

**Fyle Elementary School Improvement Plan
Beginning of the Year Report
2021-2022**



- I. Equity and Inclusion**
- II. Mental Wellness**
- III. Instruction**
 - **English Language Arts (ELA) / Literacy**
 - **Mathematics**
 - **Information and Communication Technology (ICT)**
- IV. Special Education**

I. EQUITY AND INCLUSION

The Rush-Henrietta Central School District and Fyle stand united against racism and discrimination. Recognizing the many kinds of diversity that exist within our school community, we are committed to strengthening the connection among culture, teaching, learning, achievement, and transformation. We must strive to ensure that our programs, curriculum, and learning environments are culturally responsive and equitable.

A. Areas of Improvement:

1. Equity in Systems and Practice

Continuing to examine district systems, policies, and practices to advance equity and strive to reflect the diverse backgrounds and lived experiences of our students, families, and colleagues will be paramount. We will assess the extent to which the district provides equity of opportunity, access, and support, and establish measures and outcomes that will indicate success.

2. Inclusive Excellence

Advancing inclusion throughout the district will continue, including examining and implementing ways to help ensure that all students, families, and staff are fully included. We must measure the degree to which we promote an inclusive, supportive learning environment where all students and staff feel accepted, where students see their cultures and experiences represented throughout the district's instructional practices, curriculum and programs, and where all students have access to experiences that fully challenge their potential.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Equity in Systems and Practices

- a. Continue to serve as the principal representative on the District Equity and Inclusion Steering Committee.
- b. Implement and monitor restorative practices, including continuing to expand the use of community-building circles within classrooms and among staff members.
- c. Support the implementation of practices outlined in the revised Code of Conduct, ensuring equitable practices in responding to student behaviors, and the use of restorative discipline.

2. Inclusive Excellence

- a. Participate in data analysis focused on gaps in student performance (especially subgroups such as students with disabilities, English language learners, and students of color), attendance, behavior referrals, and suspension rates/practices, to identify potential biases and to develop strategies to ensure that all students have the opportunities and necessary supports to succeed.
- b. Utilize multiple modalities to allow students to demonstrate proficiency of standards.
- c. Develop and facilitate professional development for Fyle focusing on advancement along the cultural competence continuum, and the alignment among equity, social-emotional learning, mental wellness, and restorative practices. All staff will participate in a shared professional development experience utilizing the book, "Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain." Staff will take a pre- and post-survey to measure their own learning.
- d. Continue to offer opportunities for community conversations about issues related to equity and inclusion (School Improvement Team and Parent Group Meetings).

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

- 1. Equity in Systems and Practice:** Increase percentage of our SEL Team reporting alignment of restorative practices with responses to student conduct from a score of 1 to a score of 2 on the Social Emotional Learning Team Rubric.

Beginning of the Year	Middle of the Year	End of the Year
1		

Reflection:

- 2. Inclusive Excellence:** Increase percentage of student growth for English Language Learners on NWEA MAPS Reading across all grade levels. See appendix B for results.

Reflection:

II. MENTAL WELLNESS

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

A. Areas of Improvement:

Mental health surveys conducted for two consecutive years in Rush-Henrietta highlight the importance of continuing to provide a comprehensive mental wellness program. Students, parents, and staff have provided a wealth of information regarding wellness initiatives that are beneficial to them and additional supports for consideration. Survey results speak to the importance and desire of R-H school staff and the broader community to continue to learn about a range of topics to support student and adult mental wellness and social-emotional well-being. Based on this information, the following four areas continue to be essential components of our comprehensive mental wellness program:

1. School Mental Health Services and Programs

Articulating and communicating school mental health services and programs, increasing consistent implementation of these services throughout the district, and making appropriate adjustments where necessary is critical to effective implementation of our district-wide program.

2. Awareness and Education

Continuing to commit to increasing awareness and understanding of mental health and wellness is imperative. This will include continuing to decrease the stigma associated with mental illness that may impede individuals from seeking assistance or acceptance and providing a range of workshops, assemblies, and social-emotional programs and lessons.

3. Community Supports and Programs

Expanding the use of community resources to meet the ongoing needs of our students and families will be a primary focus area. This includes collaborating with community agencies to support students who need additional support or long-term mental health services.

