Achievement at SDS

Sonoran Desert School
2012

Achievement at SDS Contents

OVERVIEW 3

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS 3

SMALL ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL 3
AT-RISK STUDENTS 3
DIAGNOSTIC SCORES 4

FAY 10TH GRADE SCORES 4

HIGHER AGE OF ENROLLING STUDENTS 4
SMALL SAMPLE SIZES 5
2011-12 ANALYSIS 5
2010-11 ANALYSIS 5
2009-10 ANALYSIS 5
AIMS TEST CONTEXT 6
METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS 6

ADDITIONAL MEASURES OF ACHIEVEMENT 6

STAR MATH 6
STAR READING 7
OVERALL AIMS MATH SCORES 7
OVERALL AIMS READING SCORES 8
GRADUATE DATA 8
AYP/AZ LEARNS EVALUATIONS 8

IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES 9

NEW SCHOOL SITE 10
EXPANDED SCHOOL CALENDAR 10
ADDED GRADE LEVELS 10
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS 10

SUMMARY 11

APPENDIX A: STAR MATH AND READING DATA 12

APPENDIX B: GRADUATE DATA 14

Overview

Evaluation of student academic achievement is intended to support accountability for charter schools, in particular the legal obligation of charter schools to improve academic achievement. A key factor in this scenario is how achievement is defined and measured. Achievement is currently evaluated by analyzing the performance of Full Academic Year (FAY) 10th grade students who are taking AIMS HS the first time.

This report will present factors to be considered when analyzing and interpreting this data in the context of evaluating performance at Sonoran Desert School. Specifically, this report will expand upon the following points:

- SDS has been a small alternative school whose student characteristics should be considered when interpreting test results.
- The practice of measuring FAY 10th grader scores is influenced by the fact that the majority of enrolling students are 16 or older, the number of students being measured is too small (3 or fewer), and the testing process itself is undergoing development.
- Other assessments give a broader sense of achievement. STAR Math and STAR Reading show grade equivalency improvement, our AYP/AZ Learns evaluations show that our school is performing, and our school's general AIMS scores provide a clearer context for interpreting student performance.
- Adding grades and instructional days are key components in our attempts to improve and document student achievement, a process which will include a new school site, increased instructional time, a more strategic and purposeful curriculum, and a planning process that has helped to refine our vision and mission as a school.

School Characteristics

The following characteristics of Sonoran Desert School are relevant to the interpretation of FAY 10th grade AIMS results:

Small Alternative School

SDS is a small alternative school of 75-100 students. Most of the students who choose to enroll at our school have a history of the following:

- Behavior problems at previous schools
- Low academic performance
- Poor attendance
- Substance abuse issue with drugs and alcohol
- Probation and other legal problems
- Unstable family structures such as an incarcerated parent or split family

At-Risk Students

Many students who enroll are also at risk of dropping out because they are already significantly behind in credits. This means that most of our students enroll as "fifth-year seniors" or the equivalent. This circumstance beyond our control negatively affects our graduation rate, and as detailed below, skews our testing results.

Diagnostic Scores

Many students score significantly lower than their grade level on our reading and math diagnostic tests that are required for every enrolling student. Many students are unprepared for the requirements of high school. For example, we administer diagnostic tests in reading and mathematics to every enrolling student; these tests indicate students are performing significantly below grade level; a report on the test results from 8/3/11 to 2/2/12 showed the following:

- 42% of students tested at a 7th grade level or below in reading (9% 4th grade or below)
- 60% of students tested at a 7th grade level or below in math (20% 4th grade or below)

This provides some independent confirmation that many of our students are behind academically at the time of their enrollment at our school.

FAY 10th Grade Scores

As mentioned earlier, achievement at SDS is currently evaluated by analyzing the performance of Full Academic Year (FAY) 10th grade students who are taking AIMS HS the first time. The percent passing and growth percentile results are summarized in the following table:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Math	100%/30	40%/11	0%/29	0%/57.5	0%/11
Reading	80%/70	55%/19	67%/47.5	43%/35.5	33%/1

The following factors are a cause for concern when this method is used to evaluate academic performance at SDS:

Higher Age of Enrolling Students

The majority of students enrolling at our school are in grades 11 or 12. Very few students enroll in grade 10, and even fewer in grade 9; for example, in our current student population, 88% of students who enrolled were already past grade 10, by both age and previous AIMS test attempts[1].

