

Vermont School Continuous Improvement Plan Template

LEA Approving the Plan: Rutland City Public Schools

School Name: Rutland High School

ESEA and State [Designations](#) (check all that apply):

- ☒ Title 1 Schoolwide Program
☐ Comprehensive Support and Improvement
☐ Targeted or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (Equity 2 or 3)

School Continuous Improvement Plan Point of Contact Name: Gregory Schillinger

School Continuous Improvement Plan Point of Contact Email: greg.schillinger@rcpsvt.org

Assurances

- ☒ A Comprehensive Needs Assessment, including comprehensive data analyses (with student learning, demographic, school process, and perceptions data) and causal analyses has been completed at the school level and the results have informed the goals and change ideas included in this School Continuous Improvement Plan. Resources such as the [Comprehensive Needs Assessment Toolkit](#), and the [Data Profiles: Protocol for Analysis](#) document may assist you in defining your current assets and challenges.
- ☒ A [data inventory](#) demonstrating the results of the CNA has been completed and has been uploaded with submission of this CIP. This data inventory must include student proficiency levels for literacy and indicate universal screening instruments used in local assessment systems ([per Act 139](#)).



the

- ☒ This plan will be made available to the school community via the school website and in print form (if requested). If a language translation or other accommodation is required, please contact [Please type here]. _____
- ☒ This plan was/will be approved by the school board.
- ☒ This plan was approved by the LEA Superintendent or designee.
- ☐ If your LEA is currently undergoing a formal Resource Allocation Review (RAR) with the AOE, please ensure that LEA leadership attaches/uploads a copy of the LEA's RAR improvement goals and strategies.
- ☐ This plan is developed in coordination with other Federal, State and local services, resources and programs such as _____
- ☒ This plan is in effect for the 2025-26 school year
- ☒ This plan will be monitored quarterly and as needed by the school and will be updated by the school quarterly and as needed to ensure that the plan is based on student needs and is providing equitable access for all students to meet the challenging State academic standards. The AOE may request documentation of these monitoring practices at any time.

Section 1: Collaborative Stakeholder Input - All Schools complete this section

Collaborative Stakeholders Represented: Greg Schillinger, principal; Jennifer Wigmore, community member and associate principal, Brett Lertola, community member and associate principal; Tiffini Marano, community member and associate principal; Heather Finch, community member and teacher; Elizabeth Sampson, community member and teacher; Casey Giordano, community member and parent; Michael Callahan, community member and teacher; Katie Cacace, teacher and Grove Street director; Jen Pros, community member and school counselor; Alison Remy, community member and teacher; Carol Baker, community member and teacher; Patricia Aigner, community member and director of technology; Bryan Cupoli, community member and teacher

Section 2: Goals, Measures of Improvement, and Evidence-based Change Ideas

All schools complete this section.

Goal Number	School Prioritized Goals (include academic and safe, healthy school goals for all students AND targeted sub- groups if identified for TSI/ATSI)	Outcome Measures (directly related to goal)	Prioritized <u>Evidence-based</u> Strategies/Change Ideas, <u>evidence level</u> and research source citation	Fiscal, human, other resources (or investments) needed to support implementation
1. Academic Achievement	RCPS supports all students in accessing standards-based programming and working towards the Portrait of a Graduate traits by removing barriers to success. By June of 2027, 10% of students taking the Fastbridge assessment will increase their scores.	Fastbridge assessments, state standardized tests, and Common Local Assessments	Regularly analyze student achievement data and adapt and adjust instructional practices (universal for all students) and interventions (targeted and intensive) based on student outcomes. Targeted professional development on Tier 1 strategies Expand Fastbridge assessments to include additional grades	-Intervention strategies such as scheduled time during the school day for additional time on task for struggling learners as well as after-school and summer learning activities. -Supports for Multi-Language Learners -Online learning resources such as IXL -Professional development time, expertise, and support -Resources for data analysis of assessment results -Resources for parent and family engagement -licenses for Fastbridge assessments to help screen and monitor progress - intervention strategies, including MTSS coaching and credit recovery

2. Safe and Healthy Schools	RHS will embody a culture of well-being through practices and infrastructure to enhance the physical, social, and emotional health of our students and staff, contributing to the vitality of our school community. By June of 2027, 75% of students participating in co-curricular activities will complete a survey providing feedback on their experiences.	Increase participation in co-curricular activities Decrease the number of behavioral infractions within cohorts	Encourage active participation by all stakeholders to support and promote the pursuit of healthy and balanced mental and physical lifestyles.	Social / Emotional learning curricula Data analysis
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). <i>Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child (WSCC) model</i>. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/wsc/index.htm Aziz, R., Mulyadi, M., Mangestuti, R., Hadi, M. S., & Wahyuni, E. N. (2024). "Exploring Student and Teacher Perspectives on Well-Being Development: A Mixed-Methods Investigation." <i>Participatory Educational Research</i>, 11(1), 198–210.				