4. Professional Development/Evidence-Based Training

Providing professional development and access to evidence-based training for staff in a range of areas focused on mental health, wellness, and trauma will continue to be strengthened. These professional development opportunities will be focused on continuing to support the range of social-emotional and wellness needs of our school district community.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. School Mental Health Services and Programs

- a. Implement the K-3 comprehensive counseling plan across all schools adding direct counseling support at the K-3 levels through virtual student lessons.
- b. Utilize results from the second year administration of student, parent, and staff mental health surveys to develop a range of social-emotional supports and targeted interventions at each school building.
- c. Establish a process to enhance the alignment of social-emotional learning (SEL), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and Restorative Practices, ensuring coordinated efforts of teams engaging in these initiatives.
- d. Continue to provide short-term crisis support services for students experiencing social-emotional, behavioral, or mental health challenges.
- e. Monitor and support the expansion of the use of community-building circles and other restorative practices strategies for group counseling, social-emotional learning, and fostering connections within multiple settings.

2. Awareness and Education

- a. Continue to expand the use of social media and virtual platforms to engage families in raising awareness about mental health and wellness among their adolescent peers.

3. Community Supports and Programs

- a. Work with the University of Rochester Medical Center (URMC) to expand mental health consultation services.

4. Professional Development/Evidence-Based Training

- a. Provide professional development opportunities in-person, virtually, and through a district Google learning platform to a range of stakeholders in the following areas related to mental wellness:
 - i. Trauma-informed educational practices
 - ii. Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and the alignment with equity-focused strategies
 - iii. Therapeutic Crisis Intervention for Schools (TCIS)
 - iv. Trauma, Illness, and Grief (TIG)
 - v. Restorative Practices
 - vi. Student and staff mental wellness and self-care strategies

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. Increase the percentage of our SEL Team reporting awareness of strategies and resources available to support the development of SEL competencies, PBIS Traits, and Restorative Practices from a score of 1 to a score of 2 on the SEL Team Rubric.

Beginning of the Year	Middle of the Year	End of the Year
1		

Reflection:

2. Increase the percentage of students reporting being really excited about school from 61% to 80% on the R-H Parent Mental Health Survey in August 2022.

August 2021	August 2022
61%	

Reflection:

III. INSTRUCTION

Academic Program

A. Area of Improvement:

English Language Arts (ELA) and Math (grades 3-8)

ELA and math instruction must be strengthened until Fyle students achieve high levels of proficiency on state and local (district) assessments.

Proficiency rates for New York State assessments are reported below by year. The number and percentage of student assessment participation appear in parentheses. Expected passing rates appear as district benchmarks. Benchmarks are set to rank district performance among the top-half of Monroe County schools. The 2021 ELA and math state assessments were abbreviated and student participation was optional. For district cohort and ethnicity group proficiency rates, refer to Appendix A.

	2021	2019	2018	Benchmark ¹	Gap ²	Trend ³
ELA 3 (CCR)	60%	53%	63%	65%	-5	+

	2021	2019	2018	Benchmark ¹	Gap ²	Trend ³
Math 3 (CCR)	71%	76%	75%	75%	-4	-

¹Benchmarks are adjusted to reflect Monroe County achievement on spring 2019 assessments

²Gap is the difference between proficiency rate and the benchmark

³Three-Year Trend is positive or negative if there is a 3% change over the three year period

⁴County ranking target is 1-8 to rank among the top half of the Monroe County public schools

ELA (grade 3-8) Reflection:

The NYS 3-8 ELA assessment results indicate that, for the students who did participate in the assessment, student proficiency rates increased from the 2019 assessment (see trend data). We were slightly below the benchmark. **Our ELL and economically disadvantaged cohorts will be closely monitored and diagnostic assessments will be used for targeted academic intervention services.**

Math (grade 3-8) Reflection:

The NYS 3-8 math assessment results indicate that, for the students who did participate in the assessment, student proficiency rates showed a decrease from the 2019 assessment and the grade-level benchmark was not met. Similar to ELA, our ELL and economically disadvantaged cohorts will be closely monitored. Intensive interventions will be provided to students based on state and district assessments. Classroom instruction will be monitored to ensure math standards are being taught as prescribed in the district curriculum as well as best instructional practices.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Classroom Instruction

- a. Use phonetically regular text to reinforce spelling patterns (ELA K and 1).
- b. Include more rigorous texts in lessons through all genres (ELA K-3).
- c. Revisit the purpose and format of the reading workshop to ensure every student is working in small, targeted groups with a teacher.
- d. Promote and monitor engagement strategies occurring within ELA and math instruction through walk-throughs. Develop common engagement look-fors with staff input.
- e. Implement the components of a Eureka lesson with fidelity including fluency, application problem, concept development, student debrief, and exit ticket.

