to accurately diagnose math gaps, plan responsive instruction and identify appropriate interventions.
e. K-8: School administrators and the math program director met three times using newly defined data dialogue protocols for monitoring school and district student achievement, initiated appropriate interventions, and identified program improvements.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. MAP Assessments

Proficiency rates for NWEA MAP assessments are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected college and career readiness rates appear as benchmarks (percent of students scoring at or above the 61% percentile).

Math		Fall	Winter	Spring	Benchmark	Gap	Trend*
MAP K:	CCR	*** (***)	56% (***)	61 (***)	60%	+1%	+
MAP 1:	CCR	37% (***)	45% (***)	58 (***)	60%	-2%	+
MAP 2:	CCR	56% (42%) (35%)	62% (54%) (43%)	60 (41%) (50%)	60%	0%	+
MAP 3:	CCR	47% (42%) (45%)	46% (48%) (50%)	51 (51%) (58%)	60%	-9%	+
MAP 4:	CCR	49% (51%) (46%)	44% (61%) (59%)	48 (58%) (62%)	70%	-22%	-
MAP 5:	CCR	55% (56%) (49%)	54% (59%) (50%)	59 (57%) (55%)	70%	-11%	+
MAP 6:	CCR	44% (47%) (44%)	50% (46%) (49%)	54 (46%) (55%)	60%	-6%	+
MAP 7:	CCR	51% (56%) (55%)	51% (54%) (57%)	54 (56%) (61%)	60%	-6%`	+
MAP 8:	CCR	54% (65%) (60%)	55% (61%) (60%)	51 (58%) (60%)	60%	-9%	-

***2% or greater change**

Reflection:
At Kindergarten, grades 1, 2 and 3, student achievement and growth on the overall proficiency improved throughout the year. Overall, student performance met or exceeded benchmarks at Kindergarten and second grade. At grades 1 and 3, overall student performance did not meet benchmarks but the grade 3 cohort achievement improved from 41% to 51% which indicates a closing of the gap. Practices will be refined to improve math instruction at these grade levels and the achievement variations among schools will be addressed.

At grades 4, there was a regression in student achievement. Principals and coaches worked with teachers to improve instructional practices in identified classrooms. However, the efforts put forth did not yield an improvement in student performance. During the summer, a review of grade 4 classroom instructional practices will be conducted to identify how best to utilize instructional coaches to support specific classrooms. At grades 5 and 6, student achievement and growth on the overall proficiency improved throughout the year, however overall student performance did not meet benchmarks. At grade 6 there was an overall gain in grade level performance, but the cohort lost ground dropping 3% for overall achievement. The Eureka Math Program and interventions will continue to be implemented as prescribed and interventions with be provided to cohorts in need of support.

At grade 7 there was an increase in student achievement since the fall and a significant increase for the cohort, however student performance did not meet the benchmark. At grade 8 there was a slight regression in student achievement. This pattern aligns with the preliminary 2018 NYS math assessments results. However, at each grade student growth goals are exceeding norm referenced averages.

At grade 8, full implementation of Eureka math program is predicted to improve student achievement. A review of AIS students' MAP assessment results showed larger than expected growth which is an indicator that their skill gaps are being closed. This will continue to be an area of focus as we improve our Response to Intervention (RtI) practices.

2. Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessments

Proficiency rates for mid-year common assessments and Regents exams are reported below. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks.

Math		Winter		Regents	Benchmark	Gap	Trend
Algebra I:	Passing	66%	(NA)	100%	95*	+5	+
(8A)	CCR	39%	(NA)	93%	65*	+28	+
Algebra I:	Passing	24%	(NA)	87%	95*	-8	+
(9-12)	CCR	9%	(NA)	45%	65*	-20	+
Geometry:	Passing	81%	(NA)	98%	85*	+13	+
(9)	CCR	52%	(NA)	72%	40*	+32	+
Geometry:	Passing	27%	(NA)	88%	85*	+3	+
(10)	CCR	10%	(NA)	39%	40*	-1	+
Algebra II:	Passing	21%	(NA)	96%	95	+1	+
	CCR	5%	(NA)	60%	60	0	+

*Benchmarks are for overall combined student achievement.

Reflection: Winter 2018 was the first administration of a mid-year learning assessment. Students did not receive any re-teaching prior to test administration in order to ascertain long term mastery of standards. Teachers and students analyzed the assessment results to identify conceptual understandings and skill areas in need of improvement and provided appropriate interventions. The end of year Regents results indicate positive growth at levels.

3. NYS Assessments

Proficiency rates for this year's New York State math assessments are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks. These benchmarks need to be achieved for R-H to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

		All Students				Benchmark[2]	Gap	Trend*	County Ranking[3]		
		2018	2017	2016	2015						
NYS Math 3	CCR	___	(67%)	(57%)	(62%)	65%			___	(3)	(7)
NYS Math 4	CCR	___	(62%)	(62%)	(64%)	65%			___	(7)	(9)
NYS Math 5	CCR	___	(55%)	(55%)	(54%)	65%			___	(10)	(8)
NYS Math 6	CCR	___	(55%)	(56%)	(60%)	55%			___	(8)	(10)
NYS Math 7	CCR	___	(44%)	(55%)	(48%)	55%			___	(14)	(9)
NYS Math 8[1]	CCR	___	(10%)	(22%)	(31%)	20%			___	(14)	(10)
Algebra I	Passing	87%	(90%)	(91%)	(79%)	95%	-8	-	___	(11)	(8)
(CCLS)	CCR	45%	(53%)	(53%)	(24%)	65%	-20	-	___	(13)	(7)
Geometry	Passing	92%	(87%)	(85%)	(80%)	85%	+7	+	___	(5)	(7)
(CCLS)	CCR	51%	(40%)	(31%)	(33%)	40%	+11	+	___	(6)	(11)
Algebra II	Passing	96%	(96%)	(97%)	(----)	95%	+1	0	___	(7)	(5)
(CCLS)	CCR	60%	(53%)	(59%)	(----)	60%	0	+	___	(7)	(11)

*Three-Year Trend

[1]Accelerated math students do not take grade 8 state math assessments

[2]Benchmarks have been adjusted to reflect Monroe County achievement on spring 2017 assessments, including "opt out."

[3]Target: 1-8

Reflection: New York State grades 3-8 assessments are not available at this time.
Student achievement on the Geometry exam improved compared to the prior year for both proficiency and CCR. Student achievement on the Algebra II exam remained strong for passing and increased in the area of CCR. However Algebra I student achievement for passing declined slightly along with CCR rates. To improve student achievement in Algebra I, an expansion plan to our secondary course offerings is being developed to better meet the diverse learning needs of our students. College/Career Readiness rates and Monroe County averages for NYS Regents Exams are not available at this time.

III. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

A. The Problem:

To prepare students for college and careers, the school learning environment must move beyond traditional teaching methods to provide authentic, real world experiences. One aspect of this real world experience is the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), which is the facilitation of learning by using, managing, and creating appropriate technological processes and resources. To ensure our students are ready to be productive citizens in this technological world, we must help them master the ISTE Standards for Students and their ICT skills. By improving their skills, our students will be better able to create, collaborate, communicate, and apply critical thinking skills.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Curriculum Development

a. The number of common learning experiences and assessments that incorporate the ISTE standards and ICT skills within the district curriculum maps have been increased. (Grade 4-6, ELA 9-12, and Science 7 and 8)
b. The STEAM 7 (BITS- Build, Innovate, Think, Share) and STEAM 8 (Collaborative Design) curricula were revised to specifically incorporate ISTE Standards and ICT skills while integrating content area standards.

2. Classroom Instruction

a. K-12: One-to-one student access to technology devices, the Internet, web-based applications, and synchronized communication for teaching and learning has been provided to all students.
b. K-12: Students expanded their use of G Suite,, including Google Classroom, Google Docs, Google Forms, Google Slides, and Google Sheets.
c. K-12: Teachers advanced the application of the ISTE Standards and ICT skills scope and sequence in lesson planning and unit design through coaching cycles with ICT coaches and Library Media Specialists (LMS).
d. K-12: The ISTE standard, Knowledge Constructor, and related ICT skills are being embed within classroom instruction.
e. 4-5: Students brought home Chromebooks in order to extend their learning and build familiarity with the device.

3. Learning Assessments

a. 2-6: Keyboarding assessments were administered 3 times to track accuracy and words per minute.
b. 3: A benchmark ISTE assessment (Primary Capstone) was administered to assess fundamental ICT skills and progress towards the ISTE standards.
c. 6: A benchmark ISTE assessment (Intermediate Capstone) was piloted to assess ICT skills and ISTE standards implementation.
d. 9: A benchmark ISTE assessment (Junior High Capstone) was piloted assess research skills, ICT skills and ISTE standards implementation.
e. 4-6, ELA 9 and Science 6: ICT skills were integrated into core-content assessments as performance-based tasks.
f. K-12: Instructional Technology Coaches worked with teachers to rewrite assessments within identified units to incorporate ISTE standards and then plan unit using backwards design.

4. Academic Intervention

a. 2-6: Students not meeting grade level benchmarks for keyboarding received additional time to practice keyboarding within the classroom setting using supplemental web based keyboarding programs.
b. K-12: Students having difficulty with foundational ICT skills and application of ISTE standards received assistance and support from classroom teachers and Technology Teaching Assistants (TTA)s.

5. Progress Monitoring

a. 2-6: School administrators and the ICT director reviewed grade level benchmark results for keyboarding proficiency.
b. 3: School principals and teachers reviewed Primary Capstone benchmark assessment results to analyze student performance and recalibrate rubric and project expectations.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. Teacher Capacity for Technology Use (Self-Reported)

	Awareness			Literacy			Integration			Leadership				Integration or Leadership		
	2018	2017	2016	2018	2017	2016	2018	2017	2016	2018	2017	2016		2018	2017	2016
Elementary Schools	4%	5%	6%	39%	52%	49%	45%	35%	40%	12%	8%	9%		57%	43%	49%
Secondary Schools	6%	9%	5%	44%	48%	47%	41%	38%	41%	9%	6%	8%		50%	44%	49%

Target=85%

Reflection: At the elementary level, there was impressive movement from literacy to integration category. The secondary level saw more incremental movement across all categories. Overall, there was significant growth in both the integration and leadership levels. This indicates that the lower 2016-17 school year results were caused by an implementation dip as teachers became familiar with the ISTE standards and ICT skills. While teachers did report significant gains at both levels this year, there is still much work to be done to deepen teacher self-efficacy around meaningful integration of the ISTE standards. According to the Spring 2018 Needs Assessment Survey, over 50% of teachers listed a lack of planning time as either a moderate or large obstacle to integration. The second biggest identified obstacle teachers noted was "keeping up with changes in technology".

Significant time, both for professional development and for teachers to collaboratively make curricular upgrades, must be given for teachers to continue to grow in this area. District and building leadership must find more opportunities to allow teachers to work and learn together on how to integrate technology into instruction and curriculum. Teachers must be presented numerous examples on how to best integrate technology within their own content/grade levels and then be given the time and resources needed to successfully adapt those examples to their own instruction and student work.

2. Keyboarding

Proficiency rates for benchmark assessments (accuracy and words per minute) are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates appear in parentheses. Expected proficiency rates appear as benchmarks.

Accuracy

	Q2_	Q3_	Q4_	Benchmark	Gap
Grade 2	82% (82%)	84 (86%)	90 (88%)	90%	0%
Grade 3	89% (87%)	90 (91%)	92 (91%)	90%	+2 %
Grade 4	92% (92%)	92 (93%)	93 (92%)	90%	+3 %
Grade 5	93% (93%)	92 (94%)	93 (93%)	90%	+3%
Grade 6	94% (***)	94 (***)	95 (***)	90%	+5 %

Words per Minute

	Q2_	Q3_	Q4_	Benchmark	Gap
Grade 2	7 (6)	8 (8)	11 (11)	10	+1
Grade 3	11 (12)	16 (13)	17 (17)	15	+2
Grade 4	17 (19)	21 (20)	22 (23)	20	+2
Grade 5	25 (21)	27 (24)	28 (26)	25	+3
Grade 6	28 (**)	29 (**)	33 (**)	30	+3

Reflection: All grade levels met or exceeded district benchmarks. While a 90% accuracy remains an appropriate benchmark, two years of exceeding word per minute benchmarks for the majority of grades indicates that our keyboarding program is achieving intended results. To sustain student growth, word per minute benchmarks will be increased for each of the grade levels as follows:

2018/19 Benchmarks

Grade 2	11
Grade 3	17
Grade 4	23
Grade 5	28
Grade 6	33

3. ISTE Proficiency (Capstone Project)

Proficiency rates for capstone assessments are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates are not available since these assessments are new. Expected passing rates appear as benchmarks (percent of students scoring a 3 or higher on the ISTE Primary Capstone project).