This is a problem because AIMS tests are based on the AZ Academic Standards for high school, which means that providing instruction for grade 9 and part of grade 10 is critical. Even students who enroll in grade 10 have had more than half of that instruction elsewhere by the time they take the spring AIMS test, and odds are they were experiencing some sort of academic problems during that time that led them to seek an alternative school.

Because students often enroll at our school after experiencing problems elsewhere, we have often had a very limited opportunity to help students prepare for the grade 10 administration of AIMS. We would like to attract students earlier and retain them longer so that our test scores are a better reflection of our instructional program.

[1] 34% of students are 18 or over, 34% are age 17, 20% are age 16, 11% are age 15, and only 1% are age 14.

Small Sample Sizes

Because we have a small school of 75-100 students with a high percentage of students enrolling after the 10th grade, our AIMS results are being based on a very small sample size. Even a general source such as Wikipedia notes, "a choice of small sample sizes, though sometimes necessary, can result in wide confidence intervals or risks of errors in statistical hypothesis testing."[2] Additionally, in a mathematical or scientific study, a sample is selected beforehand through a statistical process to ensure an accurate relationship between the sample and the overall population. The sample being used in this case was selected by a process that is random; in fact, the selection is biased by enrollment and population factors discussed previously.

Unfortunately, we don't have access to the actual source data that was used to generate our ASBCS AIMS achievement charts, and we don't have access to the methodology used (e.g., a specific definition for "FAY student," or the formula used to determine median growth).

However, we analyzed our school data to present a more complete picture of the source data used for those charts. We highlighted grade 10 students taking the AIMS test for the first time who were present at our school from the first day of school all the way to the test date. In each case, it was a small number of students (3 or fewer), and for this year's test our student achievement in both reading and math will be based on the performance of a single student who also happened to be receiving special education services. The following is a breakdown by year:

2011-12 Analysis

- AIMS Reading Test (2/29/12)
    - Number of FAY 10th grade students tested: 1[3]
- AIMS Math Test (4/6/11)
    - Number of FAY 10th grade students tested: 1

2010-11 Analysis[4]

- AIMS Reading Test (3/2/11)
    - Number of FAY 10th grade students tested: 2
- AIMS Math Test (4/6/11)
    - Number of FAY 10th grade students tested: 2

2009-10 Analysis

- AIMS Reading Test (2/24/10)
    - Number of FAY 10th grade students tested: 3
- AIMS Math Test (4/7/10)
    - Number of FAY 10th grade students tested: 3

---

[2] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sample_size_determination

[3] The single FAY 10th grade student representing our school on both tests was receiving Special Education services.

[4] An email from Johanna Medina stated, "the academic performance graphs were calculated based on three full academic year students that took the AIMS test in FY2011 that were within the acceptable grade level." The discrepancy may be explained by a student who started the year at our school but then withdrew and re-enrolled twice during the year (so the student was enrolled from 8/3/10-9/9/10, 1/3/11-2/17/11, and 3/3/11-4/7/11). Because of the resultant gaps, we wouldn't consider this student a true FAY student even if the start date and test date suggests that he was.

We are concerned that such small sample sizes are being used to represent and evaluate student academic improvement at our school. Such samples appear to lack statistical validity as representations of general student achievement.

AIMS Test Context

The legislative inclusion of AIMS Augmentation in 2005 supports the need to understand AIMS as a work in progress.[5] Since math performance in particular dropped from 2009 on, we are concerned that this may be in part attributable to the altered content of the test under a new publisher.[6] In fact, in 2009-10 there was a statewide dip in math test scores attributed to the adoption of more rigorous standards.[7]

Changing standards and content is especially difficult for at-risk students who by definition already struggle academically; increasing academic rigor pushes many of these students to give up because they believe they can't succeed. We respectfully request that this factor is considered when evaluating student achievement.

Methodological Limitations

The current measure of academic measures only the reading and math performance of a sub-group (FAY 10th graders). Additional measures of achievement should be considered, especially when a school serves a specialized population. For example, an evaluation could include a sample of course grades, the number of "turn-arounds" (at-risk students who recover credits and graduate), increases in attendance, and decreases in disciplinary referrals as a measure of what students are achieving in the classroom.

