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I. Equity and Inclusion
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III. Instruction
   ● English Language Arts (ELA) / Literacy
   ● Mathematics
   ● Information and Communication Technology (ICT)
IV. Special Education (Embedded in Instruction)
I. EQUITY AND INCLUSION

A. Areas of Improvement

Leary Elementary stands united against racism and discrimination. Recognizing the many kinds of diversity that exist within our school, we are committed to strengthening connections among culture, teaching, learning, achievement, and transformation. We strive to ensure that our programs, curriculum, and learning environments are culturally responsive and safeguard equity and inclusion.

1. Equity in Systems and Practice
Leary evaluated the extent to which we provided equity of opportunity, access, and support, and established the desired measures and outcomes that were needed to indicate success.

2. Inclusive Excellence
Leary implemented and promoted a shared definition and understanding of “inclusion,” and articulated how we can ensure that all students, families, and staff are fully included. We measured the degree to which we promoted an inclusive, supportive learning environment where all students and staff feel accepted. Our goal was that students saw their cultures and experiences represented throughout Leary’s instructional practices, curriculum and programs. All students had access to experiences that fully challenged their potential.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Equity in Systems and Practice
   a. Provided professional development and opportunities focused on advancement along the cultural competence continuum, and the alignment among equity, social-emotional learning, mental wellness, and restorative practice
   b. Student, parent and staff survey data was shared with stakeholder groups
   c. Utilized our restorative practices team and established goals focused on restorative practices implementation, including expanding the use of community-building circles within classrooms and among staff members
   d. Identified staff members who needed additional training, support and feedback in implementing community-building circles and restorative, rather than punitive, approaches to interactions with students and implemented a plan to provide needed support

2. Inclusive Excellence
   a. Analyzed multiple data measures focusing on gaps in student performance (especially subgroups such as students with disabilities, English Language Learners, economically disadvantaged students, and students of color including attendance, behavior data, and suspension rates/practices) and identified possible bias in school and classroom practices, and ensured opportunities to increase participation and representation of diverse voices and experiences.
   b. Encouraged teacher and/or principal-led teams to engage in action research and study groups focused on diversity-related topics such as the impact of poverty on student learning and gender-related achievement gaps
c. Assessed the current level of diverse and inclusive materials that reflect our building’s population, and explored the possibility of expanding our resources and texts for use in community-building circles, to honor and validate students’ life experiences, cultural capital, and prior knowledge

d. Provided professional development to engage teachers in more inclusive and culturally responsive pedagogy, instructional and assessment practices, including learning activities and relationship-building that address social-emotional needs and honor students’ cultural and social backgrounds

e. Partnered with Senior High School Diversity Club students to educate Leary teachers and staff about cultural norms and practices of our English as a New Language (ENL) families with the goal of reinforcing Leary teacher/staff and Leary family partnerships

f. Increased the use of multiple perspectives in teaching content areas such as history and implemented lessons that reflect students’ life experiences, cultural capital and prior knowledge

g. Ensured that resources regarding equity and culturally responsive education are available to staff and families

h. Utilized NYS Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Framework to implement classroom and school-wide inclusive practices

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan

1. Leary increased the average use of community building circles in classrooms from two times a month to three times a month during the 2020-2021 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average in December</th>
<th>Average in May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of circles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Maintained the percentage of all students receiving all meets expectations (ME) on the PBIS/Behavior section of progress reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ME</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Increased the percentage of students attending school in all subgroups (Q4/Q3/Q2/Q1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>SPED</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Present</td>
<td>97/98/97/97</td>
<td>96/96/94/95</td>
<td>97/97/96/96</td>
<td>98/98/97/97</td>
<td>97/98/96/99</td>
<td>99/99/97/97</td>
<td>97/97/97/97</td>
<td>97/97/96/97</td>
<td>96/96/96/96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflection
Throughout the school year Leary continued our collaborative work raising awareness and understanding of our equity priority. Staff utilized a variety of resources including the New York State Culturally Responsive Sustaining Framework, The Cultural Continuum, Culturally Responsive Teaching in the Brain, and articles and videos provided by the 10 day Equity Challenge. Leary teachers combined these resources with our building level SEL work. Staff increased our use of circles as we merged cohorts. Our Positive Behavior Intervention Support team designed and refined circle plans to help students transition back to attending school four days a week. Our percentage of Meeting Expectations students slightly decreased from Quarter 1. We believe this decline is connected to both cohorts returning to school and more students in classrooms and the school. The Leary staff will continue to improve our ability to hold all students to high expectations by ensuring intellectual engagement and improving all subgroups academic data.
II. MENTAL WELLNESS