	2017-18	Benchmark	Gap	Trend
Primary Capstone (Grade 3):	79% (NA)	80%	-1%	---

Reflection: The results of the first year of implementation indicate that our third grade students were highly successful at demonstrating progress towards the ISTE Standards while showing their understanding of the four major components of Social Studies: Geography, Culture, Government and Economics.

Based on analysis of ISTE performance indicators, two areas to focus instruction on are use of digital tools and developing a topic with sufficient facts, definitions, and details. Library media specialists and the elementary ICT coach will work with teachers to design more opportunities for students to practice these specific skill sets in all primary classrooms.

The Intermediate and Junior High Capstones were developed this year. Both Capstones have been vetted and approved by teachers and volunteers piloted aspects of each Capstone with their students this spring. This allowed the pilot teams to use student work to identify exemplars, norm the rubric, modify/clarify the tasks and make curriculum/instructional revisions for full implementation next year. All grade level teachers have seen the finished Capstones and know that this is a required assessment for the 2018-2019 school year.

IV. SCHOOL RECONFIGURATION

The operational aspects of school reconfiguration are complete. We are now focusing on ensuring that the new school configurations better serve our students. This requires clearly articulating and communicating the vision for each grade-level configuration; ensuring that our instructional programs and practices are aligned with these visions of school excellence; decisively addressing any problematic aspects of school operations; and, taking advantage of emerging opportunities.

A. The Problem:

1. **Space Planning:** Validate that there is sufficient classroom space at each school for the next 3-5 years.

2. **Facility Renovations**: Complete building renovations at Burger, Sherman, and Vollmer.

3. **Start/End Times:** Consider alternative school start and end times to address staff and parent interests and concerns. This includes start and end times for before and after school activities.

4. **Student Transportation:** Adopt administrative guidelines that address staff and parent concerns with three student transportation practices: bus change requests, length of bus rides, and student drop off.

5. **School Management:** Articulate and communicate the vision for each grade-level configuration, and review the administrative guidelines for each grade-level configuration to ensure that these guidelines are up-to-date and aligned with the vision for the grade-level configuration.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. **Space Planning:**
   a. Charge the district's Instructional Space Committee with validating that there is sufficient classroom space at each school for the next 3-5 years.
   b. If space constraints are projected, have the Space Committee recommend actions that should be taken to mitigate the constraints.
   c. Present this information to the Board of Education and ask for guidance on how to proceed.

2. **Facility Renovations**:
   a. Develop a comprehensive list of the projects that need to be completed at Burger, Sherman, and Vollmer. (Punch List)
   b. Monitor work completion and intervene as needed.

3. **Start/End Times:**
   a. Document staff and parent concerns with school start and end times, including start and end times for before school and after school activities.
   b. Consider alternative school schedules that address interests and concerns.
   c. Present feasible school schedule modifications to the Board of Education and ask for guidance on how to proceed.

4. **Student Transportation:**
   a. Develop administrative guidelines that address staff and parent concerns with three transportation practices: (a) bus change requests, (b) length of bus rides, and (c) student drop-off.
   b. Present these administrative guidelines to the Board of Education for adoption.

5. **School Management:**
   a. Explain the vision for each new grade-level configuration at the Staff Kick-Off meeting.
   b. Meet quarterly with school leaders to document problems related to school reconfiguration, and to monitor progress being made in addressing problems.
   c. Review and, if necessary, revise the administrative guidelines for each grade-level configuration to document changes and ensure alignment with the vision.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan

1. **Space Planning:**
   a. The district's Instructional Space Committee has validated that there is sufficient classroom space at all schools for the next 3-5 years.

2. **Facility Renovations**:
   a. Facility renovations at Burger, Sherman, and Vollmer are complete. Additional renovation work will be completed at Sherman over the next two years.
   b. Roth windows have been installed. Interior painting has been completed.

3. **Start/End Times:**
   a. The following changes have been requested for school start and end times: (1) a later start time for the SHS; (2) a later bus drop off time for JHS; (3) a shorter day for students participating in both music ensembles and after-school activities at intermediate schools; (4) earlier start and end times at intermediate schools; and, (5) removing recess from the lunch period at primary and intermediate schools.
   b. School schedules have been developed that address most of these requests. However, an aspect of the proposed schedules (unassigned time) may not comply with the RHEA teacher's contract. This issue is being addressed through contract negotiations. The goal is to implement a revised schedule in September 2019.

4. **Student Transportation:**
   a. Bus Change Requests – In January 2017, the Board of Education authorized an administrative guideline that: (1) specifies acceptable reasons for a bus change request, and (2) requires parents to make bus change requests at least one week in advance. School administrators and the district's Director of Transportation report that this guideline is working well.
   b. Student Drop Off –In January 2018, authorized an administrative guideline that allows children attending intermediate schools to be dropped off without the presence of a responsible adult or older sibling unless such supervision is requested by the parent. This guideline went into effect on January 29, 2018.
   c. Length of Bus Rides – In February 2018, the Board authorized an administrative guideline that specifies acceptable bus ride lengths.

5. **School Management**:
   a. In September 2017, the Superintendent of Schools at the Staff Kick-Off meeting shared the vision for the new grade-level configurations with school staff. Following the Kick-Off meeting, school principals discussed these visions with school staff.
   b. Staffing allocations have been modified for Intermediate Schools (art teachers, music teachers, main office clerical staff, youth assistants, and cafeteria monitors) and Primary Schools (cafeteria monitors).
   c. The Intermediate School schedule has been changed for 2018-19 (specials class time extended by 10 minutes to accommodate unassigned time without a lunchtime recess, classroom teachers will provide daily recess at a time of their discretion).
   d. A Junior High School schedule change is being considered - modify the homeroom period to provide time for student/teacher access during the school day).
   e. A Primary School schedule is being considered - eliminate the need for the lunch recess.
   f. Questions remain about the best instructional teaming model for Intermediate Schools.
   g. Administrative guidelines for each grade-level configuration will be reviewed and updated in 2018-19.

V. WELCOMING DIVERSITY

Given the growing diversity of our student body and community, we must do more to recognize the importance and connection among culture, teaching and learning. Specifically, we must ensure that we respect and appreciate the diverse backgrounds of our students, families, and colleagues; that we promote cultural sensitivity in and outside of the classroom; that we provide inclusive, supportive learning environments where all students and staff feel accepted rather than tolerated; and, that we develop a workforce that reflects the diversity of our community.

A. The Problem:

1. Respect and Appreciation - How do we measure the degree to which we respect and appreciate the diverse backgrounds of our students, families, and colleagues? What are the desired benchmarks, and what outcomes will indicate success?