The work being done to create a Parallel Achievement Profile for alternative schools supports the position that a small, random sampling from a test that is undergoing a public process of trial-and-error is not yet a fair, accurate, or comprehensive way to evaluate student performance.

Additional Measures of Achievement

Every student at SDS is tested in math and reading using the STAR computer-adaptive testing framework as described in the following (please see Appendix A for source data):

STAR Math

STAR Math is a norm-referenced diagnostic test from Renaissance Learning. It is computer-adaptive, so the test questions are selected in response to correct or incorrect answers. In 2011-12, we administered the STAR Math test in the fall and in the spring, and then analyzed the data for students who had started within the first two months of school and who were still at the school in the spring, with the following results:

- 73% of students showed improvement in Scale Score and/or Grade Equivalent.
- Average increase in Scale Score of 50.82 points
- Average increase in Grade Equivalent of 1.32 years

[5] http://www.azleg.gov/briefs/Senate/AIMS.pdf
[6] http://www.prweb.com/releases/2009/06/prweb2476664.htm
[7] http://azstarnet.com/news/local/education/article_35294ed0-b6a3-5688-ac68-a087cc3cef2c.html

STAR Reading

STAR Reading is also a norm-referenced, computer-adaptive diagnostic test from Renaissance Learning. In 2011-12, we administered the STAR Reading test in the fall and in the spring, and then analyzed the data for students who had started within the first two months of school and who were still at the school in the spring, with the following results:

- 67% of students showed improvement in Scale Score and/or Grade Equivalent.
- Average increase in Scale Score of 91.73 points
- Average increase in Grade Equivalent of 1.07 years

Overall AIMS Math Scores[8]

Fiscal Year	Math # Tested	Math Mean Scale Score	Math % Falls Far Below	Math % Approaches	Math % Meets	Math % Exceeds	Math % Passing
2011	43	460	70	16	12	2	14
2010	32	479	81	9	6	3	9
2009	46	666	57	20	24	0	24
2008	39	672	33	31	36[9]	0	36

Recent attempts to improve math scores have involved increasing the rigor of math programs with the thought that having higher math standards, more math credits required, and more difficult exams will cause performance to improve. However, a high percentage of students who enroll at an alternative school have an extended history of academic problems in math. When a student enters high school behind in math, increasing rigor only leaves them further behind. The increased rigor of this test is arguably the biggest challenge to at-risk students and the educators who work with them.

Our math scores reflect this difficulty, particularly the dramatic dip in 2010 when the test moved to a new publisher, more rigorous standards, and an altered scale threshold that resulted in a statewide dip. We believe the 27% regression in our scores from 2008 to 2010 reflects changes that made the test more difficult, an effect that is magnified because of the academic vulnerability of at-risk students. Even with the increased difficulty of the test, we've had some students exceed the standard, but it's clear that increased academic rigor has not changed the minds the disenfranchised majority of at-risk students who have developed an anti-academic attitude over the years.

[8] AIMS data compiled from ADE at http://www.azed.gov/research-evaluation/aims-assessment-results/
[9] According to the disaggregated data available, 40% of 10th graders met the standard in 2008.

Overall AIMS Reading Scores

Fiscal Year	Reading # Tested	Reading Mean Scale Score	Reading % Falls Far Below	Reading % Approaches	Reading % Meets	Reading % Exceeds	Reading % Passing
2011	21	676	10	38	52	0	52
2010	27	656	26	48	26	0	26
2009	34	669	21	38	41	0	41
2008	33	679	9	33	55	3	58

Though not as severe, some of the same testing dynamics that affected math appear to have affected reading, particularly in 2010. Fortunately, a 26% gain in reading scores from 2010-2011 has helped to offset the loss that occurred from 2008-2010.

Graduate Data

The following characteristics of our graduates show how students have achieved success despite many students enrolling with a record of academic struggle (please see Appendix B for source data):

- Class of 2011
  - 35 graduates
  - 40% enrolled with a GPA under 2.0
  - 80% improved their GPA
  - Average GPA improvement of .34

- Class of 2010
  - 30 graduates
  - 47% enrolled with a GPA under 2.0
  - 80% improved their GPA
  - Average GPA improvement of .34

- Class of 2009
  - 35 graduates
  - 37% enrolled with a GPA under 2.0
  - 86% improved their GPA
  - Average GPA improvement of .34

AYP/AZ Learns Evaluations[10]

The following summary of our AYP/AZ Learns Evaluations shows that we've consistently met goals for percent tested and test objectives toward AYP and that we have maintained the status of "Performing" school under AZ Learns. The fluctuations in graduation rate shows why we believe it is essential to add grade levels to our school; we need to attract students at an earlier age and retain them longer in order to improve performance related to attendance, promotion, and testing.