A. Areas of Improvement

Given growing societal concerns regarding student and staff mental wellness and the impact of mental wellness on daily functioning, the staff at Leary Elementary will continue to build upon our comprehensive mental wellness program to ensure consistent implementation, access to services, and program refinement. We expanded our mental health supports and services to address existing and emerging needs of Leary students and staff in the areas of mental wellness and social-emotional well-being.

1. School Mental Health Services and Programs
   Leary articulated and communicated school mental health services and programs, increasing consistent implementation of these services throughout the district, and making appropriate adjustments where necessary.

2. Awareness and Education
   Leary is committed to increasing awareness and understanding of mental health and wellness. This included helping to decrease stigma associated with mental illness that may impede individuals from seeking assistance or acceptance.

3. Professional Development/Evidence-Based Training
   Leary provided professional development and access to evidence-based training for staff in a range of areas focused on mental health, wellness, and trauma in order to continue to support the social-emotional and wellness needs of our school community.

B. The Improvement Plan

1. School Mental Health Services and Programs
   a. Utilized results from the student, parent, and staff mental health surveys and developed multi-tiered systems of social-emotional support
   b. Provided short-term crisis support services for students experiencing social-emotional, behavioral, or mental health challenges
   c. Expanded our focus on providing social-emotional learning opportunities for all students

2. Awareness and Education
   a. Expanded our focus on social-emotional learning (SEL) and implemented SEL lessons with students in classrooms. Leary SEL leadership team created an SEL/PBIS Google Classroom and Google Site to communicate lessons and provide staff professional development opportunities
   b. Raised awareness on the five social-emotional learning competencies through posters within our school and on the school website
   c. Conducted monthly PBIS assemblies with students that focused on the SEL competencies
   d. Provided information for families on the topics of mental wellness, SEL, and making resources available within the district through Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings and weekly E-News
3. Professional Development/Evidence-Based Training
   a. Continued to provide professional development opportunities both in person and through a newly developed district Google learning platform to Leary staff in the following areas related to mental wellness:
      ● Trauma-informed educational practices
      ● Social-Emotional Learning
      ● Therapeutic Crisis Intervention for Schools (TCIS)
      ● Trauma, Illness, and Grief (TIG)
      ● Restorative Practices
      ● Student and staff mental wellness and self-care strategies

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:
   1. Increased the percentage of positive/satisfied statements on student/family and staff, district or building surveys and used them to create multi-tiered systems of social-emotional support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff-Wellness</td>
<td>How would you rate your own well-being?</td>
<td>27% feel good or occasionally stressed</td>
<td>74% feel good or occasionally stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff- Safety</td>
<td>With Covid-19, how safe do you feel at work?</td>
<td>68% feel overall or very safe</td>
<td>90% feel overall or very safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Wellness</td>
<td>How would you rate your child’s mental wellness/social-emotional well-being as it relates to school (Q4).</td>
<td>69% report their child seems fine or struggling once in a while</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Family-Safety</td>
<td>Please ask your child how they feel about beginning school this fall (Q3).</td>
<td>63% report feeling no concerns/worries or slightly concerned/worried</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Leary continued to expand its implementation of synchronous and asynchronous professional development and student lessons to raise awareness on the topics of mental health, wellness and self-care strategies for students and staff to one time per month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>SEL Overview</td>
<td>Self-Care</td>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>Relationship Skills</td>
<td>Self-Care</td>
<td>Self-Care</td>
<td>Relationship Skills</td>
<td>Self-Care</td>
<td>Self-Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Ready to Learn</td>
<td>Ready to Learn</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>Respectful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection
During this unique school year, Leary supported students, staff, and families by embedding SEL resources into our PBIS and Equity work. Families were not surveyed during the second semester; however, we used informal conversations with students and families and inferred that stress levels decreased as the year progressed. Teachers continued with morning meetings that gauged students’ emotional status and developed independent learning habits. In our Life Skills classrooms, modified PBIS lessons, and social stories were used in the classrooms to support students. At the end of the year, we surveyed staff. That survey data indicated that staff felt less stressed and they felt safe at school. This continued improvement was directly related to professional development focused on self-care, self awareness, a continued emphasis on safety and improved staff wellness.
III. INSTRUCTION