2. Cultural Sensitivity and Inclusion – How do we define "inclusion," and how does that differ from "tolerance"? How do we measure the degree to which we are promoting inclusive, supportive learning environments where all students and staff feel accepted?

3. Workforce Diversity – How do we measure this? What are the appropriate benchmarks?

Reflection: In the absence of baseline data from a needs assessment, these three goals represent the district leadership's identified major areas of need based on anecdotal evidence and experience.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Steering Committee

a. Established a steering committee with members representing stakeholder groups and the community, to guide the diversity work and strategic planning. The committee met three times during the spring, and will meet again during the summer.
b. The committee engaged in several community circles (restorative practice) to develop a "safe space" for members to have courageous conversations about diversity-related issues, to build trust as a community of learners, and to identify key questions and areas of need.
c. The committee met with consultants from the University of Rochester, to review their proposal for design and implementation of a comprehensive Needs Assessment to identify issues and problems related to bias, equity and inclusion within the district's systems, processes and programs. The committee members provided suggestions for topics and questions to be used with stakeholders during the Needs Assessment data collection (surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.).

2. Professional Development – Initiated professional development programs to begin conversations and build awareness for working effectively with diverse populations of students, families and colleagues.

a. A community forum to screen and discuss the documentary, "I'm Not Racist, Am I?" took place in January, and was attended by more than 40 staff, Board of Education members, parents, students and community members.
b. Members of the Board of Education and Administrative Council attended a poverty simulation workshop in February.
c. Human Resources staff attended a workshop on workforce diversity and retention with Dr. Margarita Bianco at BOCES 1 in February.
d. Dr. Derek Greenfield will present a workshop on "building inclusive excellence" with the Leadership Staff during the August 2018 leadership development week.

3. Student Discipline (Character Development) –

a. A restorative practices pilot project was implemented at the Senior High School and Webster Learning Center, to help promote inclusive, supportive, learning environments.
b. Restorative strategies were piloted within classrooms for community building and academic engagement, building on the existing PBIS framework for student management.

4. Recruitment and Hiring

a. The Human Resources Department has drafted a five-year Workforce Diversity Plan, which was approved by the Board of Education in March.
b. Recruitment/outreach activities took place.
c. Hiring processes for 2018-19 included identification of qualified minority teaching and administrator candidates for inclusion in the screening process.
d. District teachers and administrators will attend training with Dr. Bianco in August to prepare for implementation of the Pathways 2 Teaching program to "grow our own teachers" from among current Rush-Henrietta students of color.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. Respect and Appreciation

a. The Board of Education approved the University of Rochester consultants' proposal for the Needs Assessment, including design and data gathering in 2018-19, and data analysis and development of findings and recommendations in 2019-20.
b. The committee will engage with the consultants throughout the Needs Assessment to help interpret the data and to provide guidance for further data collection and analysis.
c. Administrators engaged in leadership development activities, which will lead to discussions with teachers and staff on issues of equity and inclusion.

2. Cultural Sensitivity and Inclusion

a. More than 50 teachers, administrators and other staff members were trained in community-building circles (restorative practices) this year.
b. These staff members implemented community-building circles in their classrooms and other settings, shared their experiences with colleagues, and provided in-service workshops to establish common information and vocabulary related to community-building circles.
c. An implementation plan was developed to guide the work over the next several years, including plans for establishing a Restorative Practices Leadership Team (RPST) and for more comprehensive training for staff and students throughout the district.
d. Several teacher-led action research projects and study groups focused on diversity-related topics such as the impact of poverty on student learning and gender-related achievement gaps.
e. Teachers and students engaged in discussions of multiple perspectives on history and other aspects of the curriculum.

3. Workforce Diversity

a. Recruitment and hiring processes for seven administrative positions included candidates of color for each position; candidates of color advanced beyond the screening interviews for principal, director and assistant principal. Candidates of color comprised 30 percent of those interviewed for the elementary principal positions and 50 percent of the finalists for assistant principal.
b. Outreach to colleges, teacher recruitment events and other venues resulted in the interviewing and hiring of several teachers of color in 2018-17 and for 2018-19.
c. HR administrators met with students at staff at the Senior High School to explore establishing a future educators' club to help develop potential "in-house" candidates for employment.

Reflection: The first year of this multi-year District Priority has established a foundation for professional learning and community conversations about issues related to diversity, equity, bias and inclusion.

In 2018-19, the work will focus on: Design and implementation of the Needs Assessment, including ongoing consultation with the Steering Committee; continued training of staff and implementation of restorative practices in the classroom and other settings; and ongoing efforts to diversify the employment applicant pool.

VI. DIGITAL CITIZENSHIP

An aspect of student character that requires attention is digital citizenship. Although not problematic, our students access to and use of information and communication technology continues to grow, both in and out of school. For this reason, we must explicitly articulate, teach, model, and acknowledge responsible use of information and communication technology. In addition, we must educate parents about student use of information and communication technology, and steps that parents can take to promote digital citizenship.

A. The Problem:

1. Elementary Schools – Student Survey (Grades 3-6)

	2016-17	2015-16
My teacher has taught me about digital citizenship.	99%	NR
My teacher has taught me that the things I post online never go away so I know to be responsible with what I post (digital footprint).	97%	NR
I use technology respectfully in my classroom.	98%	NR
I have been recognized for positive digital citizenship.	75%	NR
I have not been made fun of, called names, or threatened through electronics at/during school.	91%	NR

Target = 90%

Reflection: Last year, emphasis was placed on teaching students about the meaning of digital citizenship, the importance of being responsible online, and using technology in an appropriate manner within the classroom. Meaningfully acknowledging students who consistently demonstrate the attributes of a good digital citizen was also emphasized. These efforts need to continue. In addition, we need to educate parents on the advantages/disadvantages of using technology, the possible addictive effects of electronic devices, and its impact on students' learning.

2. Junior High Schools – Student Survey

	2016-17	2015-16
Digital citizenship and digital footprint have been discussed/taught by my teachers or other staff members.	98%	96%
Technology is used by students in a respectful manner.	84%	84%
I have been acknowledged for my positive digital citizenship behaviors.	84%	NR
Students are not harassed through the use of electronics at school.	92%	94%

Target = 90%

Reflection: Last year, emphasis was placed on teaching students about digital citizenship and their digital footprint. Throughout the year, staff members were proactive and consistent in teaching students what being a good digital citizen is and looks like. Additionally, through school-wide assemblies, they emphasized the advantages and disadvantages of using technology and how to remain safe online. Interventions to specifically address misuse of technology were developed and implemented. We are pleased with the overall impact of this work. However, still of concern is the respectful manner in which students are using technology in the classroom and the various ways we are acknowledging students displaying positive digital citizenship behaviors. In addition, we need to educate parents on the advantages/disadvantages of using technology, the possible addictive effects of electronic devices, and its impact on students' learning.