- f. Introduce the Rotational Model as a way to differentiate learning and provide AIS within the math block.

2. Learning Assessments

- a. Administer the Computer-Based Testing (CBT) NYS math assessment spring 2022 (Math 3).
- b. Advance the use of fact fluency screeners to develop students’ mathematical numeracy and flexibility of thinking (Math 1-3).
- c. Align assessment items to new New York State Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) (Math 3).
- d. Transition unit and interim assessments to online modality for administration (Math K-3).

3. Academic Intervention

- a. Implement High Impact Tutoring model (ELA K-3).
- b. Use consistent research-based practices for interventions that are vertically aligned (ELA K-3).
- c. Improve math intervention practices for computational fluency (Math 2-3).

4. Progress Monitoring

- a. Expand use of the aimswebPlus platform to screen and progress-monitor student reading needs (ELA K-3).
- b. Create action plans and closely monitor student growth between NWEA range levels using a digital data board.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (ELA / Math)

Proficiency rates for NWEA MAP assessments for the 2021-22 school year are reported below. Prior year proficiency rates (2019-2021) appear in parentheses. Expected proficiency rates appear as benchmarks (percent of students scoring at or above the 61%** percentile). For district cohort and ethnicity group proficiency rates, refer to Appendix C.

Reading	Fall	Winter	Spring	Benchmark	Gap	Trend*
MAP K:	Not Given	(59%) (60%)	(57%)(NA)	65%	NA	NA
MAP 1:	45% (48%) (55%)	(36%) (53%)	(39%) (NA)	65%	-17%	NA
MAP 2:	36% (35%) (49%)	(37%) (54%)	(45%) (NA)	65%	-29%	NA
MAP 3:	43% (47%)(55%)	(46%) (47%)	(43%) (NA)	65%	-17%	NA

Math	Fall	Winter	Spring	Benchmark	Gap	Trend*
MAP K:	Not Given	(63%) (52%)	(63%) (NA))	65%	NA	NA
MAP 1:	46% (31%) (56%)	(24%) (52%)	(50%) (NA)	65%	-9%	NA
MAP 2:	42% (46%) (72%)	(46%) (65%)	(55%) (NA)	65%	-13%	NA
MAP 3:	34% (33%) (51%)	(45%) (61%)	(44%) (NA)	65%	-31%	NA

*2% or greater change from fall administration

**61% places a student above the national norm average which aligns with the required level of proficiency on NYS assessments

NG not given

ELA (K-3) NWEA MAP Reflection:

Students in grades 1 and 3 are performing similarly to last year on a grade-to-grade cohort comparison. Our students in grades 2 and 3 were within 3% when compared to their spring results, while students in grade 1 declined from the spring. Students in grade 2, especially those taking the K-2 assessment, are performing below expectations. The teachers at grade 2 will be working closely with the Literacy Coach to plan and monitor progress. A major instructional focus will be on decoding texts. Additionally, our ELLs are not showing the level of growth we believe they are capable of. Grade 2 students taking the K-2 assessment

and our English Language Learners (ELL) and Students With Special Needs (SWSN) are our primary focus for significant intervention. We will work to develop student understanding of literary and informational text and writing, and conventions of academic English. We will work to accelerate their growth by using word recognition strategies to ensure students are comprehending text within daily targeted small groups and be able to show evidence of comprehension in their writing. In addition, we will use the new integrated curriculum maps to provide students with instructional experiences to apply reading and strategies. Grade levels will create action steps with specific strategies to ensure all students are making growth. This progress will be monitored by a [digital data board](#) throughout the school year.

Math (K-3) NWEA MAP Reflection:

Students in grade 1 exceeded last year’s student performance when compared to last year's grade level. Grade 2 students have remained consistent with last year’s grade 2 cohort, but showed a slight decline from spring administration. Students in grade 3 are performing below expectations. Students declined when compared to their own performance in the spring. Additionally, our ELLs are not showing the level of growth we believe they are capable of. Grade 3 students and our English Language Learners (ELL) and Students With Special Needs (SWSN) are our primary focus for significant intervention. We will work to accelerate their growth through the implementation of a targeted math intervention focusing on numbers and operations. We will use critical math components to customize and tailor instructional experiences to match individual goals. Additionally, we will provide professional development and coaching to teachers on ways to differentiate learning through the rotational model. Grade levels will create action steps with specific strategies to ensure all students are making growth. This progress will be monitored by a [digital data board](#) throughout the school year.