English Language Arts (ELA) / Literacy

A. Areas Of Improvement

English Language Arts (ELA) instruction must continue to be strengthened until Leary students achieve high levels of proficiency on state and local (district) assessments. The reopening of schools for the 2020-21 school year includes the implementation of two new learning models that will require immediate implementation of revised curriculum that identifies the most essential standards, includes effective online resources, and the use of best blended learning instructional methodologies.

Even though the proficiency rates for last year’s New York State ELA assessments are not available for Spring 2020, we recognize that improved ELA proficiency remains a priority, especially with loss of instructional time last school year.

The proficiency rates and county rankings are for all Leary Rush-Henrietta students in- and out-of-district. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as district benchmarks for the upcoming school year. These benchmarks need to be achieved for Leary to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA 3 (CCR)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection

Due to the extended closure of school related to the COVID-19 pandemic, NYS ELA assessments were not administered in Spring 2020. Leary used Winter 2020 NWEA MAPS, Fall 2020 NWEA MAPS, and the district developed literacy assessment/screener results to determine areas of program improvement for the upcoming year. In addition, program improvements have been identified to support the implementation of hybrid and remote learning models in a virtual learning environment. See Appendix A for a comparison of student subgroups from past years.

B. The Improvement Plan

1. Classroom Instruction
   a. Implemented instructional practices and upgraded, new learning experiences that were appropriate for blended learning as prescribed in the revised curriculum maps
   b. Used digital resources to develop and implement student-centered online learning opportunities in ELA instruction
   c. Used district Backward Design for Blended Learning Flowchart and professional resources, R-H Office of Professional Learning Google Site, for planning blended learning units/lessons focused on active engagement and critical thinking skills
   d. Used baseline data to inform gaps in learning due to the extended school closure. Targeted instruction to address literacy needs identified in early literacy screeners
   e. Used Readers Are Writers as a resource for instruction (Grades 2 and 3)
   f. Implemented revised curriculum that was aligned to reading, writing, and content standards (Grade 3)
   g. Assessed the extent to which the district provided a high-quality inclusive setting including the following:
Instruction provided in classrooms included both students with disabilities and general education students.

Students with disabilities were held to the same high expectations for achievement.

Special education and general education teachers provided specially designed instruction that promoted participation and progress in the general education setting.

Evidence-based services and supports were utilized to address the needs of students with disabilities for cognitive, communication, physical, behavioral, and social-emotional development and progress.

2. Learning Assessments
   a. Implemented all required course assessments using district web-based platforms
   b. Implemented early literacy screeners to identify student skill needs
   c. Implemented Heggerty Phonemic Awareness assessment (Grade 1) to students who performed below district expectations on the screener
   d. Administered the 3 minute Rasinski Reading Assessment quarterly

3. Academic Intervention
   a. Identified instructional practices that provided equitable access to learning grade level standards
   b. Provided embedded professional learning for teachers using concepts mastered at the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) training
   c. Continued to provide time for special education and general education teachers to engage in common planning for specially designed instruction and professional development.

4. Progress Monitoring
   a. Conducted unannounced and announced observations and provided feedback regarding the implementation of effective teaching practices for the hybrid and remote learning models
   b. Conducted walk-throughs to monitor the implementation of the literacy programs within the hybrid and remote learning models
   c. Administered NWEA MAPs, analyzed data by subgroup, and refined grade-level action plans
   d. AIS progress monitoring meetings were held in October, February and May, for grades K-3, including classroom teachers, interventionists, English as a Second Language teachers, related service providers, and coaches.
   e. Ensured students who were referred for special education services were provided appropriate pre-referral interventions and individual evaluations. Evidence of the interventions implemented accompanied referrals.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan

1. NWEA Reading Results
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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP K:</td>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>54% (57%) (61%)</td>
<td>44% (NA) (69%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 1:</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>47% (62%) (54%)</td>
<td>38% (59%) (64%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 2:</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>49% (61%) (47%)</td>
<td>49% (58%) (63%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 3:</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>59% (48%) (53%)</td>
<td>54% (56%) (61%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reflection**

Achievement results at grades K-2 in ELA did not demonstrate sufficient growth. However, third grade achievement and growth strands were positive. Based on our analysis of the results, and in conjunction with related assessments, each grade level has identified specific action plans to increase achievement for grades K-3.