3. Senior High School – Student Survey

	2016-17	2015-16
Digital citizenship and digital footprint have been discussed/taught by my teachers or other staff members.	91%	83%
Technology is used by students in a respectful manner.	80%	82%
I have been acknowledged for my positive digital citizenship behaviors.	72%	NR
Students are not harassed through the use of electronics at school.	86%	86%

Target = 90%

Reflection: Last year, educating students about their digital footprint and its impact on their learning, now and in the future was emphasized. This was accomplished through panel discussions, guest speakers, student developed videos, grade-level assemblies, and targeted lessons. Students were also recognized on a monthly basis for demonstrating digital citizenship attributes. Most students reported that information and communication technology was used by students in a respectful manner. This is impressive because, in some classrooms, students use multiple devices, including their cell phones, for learning. The next steps are to continue the work on digital footprint and begin to identify the other elements of digital citizenship such digital health and wellness, and digital law, that we believe are important for students to know and understand. Furthermore, it is necessary to educate parents on the advantages/disadvantages of using technology, the possible addictive effects of electronic devices, and its impact on students' learning.

4. Parent Education – Parent Survey

Do you have adequate information about the expanding use of information and communication technology for student learning	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Elementary Schools:	86%	83%	63%
Middle Schools:	91%	92%	76%
NGA:	90%	89%	58%
SHS:	84%	83%	69%

Target = 85%

Reflection: Most parents continued to report that they had adequate information about the district's digital learning initiative. Many parents also reported wanting more opportunities to learn about their children's growing use of information and communication technology – at school and at home. Information about how to supervise their child's use of this technology at home continues to be a topic of great interest.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. **Expectations** – At all schools, PBIS teams reviewed and, as necessary, revised their matrices with language and expectations for digital citizenship. Digital citizenship expectations are embedded within the five PBIS attributes: *Be Caring, Be Ready to Learn, Be Respectful, Be Responsible, and Be Trustworthy*.

2. **Instruction** – At all schools, there have been lessons, activities, and assemblies that teach and reinforce specific elements of digital citizenship. In elementary schools, digital literacy, communication, and etiquette were emphasized. In secondary schools, digital communication, etiquette, literacy, security, and rights and responsibilities were emphasized. The teaching and reinforcement of these elements are taught through targeted PBIS team-created lessons, assemblies, workshops, and online digital literacy and citizenship classroom curriculum (www.commonsensemedia.com).

3. **Acknowledgements** – At all schools, procedures for acknowledging students exemplifying appropriate digital citizenship were reviewed and, as necessary, updated.

4. **Interventions** – At all schools, teaching appropriate digital citizenship were emphasized (rather than punishing inappropriate use). When necessary, building administrators followed the district's progressive disciplinary protocol to address student misconduct.

5. **Progress Monitoring** – Surveys were updated and administered to students and teachers.

6. **Parent Education**

    a. At all schools, parents were asked to attend workshops to learn about student use of digital technology at school.

    b. Parents were encouraged to attend two district forums on teenagers' use of digital technology and steps that parents can take to encourage digital citizenship:
        i. "Growing Up in the Digital Age" -Roth JHS (*October 17, 2017*) (Attendance: 139)
        ii. "Growing Up in the Digital Age" -Burger JHS (*October 30, 2017*) (Attendance: 250)

    c. A digital citizenship week was held February 12-16, 2018 in all district buildings. Each day had a corresponding theme and resources and tips were provided to parents to help them continue the conversation and practice the elements of digital citizenship with their child at home.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. Elementary Schools – Student Survey (Grades 3-6)

	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
My teacher has taught me about digital citizenship.	98%	99%	NR
I use technology respectfully in my classroom.	99%	98%	NR
I have been recognized for positive digital citizenship.	72%	75%	NR
My teacher has taught me that the things I post online never go away so I know to be responsible with what I post (digital footprint).	98%	97%	NR
I have not been made fun of, called names, or threatened through electronics at/during school.	89%	91%	NR

Target = 95%

Reflection: At all elementary schools, there was significant emphasis placed on teaching students about the meaning of digital citizenship, the importance of being responsible online, and using the technology in an appropriate manner within the classroom. Both teacher and student survey results show these expectations/practices were successfully implemented.

The acknowledgement systems in place at all schools need to be promoted and emphasized. The elementary schools need to continue to review their individual data to determine whether the school-wide acknowledgement system for positive digital citizen is being used consistently by all and to identify other classroom acknowledgement systems that have been put in place by individual teachers.

2. Junior High Schools - Student Survey

	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Digital citizenship and digital footprint have been discussed/taught by my teachers or other staff members.	98%	98%	96%
Technology is used by students in a respectful manner.	81%	84%	84%
I am aware of how students are acknowledged for positive digital citizenship behaviors.	88%	NR	NR
I have been acknowledged for my positive digital citizenship behaviors	77%	84%	NR
Students are not harassed through the use of electronics at school.	92%	92%	94%

Target = 95%

Reflection: At the Junior High schools, an emphasis was placed on teaching students about digital citizenship and their digital footprint. Throughout the year, staff members were proactive and consistent in teaching students what being a good digital citizen is and looks like. Additionally, through school-wide assemblies, they emphasized the advantages and disadvantages of using technology and how to remain safe online. Interventions to specifically address misuse of technology continued to be implemented.

It is necessary to continue to promote and emphasize the acknowledgement system within the schools and continue to educate parents on the advantages/disadvantages of using technology, the possible addictive effects of electronic devices, and its impact on students' learning.

3. Senior High School – Student Survey

	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Digital citizenship and digital footprint have been discussed/taught by my teachers or other staff members.	92%	91%	83%
ogy is used by students in a respectful manner.	81%	80%	82%
are of how students are acknowledged for positive digital citizenship behaviors.	67%	NR	NR
een acknowledged for my positive digital citizenship behaviors.	70%	72%	NR
s are not harassed through the use of electronics at school.	87%	86%	86%

Target = 90%

Reflection: At the high school level, the main focus was to educate students about their digital footprint and its impact on their learning, now and in the future. This was accomplished through panel discussions, guest speakers, student developed videos, grade-level assemblies, and targeted lessons. Students were also recognized on a monthly basis for demonstrating digital citizenship attributes. Most students reported that information and communication technology was used by students in a respectful manner. This is impressive because, in some classrooms, students use multiple devices, including their cell phones, for learning. Additionally, most high school students reported not being harassed via electronics while at school.