2. New York State ELA and Math Assessments (grade 3)

Proficiency rates for New York State assessments are reported below by year. Expected passing and college and career rates appear as district benchmarks. Benchmarks are set to rank district performance among the top-half of Monroe County Schools and based on the district's previous year’s passing rates. District cohort and ethnicity group proficiency rates are provided in the Appendix A.

	2022	2021	2019	2018	Benchmark ¹	Gap ²	Trend ³
ELA 3 (CCR)		60%	53%	63%	65%	-5	+

	2022	2021	2019	2018	Benchmark	Gap	*Trend
Math 3 (CCR)		71%	76%%	75%	75%	-4	-

¹Benchmarks are adjusted to reflect Monroe County achievement on spring 2019 assessments
²Gap is the difference between proficiency rate and the benchmark
³Three-Year Trend is positive or negative if there is a 3% change over the three year period
 *County ranking target is 1-8 to rank among the top half of the Monroe County public schools

ELA (grade 3-8) Reflection:

Will include an analysis of the 2022 NYS 3-8 ELA assessment results.

Math (grade 3-8) Reflection:

Will include an analysis of the 2022 NYS 3-8 math assessment results.

Information and Communication Technology

A. Area of Improvement:

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) instruction is being expanded to ensure that Rush-Henrietta students can effectively use technological tools within a variety of instructional models and understand the principles of their application - for creating, collaborating, communicating, and applying critical thinking skills.

Proficiency rates for capstone assessments are reported below. Expected passing rates appear as benchmarks (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. It should be noted that capstone rubrics received revisions/edits, therefore there may be some slight variation in scoring from year to year.

	2021	2019	2018	Benchmark ¹	Gap ²	Trend ³
Grade 3 Capstone	80%	87%	81%	80%	0	-

¹Benchmarks are based on research from peer-reviewed academic journals

²Gap is the difference between proficiency rate and the benchmark

³Three-Year Trend is positive or negative if there is a 3% change over the three year period

Reflection:

Through the Primary Capstone, students showed evidence they are learning how to integrate and synthesize ISTE standards and are able to communicate information learned by creating a presentation using a digital tool of their choice. While the benchmark proficiency rate decreased slightly from two years ago from 87% to 80%, students continue to grow both in school and at home with technology use. This year, Fyle students need to work on developing ideas, which was the lowest category at 58%, well below the district average of 73%.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Classroom Instruction

- a. Increase the use of blended learning practices and the ICT instructional shifts in unit development.
- b. Include ICT skills in lessons and students' work.
- c. Provide learning opportunities to strengthen students' ability to obtain knowledge, process information, and communicate their understandings with an **emphasis on developing ideas**.
- d. Include ICT skills in lessons.
- e. Implement the Remote Learning Academy plan/program, as needed.

2. Learning Assessments

- a. Redesign identified common assessments in curriculum maps to incorporate ICT skills and increase authenticity.

3. Academic Intervention

- a. Use assessment results to identify students who need additional development of ICT skills.

4. Professional Development

- a. Build staff capacity in the New York State Computer Science and Digital Fluency Learning Standards.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

ISTE Proficiency (Capstone Project)

Proficiency rates for capstone assessments are reported below. Expected passing rates appear as benchmarks (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. It should be noted that capstone rubrics received revisions/edits, therefore there may be some slight variation in scoring from year to year.

	2022	2021	2019	2018	Benchmark ¹	Gap ²	Trend ³
Grade 3 Capstone		80%	87%	81%	80%		

¹Benchmarks are based on research from peer-reviewed academic journals

²Gap is the difference between proficiency rate and the benchmark

³Three-Year Trend is positive or negative if there is a 3% change over the three year period

Reflection:

End of year reflection

IV. SPECIAL EDUCATION

Many Fyle students with special needs (SWSN) are not achieving high levels of proficiency on state and local (district) assessments and more students need to graduate within four years. To improve academic outcomes, instructional practices are being strengthened and the continuum of special education services are being expanded and refined to better meet the needs of students with disabilities.

A. The Problem:

English Language Arts (Literacy)

Proficiency rates for last year's New York state ELA and Math assessments for students with disabilities are reported below.