**Kindergarten**

The area of strength was writing, which was the weakest area in the winter. With a return to 4-day in-person learning, teachers were able to do much more writing. The most concerning area of weakness was in Foundational Skills. Teachers will need to continue to focus on the automaticity of letter names and sounds. They will also continue to put an emphasis on beginning blending and segmenting of cvc words. Letter formation and basic sentence structure will continue to be the focus of writing instruction.

**First Grade**

The area of relative strength was Vocabulary Acquisition and Use. Literary & Informational Text and Writing and Conventions had similar results. In winter, they were at 42% & 43%. In the Spring, they decreased slightly at 38% & 37%. The area of major concern in the winter was Foundational Skills at 29%. That strand had an increase of 12% and is now at 41%. This was a solid improvement; however, still lower than the district benchmark. As with kindergarten, there was a focus on letter sound automaticity for students that were still struggling in this area. There was also an emphasis on blending and segmenting words with blends and digraphs for all students. For both kindergarten and first grade we will be drawing upon the knowledge learned during the LETRS training this year to start strong next year with a solid and targeted focus on Foundational Skills.

**Second Grade**

Students that took the 2-5 version were high in all skill areas. Students that took the K-2 version showed an 8% improvement in Foundational Skills which was at 20% in the Winter and 28% in the Spring. This still remains the lowest and most concerning strand. The other strands had similar results with not much change (Vocab 35% to 34%, Lit/Info Text 40% to 35%, Writing 37% to 37%). Students continued to have gaps in their phonemic and phonics knowledge which impacted their ability to decode and encode. For second grade, we will continue to share as much of the concepts from the LETRS training as possible in order to strengthen practices around Foundational Skills.

**Third Grade**

Third grade showed growth in all strand areas from the Winter. Language, Craft & Structure increased from 53% to 60%, Vocabulary increased from 47% to 58%, and Key Ideas & Details increased from 54% to 59%. A large emphasis was placed on vocabulary development as well as targeted small group instruction upon return to 4-day in-person instruction.
2. New York State Assessment Results
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 Leary to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA 3 (CCR)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection
This is blank because we are awaiting state assessment data.

Mathematics

A. Areas of Improvement
Mathematics instruction must continue to be strengthened until Leary students achieve high levels of proficiency on state and local (district) assessments.

The reopening of schools for the 2020-21 school year includes the implementation of two new learning models that will require immediate implementation of revised curriculum that identifies the most essential standards, includes effective online resources, and the use of best blended learning instructional methodologies.

Even though the proficiency rates for last year’s New York State math assessments are not available for Spring 2020, we recognize that improved math proficiency remains a priority, especially with loss of instructional time last school year.

The proficiency rates and county rankings are for all Leary students in- and out-of-district. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as district benchmarks for the upcoming year. These benchmarks need to be achieved for Leary to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 3 (CCR)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection
Due to the extended closure of schools related to the COVID-19 pandemic, NYS math assessments were not administered in Spring 2020. Leary used Winter 2020 NWEA MAPS, Fall 2020 NWEA MAPS and the district developed fluency and interim assessment results to determine areas of program improvement for the upcoming year. In addition, program improvements have been identified to support the implementation of hybrid and remote learning models in a virtual learning environment. See Appendix A for a comparison of student subgroups from past years.
B. The Improvement Plan

1. Classroom Instruction
   a. Implemented remediation units to bridge learning gaps that developed as a result of emergency remote learning last spring
   b. Implemented upgraded and new learning experiences that were appropriate for blended learning as prescribed in revised curriculum maps
   c. Implemented instructional practices for administering blended learning as prescribed in the revised curriculum maps
   d. Used district Backward Design for Blended Learning Flowchart and professional resources, unit assessment blueprints defined in the curriculum maps, R-H Office of Professional Learning Google Site, for planning blended learning units/lessons
   e. Used baseline data to inform gaps in learning due to the extended school closure
   f. Implemented Zearn (web-based math program) for blended learning within the classroom and remote environments
   g. Assessed the extent to which the district provides a high-quality inclusive setting including the following:
      ● Instruction provided in classrooms included both students with disabilities and general education students
      ● Students with disabilities were held to the same high expectations for achievement
      ● Special education and general education teachers provided specially designed instruction that promoted participation and progress in the general education setting
      ● Evidence-based services and supports were utilized to address the needs of students with disabilities for cognitive, communication, physical, behavioral, and social-emotional development and progress.