Add additional rows, as needed.

Section 2 (a): Goals Related to Reading Proficiency ([Act 139](#) implementation)

All schools with grades K-3 complete this section.

Goal Number	School prioritized goals related to Act 139 (increasing reading proficiency)	Outcome Measures (directly related to goal)	Number and % students proficient on local and state literacy assessments (K-3)	Prioritized evidence-based strategies/ change ideas, evidence level and research source citation	Fiscal, human, other resources (or investments) needed to support implementation
3. Reading	RHS will provide reading support to those students who are struggling to read at grade level.	Fastbridge assessments, state standardized tests, and Common Local Assessments	In the fall, 2025 assessment of 9th grade students in aReading At/ Above: 59% Below: 41% In the winter, 2026 assessment of 9th grade students At/ Above: 63% Below: 37%	Expand the use of Fastbridge testing to additional grades Professional development on tier I reading strategies across the curriculum	-Intervention strategies such as scheduled time during the school day for additional time on task for struggling learners as well as after-school and summer learning activities. -MTSS Coach -Targeted professional development on Tier I literacy strategies -licenses for Fastbridge assessments to help screen and monitor progress -intervention strategies, including MTSS coaching and credit recovery
Explicit Vocabulary Instruction cited source: Beck, McKeown, & Kucan (2002); Marzano (2004); <i>What Works Clearinghouse</i> (WWC) reports Teaching students how to read, write, and think like experts in each subject area. Cited source: Shanahan & Shanahan (2008); Moje (2008)					

--	--	--	--	--	--

Add additional rows, as needed.

Section 3: Schools Identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support Complete This Section (CSI & TSI/ATSI/Equity 2 and 3)

Problem(s) of Practice & Root Cause Analysis: Please upload a copy of your fishbone or 5 Whys Diagram.

Equitable Resource Allocations:

- For which student populations did you identify inequities? _____
- What are the root causes of these inequities? _____

Equitable Resource Allocation Goal	Measures of Improvement	Change Ideas

Section 4: Progress Monitoring

All schools complete this section.

Goal Reference Number	Measures	Baseline Data (Initial Submission)	Mid-Year Progress Check and Next Steps	End-of-Year Results and Next Steps
-----------------------	----------	------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