NYS ELA

Proficiency rates for 2021 NYS ELA assessments are below by cohort. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	All	GE	Special Education
Grade 3	60% (58)	60% (57)	100% (1)

NYS Math

Proficiency rates for 2021 NYS Math assessments are below by cohort. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	All	GE	Special Education
Grade 3	71% (58)	72% (57)	0% (1)

Reflections:

In ELA and Math, the Students with Special Needs (SWSN) cohort continues to have low achievement and growth results. Proactive collaboration between classroom teacher, consultant teacher, and service providers will continue to be a focus, and efforts to strengthen will be emphasized. We will also be exploring ways to target instruction on Individualized Education Plans (IEP) and grade level goals and skills.

B. The Improvement Plan:

1. Classroom Instruction

- a. Special and general education teachers will collaboratively develop lessons that provide instructional materials that are specially designed to meet student needs.
- b. Special and general education teachers will collaboratively assess students' understanding of lessons to improve and target instruction to their needs.
- c. Special and general education teachers will use electronic devices to accommodate various learning styles, enhancing understanding of the curriculum and increasing student engagement, when appropriate.
- d. Provide professional learning opportunities regarding the following:
 - i. Establishing a co-teaching partnership
 - ii. Models of co-teaching
 - iii. Specially-designed instruction

2. Progress Monitoring

- a. Special and general education teachers will collaboratively use student data to inform and design instruction for students to make progress toward grade-level standards.
- b. Special and general education teachers will implement student IEPs consistently, and routinely review them to ensure students are meeting their annual goals.
- c. Ensure students of racial-ethnic groups receive appropriate evaluations.
- d. Ensure there are equitable opportunities for students to receive supportive interventions that enable them to be successful in the general education environment.
- e. Use behavioral intervention tools to efficiently assess student behavior and make appropriate recommendations.
- f. Continue to collaborate with building administrators to provide time for special education and general education teachers to engage in common planning for specially-designed instruction and professional development.
- g. Continue to build our multidisciplinary team (Response to Intervention) to ensure:
 - i. Students who are being referred for special education services were provided appropriate pre-referral interventions, and that evidence and data of the interventions implemented is included with the referral
 - ii. Students with special needs have access to high-quality interventions through the Instructional Support Team process

3. Behavioral Intervention

- a. Work with the Mental Health Team Members and the District Behavior specialist to develop and implement Functional Behavioral Assessments, Individual Crisis Management plans (ICMP), and Behavioral Intervention plans for students.
- b. Provide therapeutic crisis intervention training to appropriate staff.
- c. Collect data to continually monitor student progress toward achieving behavior goals and make adjustments when necessary.
- d. Collaborate with outside agencies to provide targeted intervention for improvement for students with special needs identified as chronically absent.
- e. Continue to monitor suspension rates for students with special needs in monthly meetings to identify potential disproportionalities (gender, race/ethnicity, classification).
- f. Investigate in-district options/programs for students who require social-emotional support combined with academic modifications to the curriculum.
- g. Implement multi-tiered interventions for all students with and without special needs.

C. Impact of the Improvement Plan:

1. NWEA ELA & Math Assessment Results

Proficiency and growth rates for this year’s NWEA Map ELA and Math ELA assessments for students with special needs are reported in Appendix B. Our goal is to increase growth and achievement rates for students with disabilities throughout the school year.

Reflection:

2. NYS ELA & Math Assessments Results

Proficiency rates for this year’s New York state ELA assessments for students with special needs will be reported below. Expected passing and college/career readiness rates for students with disabilities appear as benchmarks. The district’s expected benchmark rates appear in parentheses.

NYS ELA

Proficiency rates for 2022, 2021 NYS ELA assessments are below. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	Special Education	Benchmark	Gap	Trend
Grade 3	(100%, n=1)	100%		

NYS Math

Proficiency rates for 2022, 2021 NYS Math assessments are below by cohort. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	Special Education	Benchmark	Gap	Trend
Grade 3	(0%, n=1)	15%		

Reflection:

APPENDIX A

New York State (NYS) Assessments for ELA (grade 3)

NYS ELA

Proficiency rates for 2022, 2021 NYS ELA assessments are below by cohort. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	All	GE	Special Education	ELL	Economically Disadvantaged
Grade 3	60% (58)	60% (57)	100% (1)	38% (8)	45% (29)

NYS ELA

Proficiency rates for 2022, 2021 NYS ELA assessments are below by ethnicity. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
Grade 3	50% (12)	67% (6)	50% (8)	71% (7)	64% (25)

New York State (NYS) Assessments for Math (grade 3)

NYS Math

Proficiency rates for 2022, 2021 NYS Math assessments are below by cohort. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	All	GE	Special Education	ELL	Economically Disadvantaged
Grade 3	71% (58%)	72% (57)	0% (1)	50% (8)	53% (30)

NYS Math

Proficiency rates for 2022, 2021 NYS Math assessments are below by ethnicity. Number of students in parentheses.