[10] Data available at ADE Common Logon link to AZ LEARNS / Adequate Yearly Progress (NCLB)

The two years in which we have not made AYP are due to fluctuations in graduation rate. As mentioned earlier, our graduation rate is negatively affected by the high percentage of older students who are already behind in credits when they enroll; we help many of these students graduate, but it is difficult to do this on time if they enter the school 2-3 years behind. The number of "school shoppers" who appear to be looking for the easiest solution available also affects our graduation rate; our program offers advantages of flexible pacing and individualization, but it is still rigorous, so we have a significant percentage of "anti-academic students" (for lack of a better term) who enter and exit within a short time.

2011 AYP Determination	Met Percent Tested	Yes
	Met Test Objectives	Yes
	Met Graduation Rate	No
	Made AYP	No
2011 AZL Determination	Achievement Profile	Performing

2010 AYP Determination	Met Percent Tested	Yes
	Met Test Objectives	Yes
	Met Graduation Rate	Yes
	Made AYP	Yes
2010 AZL Determination	Achievement Profile	Performing

2009 AYP Determination	Met Percent Tested	Yes
	Met Test Objectives	Yes
	Met Graduation Rate	No
	Made AYP	No
2009 AZL Determination	Achievement Profile	Performing

2008 AYP Determination	Met Percent Tested	Yes
	Met Test Objectives	Yes
	Met Graduation Rate	Yes
	Made AYP	Yes
2008 AZL Determination	Achievement Profile	Performing

Improvement Initiatives

While we believe it is important to consider context when evaluating test results, we are not making excuses, disavowing responsibility, or shirking accountability. As a staff, we are committed to excellence and motivated to continuously improve, as is evidenced by our excellent administrative record with the ASBCS as well as our AdvancED accreditation status. The challenges are significant, but we have been reflecting on our experience, examining models of success, and developing strategies in order to improve our program in the following ways.

New School Site

For the 2012-13 school year, SDS will be moving to a new facility in Gold Canyon. We were fortunate to find a facility that could be leased at the same price we would be paying for our current building even though the new location is almost 20 years newer. This new facility supports our improvement efforts in several critical ways.

- Increased community integration and support
- Improved learning and teaching environment
- Better technology infrastructure (prewired with Cat5e to support a Gigabit network)

In particular, we are all very excited and gratified by the level of community interest we have received in Gold Canyon; we have had more positive responses from local businesses and community organizations than we have ever had. Our registration list has started even before we have moved into marketing the school.

Expanded School Calendar

We also plan to expand our school calendar to increase instructional time to improve student achievement. The following calendar changes are planned for the 2012-13 school year:

- Increase from a 4-day to a 5-day school week
- Increase from 144 instructional days to 180 instructional days

Added Grade Levels

We are currently applying to add grades 7-8 to our program. Adding grades will allow us to serve the needs of the community, which currently has a K-6 school, as well as the needs of the school when it comes to improving academic performance. Specifically, our goal is to provide more instructional intervention in grades 7-9 so that performance on 10th grade AIMS (and other tests such as college placement tests) is much improved. To do this, we need to attract students at a younger age and retain students longer, which in turn means offering a curriculum and program that is both engaging and functionally excellent.

Program Improvements

As part of our AdvancED accreditation, we have developed plans to be implemented in the coming school year for the following areas:

- The collection, use, and analysis of formative and summative data to guide instruction and decision-making.
- Comprehensive professional development planning for all personnel.
- Revisiting, revising, and communicating the mission and vision statements to ensure that the goals are aligned to advance and guide teaching and learning.