1. Academic Achievement: RCPS supports all students in accessing standards-based programming and working towards the Portrait of a Graduate traits by removing barriers to success.	Increase academic achievement and skill development as measured by Fastbridge assessments, state standardized tests, and Common Local Assessments	On the VTCAP, in English Language Arts, ninth grade students performed slightly below the state average. (2024) <table><tr><th>Group Proficiency</th><th>School</th><th colspan="2">All Students</th></tr><tr><th></th><th></th><th>Supervisory Union</th><th>State</th></tr><tr><td>Proficient with Distinction</td><td>11%</td><td>12%</td><td>13%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>28%</td><td>28%</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>Partially Proficient</td><td>32%</td><td>32%</td><td>27%</td></tr><tr><td>Substantially Below Proficient</td><td>26%</td><td>25%</td><td>24%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Proficient and Above</td><td>40%</td><td>41%</td><td>47%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Below Proficient</td><td>59%</td><td>58%</td><td>52%</td></tr></table> In math, ninth grade students performed below the state average <table><tr><th>Group Proficiency</th><th>School</th><th colspan="2">All Students</th></tr><tr><th></th><th></th><th>Supervisory Union</th><th>State</th></tr><tr><td>Proficient with Distinction</td><td>10%</td><td>11%</td><td>7%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>24%</td><td>25%</td><td>31%</td></tr><tr><td>Partially Proficient</td><td>34%</td><td>34%</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>Substantially Below Proficient</td><td>30%</td><td>29%</td><td>27%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Proficient and Above</td><td>35%</td><td>36%</td><td>39%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Below Proficient</td><td>64%</td><td>63%</td><td>60%</td></tr></table> In the winter, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 9th grade students performed At/ Above: 58.8% Below: 41.2% relative to the reading automaticity benchmark In the winter, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 9th grade students performed At/ Above: 61.6%,	Group Proficiency	School	All Students				Supervisory Union	State	Proficient with Distinction	11%	12%	13%	Proficient	28%	28%	33%	Partially Proficient	32%	32%	27%	Substantially Below Proficient	26%	25%	24%	Total Proficient and Above	40%	41%	47%	Total Below Proficient	59%	58%	52%	Group Proficiency	School	All Students				Supervisory Union	State	Proficient with Distinction	10%	11%	7%	Proficient	24%	25%	31%	Partially Proficient	34%	34%	33%	Substantially Below Proficient	30%	29%	27%	Total Proficient and Above	35%	36%	39%	Total Below Proficient	64%	63%	60%	In the Fall, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/Above: 70% Below: 30% relative to the automaticity benchmark In the Fall, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 59%,	Results: On the VTCAP, in English Language Arts, ninth grade students performed at the state average. (2025) <table><tr><th>Group Proficiency</th><th>School</th><th colspan="2">All Students</th></tr><tr><th></th><th></th><th>Supervisory Union</th><th>State</th></tr><tr><td>Proficient with Distinction</td><td>***</td><td>7.34%</td><td>10.76%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>38.42%</td><td>34.93%</td></tr><tr><td>Partially Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>28.25%</td><td>27.06%</td></tr><tr><td>Substantially Below Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>25.99%</td><td>27.23%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Proficient and Above</td><td>***</td><td>45.76%</td><td>45.7%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Below Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>54.24%</td><td>54.29%</td></tr></table> In math, ninth grade students performed only slightly below the state average <table><tr><th>Group Proficiency</th><th>School</th><th colspan="2">All Students</th></tr><tr><th></th><th></th><th>Supervisory Union</th><th>State</th></tr><tr><td>Proficient with Distinction</td><td>***</td><td>5.52%</td><td>7.69%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>34.25%</td><td>32.89%</td></tr><tr><td>Partially Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>32.6%</td><td>33.17%</td></tr><tr><td>Substantially Below Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>27.62%</td><td>26.23%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Proficient and Above</td><td>***</td><td>39.78%</td><td>40.59%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Below Proficient</td><td>***</td><td>60.22%</td><td>59.4%</td></tr></table> In the Winter, 2025/26 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/Above: 71% Below: 28% relative to the automaticity benchmark In the Winter, 2025/26 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 55%,	Group Proficiency	School	All Students				Supervisory Union	State	Proficient with Distinction	***	7.34%	10.76%	Proficient	***	38.42%	34.93%	Partially Proficient	***	28.25%	27.06%	Substantially Below Proficient	***	25.99%	27.23%	Total Proficient and Above	***	45.76%	45.7%	Total Below Proficient	***	54.24%	54.29%	Group Proficiency	School	All Students				Supervisory Union	State	Proficient with Distinction	***	5.52%	7.69%	Proficient	***	34.25%	32.89%	Partially Proficient	***	32.6%	33.17%	Substantially Below Proficient	***	27.62%	26.23%	Total Proficient and Above	***	39.78%	40.59%	Total Below Proficient	***	60.22%	59.4%
Group Proficiency	School	All Students																																																																																																																																		
		Supervisory Union	State																																																																																																																																	
Proficient with Distinction	11%	12%	13%																																																																																																																																	
Proficient	28%	28%	33%																																																																																																																																	
Partially Proficient	32%	32%	27%																																																																																																																																	
Substantially Below Proficient	26%	25%	24%																																																																																																																																	
Total Proficient and Above	40%	41%	47%																																																																																																																																	
Total Below Proficient	59%	58%	52%																																																																																																																																	
Group Proficiency	School	All Students																																																																																																																																		
		Supervisory Union	State																																																																																																																																	
Proficient with Distinction	10%	11%	7%																																																																																																																																	
Proficient	24%	25%	31%																																																																																																																																	
Partially Proficient	34%	34%	33%																																																																																																																																	
Substantially Below Proficient	30%	29%	27%																																																																																																																																	
Total Proficient and Above	35%	36%	39%																																																																																																																																	
Total Below Proficient	64%	63%	60%																																																																																																																																	
Group Proficiency	School	All Students																																																																																																																																		
		Supervisory Union	State																																																																																																																																	
Proficient with Distinction	***	7.34%	10.76%																																																																																																																																	
Proficient	***	38.42%	34.93%																																																																																																																																	
Partially Proficient	***	28.25%	27.06%																																																																																																																																	
Substantially Below Proficient	***	25.99%	27.23%																																																																																																																																	
Total Proficient and Above	***	45.76%	45.7%																																																																																																																																	
Total Below Proficient	***	54.24%	54.29%																																																																																																																																	
Group Proficiency	School	All Students																																																																																																																																		
		Supervisory Union	State																																																																																																																																	
Proficient with Distinction	***	5.52%	7.69%																																																																																																																																	
Proficient	***	34.25%	32.89%																																																																																																																																	
Partially Proficient	***	32.6%	33.17%																																																																																																																																	
Substantially Below Proficient	***	27.62%	26.23%																																																																																																																																	
Total Proficient and Above	***	39.78%	40.59%																																																																																																																																	
Total Below Proficient	***	60.22%	59.4%																																																																																																																																	