It is necessary to continue to promote and emphasize the acknowledgement system in the building and continue to educate parents on the advantages/disadvantages of using technology, the possible addictive effects of electronic devices, and its impact on students' learning.

4. Parent Education – Parent Survey

Do you have adequate information about the expanding use of information and communication technology for student learning	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Primary Schools:	84%	86%	83%	63%
Intermediate Schools:	90%	86%	83%	63%
Junior High Schools:	83%	91%	91%	72%
Senior High School:	88%	84%	83%	69%

Target = 90%

Reflection: Most parents continued to report that they had adequate information about the district's digital learning initiative and were provided parent education opportunities at each school led by students. Digital citizenship instruction and disciplinary interventions along with student-led instructional demonstrations continue to be topics of great interest.

VII. SPECIAL EDUCATION

Many Rush-Henrietta students have disabilities that interfere with their learning (10.2%). To support our students with disabilities(SWDs), a broad spectrum of services are provided, including special classes, consultant teachers, teaching assistants and teacher aides, counseling, speech and language therapy, occupational therapy, and physical therapy. Despite these efforts, our students with disabilities are not achieving expected levels of academic success. Specifically, the district is consistently missing NYS Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets for students with disabilities at multiple grade levels, and the four-year graduation rate for students with disabilities is significantly below that of other Rush-Henrietta students. To ensure that students with disabilities achieve expected levels of academic success, our special education services must be strengthened.

A. The Problem:

1. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Elementary/Junior High School Level: (K-8)

a. **English Language Arts**: To meet the state's adequate yearly progress targets, each identified student subgroup must demonstrate significant improvement (usually at least 20 percent per year) in the percentage of students in that subgroup who obtained a level 3 or 4 standard on the state ELA assessment in grades 3-8. During the 2016-2017 school year, 8% of students with disabilities were considered proficient compared to 48% Rush-Henrietta students overall.

b. **Math**: To meet the state's adequate yearly progress targets, each identified student subgroup must demonstrate significant improvement (usually at least 20 percent per year) in the percentage of students in that subgroup who obtained a level 3 or 4 standard on the state Math assessment in grades 3-8. During the 2016-2017 school year, 6% of students with disabilities were considered proficient compared to 53% Rush-Henrietta students overall.

Secondary level (9-12)

a. **English Language Arts**: To meet the state's adequate yearly progress targets, each identified student subgroup must demonstrate significant improvement (usually at least 20 percent per year) in the percentage of students in that subgroup who obtained a level 3 or 4 standard on the ELA Regents Exam. In 2016-2017, 38% of students with disabilities were considered proficient compared to 80% of Rush-Henrietta students overall.

b. **Math**: To meet the state's adequate yearly progress targets, each identified student subgroup must demonstrate significant improvement (usually at least 20 percent per year) in the percentage of students in that subgroup who obtained a level 3 or 4 standard on the Algebra I or Geometry Regents Exam. In 2016-2017, 20% of students with disabilities were considered proficient compared to 65% of other Rush-Henrietta students.

2. Graduation Rates

In 2016-2017, the graduation rate for students with disabilities in the 4-year cohort was 48%; and 77% in the 5-year cohort. These numbers are significantly lower than that of the district graduation rate at 89.6% for the 4-year cohort and 93.5% for the 5-year cohort.

B. The Improvement Plan

1. Student Identification/Referrals Audit

a. What are the special education enrollment trends?
b. How many students have been enrolled in-district from out-of-district placements over the past three years?
c. What social, emotional and/or academic needs do the out-of-district programs provide? How are they different than what we provide in-district?
d. Have there been significant changes in special education enrollment by disability category, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status?
e. What is the initial eligibility process for students grades K-12? Is the referral process consistently applied at all levels? Is the current referral form appropriate or need revision?
f. How does the RtI process impact the referral process? Is there evidence of data collection and ongoing monitoring of student performance and growth prior to referral?

2. Continuum of Services/Program Delivery Audit

a. What program delivery models are in place? Are the models appropriate at the various grade levels? Are they effectively supporting student learning, growth and independence?
b. Is there a full continuum of services offered? Is there a need to expand the continuum of services? If so, what should it look like? Why?
c. What does the **integrated co-teaching model** look like at the secondary level? Is it being implemented effectively? Is there evidence of communication and collaborative planning of the two teachers? Is there evidence of data collection and ongoing monitoring of student performance? Is there evidence that lesson planning includes specially designed instruction for students with disabilities? Are the services being delivered per the Individualized Education Plan (IEP)? Is explicit instruction provided to teach skills and strategies? What opportunities are there for integration throughout the school day?
d. What does the **Consultant teacher services model** look like at all levels? What factors are considered when students are grouped and case managed? Is there evidence of the special education teacher providing specially designed instruction to an individual or group of students with disabilities? Is there evidence of communication and collaborative planning? Is there evidence of data collection and ongoing monitoring of student performance? Are the services being delivered per the Individualized Education Plan (IEP)? Is explicit instruction provided to teach skills and strategies to support student's growth and independence toward general education?
e. What is our definition of **special class**? What does the model look like at all levels? Is special class the appropriate designation for Regents level students? Do students have access to the same general education curriculum as their same age peers? Are there classroom management systems that are explicitly taught, reinforced, and consistently implemented? Are there health and safety guidelines in all classrooms? Are the services being delivered per the IEP? Are there communication protocols with related service providers? Is there evidence of communication and collaborative planning? Is there evidence of data collection and ongoing monitoring of student performance?
f. How are **related services** being delivered to students at all levels? Are there groups and/or individual sessions? When a student has multiple related service needs, what impact does this have on their instructional program and access to inclusive opportunities? Are services being delivered per the IEP? Is there evidence of communication with classroom teachers? How are classroom teachers integrating the skills from related service sessions into their lessons and providing opportunities for the transfer of these skills? Is there evidence of data collection mechanism? What process is used to determine if a student no longer qualifies for a related service? Is information effectively shared with parents regarding the role of related services as it pertains to the child's education? Is there information available for parents on how they can support their child at home?

3. Staffing Audit

a. Is the special education department reasonably staffed? Are staffing formulas applied?
b. Are positions and job descriptions defined to support an effective and efficient program?
c. Do special education support services staffs have reasonable caseloads? Do all staff members understand their role on the team? Does the teacher understand the support services staffs' role and are they being utilized effectively?