2. Learning Assessments
   a. Implemented all required course assessments using district web-based platforms (eDoctrina and Google Classroom)
   b. Implemented grade-level screeners to help in identifying students for Boot Camp interventions

3. Academic Intervention
   a. Identified instructional practices that provided equitable access to learning grade-level standards
   b. Advanced teacher capacity to diagnose mathematical needs, and provided appropriate interventions
   c. Implemented and monitored targeted intervention groups (Boot Camps) at all grade levels
   d. Utilized web-based programs (IXL) to differentiate and personalize academic intervention (Grades 1-3)
   e. Provided dedicated time for special education and general education teachers to engage in common planning for specially designed instruction and professional development.

4. Progress Monitoring
   a. Conducted unannounced and announced observations and provided feedback regarding the implementation of effective teaching practices for the hybrid and remote learning models
b. Conducted walk-throughs to monitor the implementation of the math programs within the hybrid and remote learning models

c. Administered NWEA MAPs, analyzed data by subgroup, and created grade-level action plans

d. Conducted AIS progress monitoring meetings were held in October, February, and May, for Grades K-3, that included classroom teachers, interventionists, English as a Second Language Teachers, related service providers, and coaches.

e. Ensured students who were referred for special education services were provided appropriate pre-referral intervention and individual evaluations. Evidence of the interventions implemented accompanied referrals.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. Math NWEA Results

   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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP K:</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>49% (50%) (59%)</td>
<td>53% (NA) (57%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 1:</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>40% (59%) (48%)</td>
<td>38% (59%) (52%)</td>
<td>48% (NA) (62%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 2:</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>46% (62%) (59%)</td>
<td>45% (71%) (77%)</td>
<td>41% (NA) (78%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 3:</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>32% (50%) (53%)</td>
<td>55% (63%) (73%)</td>
<td>51% (NA) (73%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   MAP Reflection
   We saw an increase in MAP achievement from winter to spring at kindergarten and first grade. The percentage of kindergarten students meeting benchmark increased from 49% to 53%. The percentage of first graders meeting benchmark increased from 38% to 48%. The percentage of second graders meeting benchmark decreased from 45% to 41%. Although third grade had a 4% decline from winter to spring, they increased 19% from fall to spring.

   Kindergarten
   The grade level targeted Number and Operations after completing their winter data dialogue. This goal area increased from 33% to 54%. This was the biggest goal area growth. Operations & Algebraic Thinking increased from 42% to 58%. This was the strongest goal area in spring. Measurement and Data decreased from 53% to 41%. This was the weakest goal area in spring. These standards were taught in the last unit of the year (Unit 3). It’s normally taught earlier in the year but was moved to the end of the year due to COVID. Geometry decreased from 61% to 53%. These standards were taught in Unit 6 which was omitted this year due to COVID.

   First Grade
   Spring had the most students meeting benchmark. There were 4 out of 5 classes that had an increase in students that met benchmark from winter to spring. Performance in Number and Operations and Algebraic Thinking remained the same. Geometry had the biggest goal area growth from 32% to 49%. This goal area was the strongest in spring. Students just finished this unit when they took the MAP assessment. Measurement & Data had a slight increase from 26% to 27% and remained the weakest goal area.

   Second Grade
   There were 10 students who took the Math 2-3 assessment. Of these students, 9 met benchmarks. Performance in Operations & Algebraic Thinking and Number and Operations decreased. Measurement & Data increased from 31% to 50%. It was the strongest goal
area in Spring. Students had just completed this unit before they took the MAP assessment. Geometry increased from 21% to 28%. Although there was an increase, it remained the weakest goal area. This unit was taught at the end of the year (Unit 8).