		Below: 38.4% relative to the aReading benchmark In the winter, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 9th grade students performed At/ Above: 57.6% Below: 42.4% relative to the math automaticity benchmark In the winter Fastbridge assessment, 9th grade students performed At/ Above: 50.9% Below: 49.1% relative to the aMath benchmark	Below: 41% relative to the aReading benchmark. Students identified as being at High Risk made up 24% In the fall, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 80% Below: 20% relative to the math automaticity benchmark In the fall, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 51% Below: 49% relative to the aMath benchmark	Below: 45% relative to the aReading benchmark. Students at high risk made up 16% In the winter, 2025-26 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 75% Below: 26% relative to the math automaticity benchmark In the winter, 2025-26 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 54% Below: 46% relative to the aMath benchmark Was Goal Met? Our ELA and math VTCAP scores improved relative to the state average.
--	--	--	---	---

				In reading automaticity, we increased the number of students in the Class of 2028 at or above the benchmark, from 58% to 70% to 71% In aReading the number of students in the Class of 2028 at or above the benchmark did not increase, but the percentage identified as High Risk decreased from 24% to 16%. In math automaticity, we increased the number of students in the Class of 2028 at or above the benchmark from 58% to 75%. In math, we increased the number of students in the Class of 2028 at or above the benchmark from 51% to 54%. Next Steps: Continue our literacy interventions.
--	--	--	--	--

Goal Reference Number	Measures	Baseline Data (Initial Submission)	Mid-Year Progress Check and Next Steps	End-of-Year Results and Next Steps
				Implement our Schoolwide Vocabulary Initiative Fill the budgeted math interventionist position and offer math interventions.

2. Safe and Healthy Schools	Increase participation in co-curricular activities Decrease the number of behavioral infractions within cohorts	From the start of the year to April 10, 2025, there have been 678 behavioral incidents Regarding participation in co-curricular activities, in the 2020-21 school year there were 531 students; in 2021-22 there were 460; and in 2022-23 there were 330. While our total student population has declined, this reduction is not proportional		Results: From the start of the year to April 8, 2026 there have been 527 behavioral incidents, which constitutes a 22% decrease year-over-year. Regarding participation in co-curricular activities, in 2024-25 there were 446 students, which constitutes a 35% increase over 2022-23. Was Goal Met? Yes, we have decreased the number of behavioral incidents and increased participation in co-curriculars. Next Steps: We are adapting our electronic devices policy per state statute to prohibit phone use for the entire school day. This will be a change in practice and we anticipate that it will impact the total number of behavioral infractions.
------------------------------------	---	---	--	---

Goal Reference Number	Measures	Baseline Data (Initial Submission)	Mid-Year Progress Check and Next Steps	End-of-Year Results and Next Steps

3. Reading		In the winter Fastbridge assessment of 9th grade students performed At/ Above: 58.8% Below: 41.2% relative to the automaticity benchmark In the winter Fastbridge assessment of 9th grade students performed At/ Above: 61.6%, Below: 38.4% relative to the aReading benchmark	In the Fall, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/Above: 70% Below: 30% relative to the automaticity benchmark In the Fall, 2025 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 59%, Below: 41% relative to the aReading benchmark. Students identified as being at High Risk made up 24%	In the Winter, 2025/26 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/Above: 71% Below: 28% relative to the automaticity benchmark In the Winter, 2025/26 Fastbridge assessment, 10th grade students performed At/ Above: 55%, Below: 45% relative to the aReading benchmark. Students at high risk made up 16% Was Goal Met? In reading automaticity, we increased the number of students in the Class of 2028 at or above the benchmark, from 58% to 70% to 71% In aReading the number of students in the Class of 2028 at or above the benchmark did not increase, but the percentage identified as High Risk decreased from 24% to 16%.
------------	--	--	--	---

Goal Reference Number	Measures	Baseline Data (Initial Submission)	Mid-Year Progress Check and Next Steps	End-of-Year Results and Next Steps
				Next Steps: Continue our literacy interventions. Implement our Schoolwide Vocabulary Initiative

Add additional rows, as needed.