4. **IEP Development (CSE, CPSE) Audit**
    a. Who are the individuals responsible for the development of the IEP? Have they been trained?
    b. Is there a document with CSE procedures to ensure consistency in the development of the IEP?
    c. Are students' strengths and needs articulated in the IEP? Do goals match the needs as articulated in the Present Level of Education Performances (PLEPs)? Are goals and objectives measurable and being monitored appropriately? Are services students are receiving consistent with their needs and disability? Do the goals and PLEPs align with long term post-graduation plans?
    d. Are students able to identify, and advocate for test accommodations and supports at age appropriate levels? Are students included in the development of their own goals and progress monitoring?

5. **IEP Implementation Audit**
    a. How often is the IEP reviewed at district level, building level, by case managers, teachers, students, and paraprofessionals during the school year?
    b. Are teaching assistants/classroom paraprofessionals helping to implement the student's IEP consistently? Are they engaged with the students in the classroom at all levels?
    c. Do the program and services prescribed on the IEP align with or exceed the needs of the student?

6. **Progress Monitoring Audit**
    a. Are interventions being evaluated for effectiveness at all levels? What evidence of adjustments is there when an intervention is not effective? How often does this occur?
    b. Is there evidence of quarterly tracking of student with disabilities graduation progress beginning in 8th grade? If so, by whom? Are students with disabilities being afforded the same opportunities to earn as many credits as the general education students?
    c. How is the progress of SWDs who are in outside placements monitored?

7. **Organization and Administration (Office of Special Education) Audit**
    a. Is the special education office, and department organized in a way to provide effective and efficient oversight for the program? Are functions logically aligned?
    b. How is the special education department holding itself accountable? Is it meeting student performance expectations?
    c. Does the special education department have adequate procedures and systems for monitoring compliance with applicable laws, regulations and policies?
    d. How has special education spending varied over the past five years? Why?
    e. Does the special education program effectively communicate with parents and other stakeholders?
    f. To what extent does the special education department effectively respond to building needs?
    g. What is building-level administrators' current understanding of the role of special education at it pertains to student achievement, discipline, and least restrictive environments?
    h. What supports and professional development does building-level administrators feel they or their staff need to build capacity in order to increase student achievement?

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan

Based on the findings of a comprehensive internal audit conducted by the special education department, it is evident that our students with disabilities are afforded opportunities essential for success. Despite these efforts, our students with disabilities are not achieving the expected levels of academic success. Our goal is to provide all students with disabilities equal access to the curriculum in the least restrictive environment as required by the New York State Education Department, and to provide the students with the skills necessary to become fully independent and graduate on time with their peers. We believe all students should have opportunities to participate in every aspect of school experience.

The findings of the audit have led to recommendations which we believe will build capacity of staff members to teach *all* students. The articulation and implementation of a consistent referral process will be the first step in creating alignment across grade levels and multiple school buildings. The implementation of professional development and ongoing communication supporting effective teaching practices and IEP development will provide students, families and staff members with increased consistency throughout.

The implementation of an integrated co-teaching (ICoT) pilot program at Crane Elementary School will begin an expansion of the continuum of services that are provided for students to receive instruction in the least restrictive environment. At Burger and Roth Junior High Schools, the integrated co-teaching model is being modified to improve student learning. An evaluation framework has been developed to monitor student progress within this pilot to determine if further expansion is warranted. The district is committed to continuing to provide high quality instruction while making the appropriate adjustments required to increase the number of students meeting AYP and attending programs within the Rush-Henrietta Central School District.

1. Student Identification/Referrals Audit

a. Findings

i. During the past five years, the number of students with disabilities increased from 524 (2013) to 648 (2018).

ii. During the past four years, 24 students returned to district from out of district placements.

iii. During the past five years, student enrollment in BOCES programs has increased from 58 to 72.

iv. During the past three years, there have been significant changes in special education enrollment by disability classification and socioeconomic status.

A. The number of students identified as having Autism has *increased* from 83 to 125.

B. The number of students identified as Emotionally Disturbed has *decreased* from 34 to 20.

C. The number of students identified as Learning Disabled has *increased* from 103 to 122.

D. The number of students identified as having an Other Health Impairment has *increased* from 93 to 134.

E. An increasing number of students demonstrating behavioral difficulties are being referred for special education services.

F. The number of students with disabilities who qualify for Free/Reduced lunch *increased* by 10% (from 54% to 65%), and are consistently higher when compared to the district rates (from 38% to 42%).

v. During the past three years, the classification rate by ethnicity shows minimal variability and is consistent with district enrollment demographics.

A. Caucasian *decreased* from 58% to 52%.

B. Multiracial *increased* from 4% to 6%.

C. American Indian/Alaskan Native remained unchanged at .5%.

D. Hispanic *increased* from 9% to 12%.

E. Black or African-American *increased* from 24% to 25%.

F. Asian/Pacific Islander *increased* from 5% to 6%.

vi. District's Response to Intervention (RtI) process, which directly affects special education through pre-referral intervention strategies, is inconsistently applied among buildings (use of anecdotal information rather than achievement data).

vii. Out-of-district placements provide a higher level of therapeutic interventions some students with disabilities require that are not typically available in a traditional public school setting. Additionally, crisis interventions and social emotional learning are embedded within the program. Staff involved within these programs are specifically trained to respond proactively to the significant social/emotional needs that these students exhibit.

b. Recommendations

i. Establish protocol for validating the classification of all students with disabilities.

ii. Collaborate with the Office of Instruction to clearly articulate the district's RtI process and ensure implementation of its use with fidelity.

iii. Develop a written guideline to articulate the referral process and make necessary improvements with the involvement of multiple stakeholders.