**Third Grade**
In the third grade, 5 out of 6 classes had an increase in students who met the benchmark from Fall to Spring. The grade level targeted Operations and Algebraic Thinking after completing their winter data dialogue. This goal area increased from 38% to 56%. This was the largest goal area growth for spring. Teachers spent more time on instruction and practice using RDW to solve word problems. Measurement & Data had a slight increase from 41% to 42%. Students were in this unit during MAP testing. Geometry decreased from 53% to 41%. This unit was taught at the end of the year (Unit 7). Number and Operations decreased from 63% to 45%. This goal area was expected to increase because the fractions unit was taught right before MAP testing. Lower performance in this area indicates a need for grade-level PD in fractions.

Classroom teachers continued to work with the Math Coach to use Math Screeners and Fluency Assessments to identify students and provide small group, targeted intervention via Boot Camps. Zearn lessons were identified and used with individuals, small groups, and/or with the whole class to provide additional instruction in areas of need. These areas of need were identified through unit assessments, interim learning tasks, and MAP.

1. **New York State Assessment Results**
   Proficiency rates for this year’s New York State Math assessments will be reported below. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates appear as benchmarks. These benchmarks need to be achieved for Leary to rank among the top-half of Monroe County public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 3 (CCR)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Three-Year Trend (3% change over three year period)  
* Benchmarks have been adjusted to reflect Monroe County achievement on spring 2018 assessments, including “opt outs.”  
* Target: 1-8

**Information and Communication Technology (ICT)**

**A. Areas of Improvement**
Information and Communication Technology (ICT) instruction was expanded to ensure Leary students effectively used technological tools within a variety of instructional models (traditional, hybrid, remote learning) - and understood the principles of their application - for creating, collaborating, communicating, and applying critical thinking skills.

Even though the proficiency rates for last year's capstone assessments were not available for Spring 2020, we recognized that improved ICT proficiency remained a priority so that teachers adjusted instruction and included new strategies for digital learning.

Prior year proficiency rates for capstones that were administered are listed in parentheses. Expected passing rates appear as district benchmarks for the upcoming school year (percent of students scoring a 3 or higher on the capstone project using the ICT district rubric). These benchmarks need to be achieved for improved student application of digital literacy for virtual learning environments.
**Reflection**

Due to the extended closure of school related to the COVID-19 pandemic, only components of the capstone project were completed. Therefore, a final score based on the district capstone rubric was not completed by spring 2020. The district used teacher and parent survey results from June 2020 and student performance information from completed assured learning experiences to determine areas of program improvement for the upcoming year. In addition, program improvements have been identified to support the implementation of hybrid and remote learning models in a virtual learning environment.

**Teacher Capacity for Technology Use (Self-Reported)**

Percentage of teacher responses were reported below. Prior year proficiency rates are listed below. The target percentage of teacher capacity of being at an integration or leadership level of proficiency is 85%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Integration or Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reviewing the self-assessment, while the switch to Remote Learning allowed most teachers to use technology in new and innovative ways, it demonstrated how much more there is to learn to effectively weave technology throughout curriculum, instruction, and assessments. The proficiency rate reflects that realization and the implementation dip one would expect from a complete revamping of our instructional delivery model. Anecdotally, teachers expressed immense pride in what they had learned and accomplished during this unprecedented time.

**B. The Improvement Plan**

1. **Classroom Instruction**
   a. Provided training on blended learning models incorporating the use of synchronous and asynchronous instructional methodologies
   b. Using the district Backward Design for Blended Learning Flowchart and professional resources, R-H Office of Professional Learning Google Site, for planning blended learning units/lessons
   c. Implemented units based on the blended learning models for classroom and remote learning environments. Implemented blended learning instructional strategies and the ICT instructional shifts to enhance instruction to deepen the way students obtain knowledge, process information, and communicate their understandings.
   d. ICT coaches and LMS provided professional development and embedded coaching cycles to support teachers in the planning and implementation of blended learning and the ICT instructional shifts.
2. Learning Assessments
   Implemented required online assessments for students to further develop their testing skills in a digital environment
   a. All required course assessments will be administered online, remotely
   b. Used revised caption rubrics (grade 3)

3. Academic Intervention
   a. Provided assistance and support for students having difficulty with foundation ICT skills and application of ISTE standards
   b. Identified a variety of technology tools, features and tech supports that will aid students in need of interventions
   c. Improved the use of technology to address the needs of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners (ELLs), and economically disadvantaged students to ensure equitable and on-demand access to instructional materials and assessments to meet the individualized needs of students