Grade	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
Grade 3	75% (12)	50% (6)	63% (8)	50% (8)	83% (24)

APPENDIX B - NWEA MAP Data

ELA

Proficiency rates for the NWEA MAP ELA assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by cohort.
Number of students in parentheses.

MAP ELA 2022	All	GE	Special Education	ELL	Economically Disadvantaged
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	45% (110)	48% (96)	15% (13)	0% (12)	38% (48)
Grade 2 (K-2)	26% (81)	29% (73)	0% (6)	11% (18)	26% (38)
Grade 2 (2-5)	93% (14)	100% (13)	0% (1)	100% (1)	100% (4)
Grade 3	43% (96)	46% (89)	0% (6)	33% (9)	30% (47)

ELA

Proficiency rates for the NWEA MAP ELA assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by ethnicity.
Number of students in parentheses.

MAP ELA 2022	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	40% (25)	38% (21)	21% (14)	56% (9)	55% (40)
Grade 2 (K-2)	35% (20)	29% (14)	8% (13)	40% (10)	22% (23)
Grade 2 (2-5)	100% (3)	null	100% (1)	100% (2)	88% (8)
Grade 3	56% (18)	24% (17)	25% (8)	40% (10)	49% (43)

ELA

Growth rates for the NWEA MAP ELA assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by cohort.
Number of students in parentheses in proficiency table.

MAP ELA 2022	All	GE	Special Education	ELL	Economically Disadvantaged
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	null	null	null	null	null
Grade 2 (K-2)	40%	43%	17%	57%	46%
Grade 2 (2-5)	57%	62%	0%	100%	75%
Grade 3	45%	46%	17%	38%	33%

ELA

Growth rates for the NWEA MAP ELA assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by ethnicity.
Number of students in parentheses in proficiency table.

MAP ELA 2022	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	null	null	null	null	null
Grade 2 (K-2)	53%	40%	20%	38%	41%
Grade 2 (2-5)	33%	null	0%	150%	75%
Grade 3	44%	31%	60%	40%	50%

Math

Proficiency rates for the NWEA MAP Math assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by cohort.
Number of students in parentheses.

MAP Math 2022	All	GE	Special Education	ELL	Economically Disadvantaged
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	46% (109)	50% (96)	17% (12)	8% (12)	35% (48)
Grade 2 (K-2)	36% (87)	39% (77)	13% (8)	17% (18)	33% (42)
Grade 2 (2-5)	100% (10)	100% (10)	null	100% (1)	100% (2)
Grade 3	34% (95)	35% (89)	0% (5)	22% (9)	17% (46)

Math

Proficiency rates for the NWEA MAP Math assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by ethnicity.
Number of students in parentheses.

MAP Math 2022	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	33% (24)	29% (21)	43% (14)	67% (9)	60% (40)
Grade 2 (K-2)	38% (21)	29% (14)	27% (15)	42% (12)	42% (24)
Grade 2 (2-5)	100% (2)	null	100% (1)	null	100% (7)
Grade 3	50% (18)	12% (17)	0% (8)	30% (10)	43% (42)

Math

Growth rates for the NWEA MAP Math assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by cohort.
Number of students in parentheses in proficiency table.

MAP Math 2022	All	GE	Special Education	ELL	Economically Disadvantaged
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	null	null	null	null	null
Grade 2 (K-2)	61%	62%	50%	93%	60%
Grade 2 (2-5)	40%	40%	null	0%	50%
Grade 3	34%	42%	0%	25%	41%

Math

Growth rates for the NWEA MAP Math assessments (Fall/Winter/Spring) are below by ethnicity.
Number of students in parentheses in proficiency table.

MAP Math 2022	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
Grade K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 1	null	null	null	null	null
Grade 2 (K-2)	67%	60%	60%	50%	63%
Grade 2 (2-5)	0%	null	100%	null	43%
Grade 3	38%	25%	20%	70%	43%