2. Continuum of Services/Program Delivery Audit

a. Findings

i. The current district program delivery models are as follows:

A. Special class (Regents level and NYSAA life-skills).

B. Consultant Teacher services provided at K-12 levels.

C. Integrated Co-teaching provided at the secondary levels (7-12).

D. Transition services and programming provided to students 18 and older

ii. Integrated co-teaching assignments are content-specific at the secondary level.

iii. Consultant Teacher services are delivered directly and/or indirectly at all levels as prescribed on the IEP. Students are grouped into general education classes and the special education teacher is assigned as the case manager.

iv. Special Class is a class consisting of students with disabilities who have been grouped together because of similar needs for the purpose of being provided specially designed instruction. In this setting:

A. Students are not integrated with general education peers for instruction.

B. Opportunities for integration for special areas classes and lunch are provided.

v. In 2017-2018, 67 students were enrolled in special class (NYSAA eligible). Many of these students would have been enrolled in outside placements in other districts.

vi. Related services are delivered per the IEP at all levels:

A. Individual and group sessions provided based on recommendations by the CSE.

B. Entry and exit criteria exist for all related service areas.

C. Therapists regularly share activities with parents to help them maintain progress at home.

vii. For all program models:

A. Data is collected using MAPs assessments, report cards, common assessments, and state testing.

B. All services are being delivered per the IEP.

C. Explicit instruction is provided by special education teachers and related service providers.

viii. In October 2017, a survey was administered to multiple stakeholders for their perspective on the continuum of services and program delivery. The following sentiments were expressed:

A. The continuum of services provided at the elementary level lacks a bridge between self-contained and consultant teacher services.

B. Integrated co-teaching implementation is inconsistent at the secondary level.

C. Students in restrictive settings (special class) do not have exposure to the curriculum at the same rate as their general education peers.

D. Many special education students with multiple related services needs have multiple transitions within the school day.

E. Special education students with multiple related services needs have fewer opportunities compared to general education peers to enroll in classes outside of the required requirements.

F. Common planning time between special education teachers and general education teachers is inconsistent.

G. Special education student schedules need to be created first at all levels to strengthen the relationships between the adults and the students and to effectively meet the particular needs of each student.

b. Recommendations

i. Pilot an effective inclusion model for co-teaching at the primary level (grades K-2).

ii. Shift the integrated co-teaching model from content-specific to grade-level bands (Grades 7-8).

iii. Collaborate with building leaders to document progress related to the pilots and make adjustments as necessary.

iv. Evaluate the effectiveness of the models and assess the need for expansion.

3. Staffing Audit

a. Findings

i. Current district staffing is as follows: 18 special education teachers (K-6); 29 special education teachers (7-12; transition); 13 speech and language teachers; 10 school psychologists; 4.8 occupational therapists.

ii. Staffing formulas for teachers, aides, and related service providers need to be reviewed for adequate staffing levels to satisfy building and student needs per CSE recommendations.

iii. Caseloads across the district are imbalanced for teachers, case managers and related service providers. Reconfiguration and special classes impacted the number of special education students in a building.
iv. Teacher understanding of support services role in the special education classroom is inconsistent. Thus, in some cases there are adults assigned to students in the classroom who are not interacting or helping the students.
v. An increasing number of students demonstrating behavioral difficulties are being referred for special education services.

b. Recommendations
i. Evaluate and review special education staffing formulas with multiple stakeholders to align with student needs per CSE recommendation and make necessary adjustments.
ii. Clearly delineate roles and responsibilities for staff members.
iii. Increase required special education training for general and special education staff (implement the professional development plan developed/and the supplemental Administrative Guide).
iv. Update the professional development plan as necessary.

4. IEP Development Audit

a. Findings
i. Special education teachers and related-service providers require additional training on exemplar IEP writing/development.
ii. Present Levels of Performance (PLEPs) written on the IEP are not always connected to the disability and goals are not always measurable.
iii. Programs and services prescribed on the IEP do not always align with the needs of the student.
iv. There are too many staff members assigned to chair CSE meetings, resulting in inconsistent program and service recommendations.
v. Students are not involved in the development of the IEP process at the secondary level; thus, their personal goals and voice are not articulated.

b. Recommendations
i. Increase required special education training (implement the professional development plan).
ii. Shift the practice of building administrators chairing Committee on Special Education (CSE) re-evaluations meetings to Special Education Office staff.
iii. Establish protocol to ensure student voice and participation in the IEP development process.

5. IEP Implementation Audit

a. Findings
i. IEPs are reviewed at the district level at least once every year.
ii. IEPs are reviewed by teachers quarterly and progress notes are provided to parents regarding student progress.
iii. Teaching Assistants/Classroom Paraprofessionals require additional training to better support student learning.
iv. IEP implementation is inconsistent across buildings.

b. Recommendations
i. Implement the professional development plan.
ii. Ensure consistent implementation of the student IEP.

6. **Progress Monitoring Audit**
   a. Findings
      i. Data collection for students receiving interventions is inconsistent and infrequent.
      ii. Quarterly tracking of students with disabilities toward graduation is inconsistent across buildings.
      iii. Student with disabilities who receive additional instruction supports do not always have the opportunity to earn as many elective credits as their peers.
      iv. Grades and attendance of students with disabilities in outside placements are monitored quarterly.
      v. Progress toward graduation requirements for students in outside placements are monitored by school counselors.
   b. Recommendations
      i. Identify ways to effectively communicate regulations, expectations and various processes to all to ensure understanding and consistency (develop and implement a special education guidebook).
      ii. Monitor performance measures of students with disabilities.
      iii. Establish protocol for tracking students with disabilities graduation rates by cohort.
      iv. Explore alternative scheduling for students with disabilities.

7. **Organization and Administration (Office of Special Education) Audit**
   a. Findings
      i. Expectations and workload for each staff member are not clearly delineated.
      ii. Protocols and procedures are reviewed regularly to monitor compliance with applicable laws and regulations.
      iii. Special education spending has increased by $2 million during the last five years.
      iv. Parents have not been receiving required annual notifications.
      v. The understanding of the role of special education varies as it pertains to student achievement, discipline, and least restrictive environment varies among building administration and staff.
   b. Recommendations
      i. Clearly delineate roles and responsibilities for office staff.
      ii. Establish and implement timelines and protocols for annual parent notifications.
      iii. Assess the impact of shifting responsibilities of CSE re-evaluation meetings from building administrators to Special Education staff, and APPR requirements.
      iv. Evaluate opportunities to increase Medicaid reimbursements.

8. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Elementary/Junior High School Level (3-8)
   a. New York State Grades 3-8 assessments results will be available in August 2018.

9. **Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Secondary Level (9-12)**
   a. New York State data regarding AYP will be available in August 2018.

10. **Graduation Rates**
    a. In 2017-2018, the preliminary district graduation rate (including out-of-district placements) for students with disabilities in the 4-year cohort was 57.4% (an increase by 9% from prior year). Despite the increase, these numbers are significantly lower than that of the district graduation rate at 89.3% for the 4-year cohort.
    b. In 2017-2018, the preliminary graduation rate for in-district students with disabilities in the 4-year cohort was 75% (an increase by 19% from prior year). Despite the increase, these numbers are significantly lower than that of the in-district graduation rate at 91.8% for the 4-year cohort.