4. Progress Monitoring
   a. Reviewed student keyboarding and capstone results to identify students in need of intervention
   b. Administered and analyzed student, parent and staff instructional technology surveys for program improvement

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan

1. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (90%) (87%)</td>
<td>78% (89%) (89%)</td>
<td>87% (NA) (91%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (92%) (94%)</td>
<td>88% (88%) (94%)</td>
<td>90% (NA) (90%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (10) (7)</td>
<td>10 (10) (6)</td>
<td>13 NA (10)</td>
<td>11 wpm</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (12) (14)</td>
<td>16 (15) (14)</td>
<td>19 NA (18)</td>
<td>17 wpm</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection
Overall, students performed well with keyboarding assessments. Students met and exceeded expectations with regards to accuracy and words per minute. We will continue to provide students with typing resources to build these skills.
2. Teacher Capacity for Technology Use (Self-Reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Integration or Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leary</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection

More teachers reported being at the integration and leadership levels. This increase is directly related to the embedded professional development focused on technology provided by our Library Media Specialist (LMS) and the increased expectation of technology use over the past year.

3. ISTE Proficiency (Capstone Project)

Proficiency rates for capstone assessments are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates, for capstones that were administered, are listed in parentheses. Expected passing rates appear as benchmarks (percent of students scoring a 3 or higher on the capstone project using the ICT district rubric).

Primary Capstone (Grade 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(93%)</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection

Our third grade students completed their capstone projects this year and developed independent research skills and presentation skills. The teachers assessed the student capstone projects using the ICT district rubric. Our third grade capstone results met the set proficiency standard.
Appendix A—New York State Assessment Student Subgroup Data

**ELA**
Proficiency rates for this year’s New York State ELA assessments were reported below for each major cohort. Last year’s results are in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYS ELA 3</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>SWD</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>(NA) (69%)</td>
<td>(NA) (33%)</td>
<td>(NA) (20%)</td>
<td>(NA) (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficiency rates for this year’s New York State ELA assessments were reported below for each ethnicity cohort. Last year’s results in parenthesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYS ELA 3</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>(NA) (42%)</td>
<td>(NA) (67%)</td>
<td>(NA) (29%)</td>
<td>(NA) (78%)</td>
<td>NA (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Math**
Proficiency rates for this year’s New York State Math assessments were reported below for each major cohort. Last year’s results are in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYS Math 3</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>SWD</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>(NA) (84%)</td>
<td>(NA) (67%)</td>
<td>(NA) (20%)</td>
<td>(NA) (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficiency rates for this year’s New York State Math assessments were reported below for each ethnicity cohort. Last year’s results are in parenthesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYS Math 3</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multiple Races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>(NA) (79%)</td>
<td>(NA) (67%)</td>
<td>(NA) (80%)</td>
<td>(NA) (89%)</td>
<td>(NA) (91%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B - NWEA MAP Growth Subgroup Data: Reading

#### Grade Level Reading Data - Achievement:
Proficiency rates for NWEA Reading MAP assessments for major cohorts will be reported below (fall/winter/spring) with the number of students indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grade Level Reading Data - Growth:
Growth rates for NWEA Math MAP assessments are reported below (fall/winter/spring) with the number of students indicated. Fall Growth is measured from last Fall 2019. Winter Growth is measured from Fall 2020. Spring Growth is measured from Winter 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Spr</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grade Level Reading Data - Growth:
Proficiency rates for NWEA Reading MAP assessments for major cohorts will be reported below (fall/winter/spring) with the number of students indicated.
# Appendix C - NWEA MAP Growth Subgroup Data: Math

## Grade Level Math Data - Achievement
Proficiency rates for NWEA Math MAP assessments for major cohorts will be reported below (fall/winter/spring) with the number of students indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>SWD</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Grade Level Math Data - Growth
Growth rates for NWEA Math MAP assessments are reported below (fall/winter/spring) with the number of students indicated. Fall Growth is measured from last Fall 2019. Winter Growth is measured from Fall 2020. Spring Growth is measured from Winter 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>SWD</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black or African Am.</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>