Articulating plans for these areas has helped us to develop a more focused sense of direction. In preparation for the 2012-13 school year, we are in the process of revising our entire program to address the following priorities:

- Increased instructional time and increased emphasis on test preparation
- Strengthening ties between standards, instruction, and assessment
- Improved use of assessment by incorporating prescriptive pre- and post-testing, benchmark testing, and longitudinal data tracking

Summary

Charter schools have a legal imperative to improve student achievement, and measures of student performance heavily influence a charter school's eligibility to expand school programs and renew its charter contract. Student achievement for charters schools is currently measured by tracking the passing percentage and median growth on AIMS reading and AIMS math for FAY 10th graders taking the test for the first time.

This is a concern for our school, a small alternative school of 75-100 students. In this context, every day has been a struggle to improve attendance, motivation, academics, promotion rates, and test performance while fighting against negative forces that range from substance abuse and criminal behaviors to mental illness and dysfunctional family structures. Because the challenge is great, we are especially concerned that the higher enrollment age and history of academic problems of our enrollees, the very small sample sizes of our test results, and the evolutionary process of testing itself are factors that prevent a fair or complete assessment of student achievement as a result of our educational program.

We are very aware of the need to demonstrate improved student achievement. While we are proud of the many students we've helped get their lives back on track, our excellent administrative record, and our AdvancED accreditation status, we realize that we need a strategic approach to instruction supported by the more systematic use objective data to validate the quality of our program. We have been working diligently at securing a new school site, expanding our school calendar, adding grade levels, improving our curriculum, and bringing a new level of purpose and quality to our educational program.

We strongly believe that inducting students from an earlier age, retaining them longer, and providing more quality instructional time is absolutely essential to improve student academic performance. We hope the more comprehensive view of student achievement presented in this report presents a solid foundation for our upcoming efforts to improve student performance.

Appendix A: STAR Math and Reading Data

Data Notes:

- STAR Math and STAR Reading are standardized, computer-adaptive assessments by Renaissance Learning with results that predict achievement on other standardized tests.[11]
- Students sampled started the school year within the first quarter and were continuously enrolled until the date of the post-test.
- SS = Scale Score
- GE = Grade Equivalent

STAR Math Results

Name	Entry Date	Math SS Fall	Math SS Spring	SS Difference	Math GE Fall	Math GE Spring	GE Difference
(Redacted)	10/24/11	781	821	40	7.9	9.7	1.8
(Redacted)	10/3/11	724	802	78	6.1	8.7	2.6
(Redacted)	8/8/11	769	737	-32	7.4	6.4	-1
(Redacted)	8/8/11	888	823	-65	12.9	9.8	-3.1
(Redacted)	8/8/11	861	890	29	12.2	12.9	0.7
(Redacted)	8/8/11	788	752	-36	8.1	6.9	-1.2
(Redacted)	8/8/11	751	852	101	6.8	11.5	4.7
(Redacted)	8/10/11	909	960	51	12.9	12.9	0
(Redacted)	8/23/11	845	880	35	11.1	12.9	1.8
(Redacted)	8/8/11	678	603	-75	5.2	4	-1.2
(Redacted)	8/29/11	809	746	-63	9	6.7	-2.3
(Redacted)	8/8/11	752	765	13	6.9	7.3	0.4
(Redacted)	8/16/11	629	769	140	4.4	7.4	3
(Redacted)	10/3/11	646	663	17	4.6	4.9	0.3
(Redacted)	8/10/11	769	862	93	7.4	12.3	4.9
(Redacted)	8/10/11	695	778	83	5.5	7.8	2.3
(Redacted)	8/16/11	744	846	102	6.6	11.1	4.5
(Redacted)	8/10/11	618	703	85	4.2	5.6	1.4
(Redacted)	8/9/11	672	650	-22	5.1	4.7	-0.4
(Redacted)	8/9/11	485	763	278	2.8	7.2	4.4
(Redacted)	8/9/11	746	882	136	6.7	9.8	3.1
(Redacted)	8/10/11	604	734	130	4	6.4	2.4
Totals				1118			29.1
Averages				+50.8182			+1.3227

[11] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/STAR_%28software%29#STAR_Reading

STAR Reading Results

Name	Entry Date	Reading SS Fall	Reading SS Spring	SS Difference	Reading GE Fall	Reading GE Spring	GE Difference
(Redacted)	10/24/11	1240	1222	-18	12.9	12.9	0
(Redacted)	10/3/11	742	828	86	6.6	7.5	0.9
(Redacted)	8/8/11	919	442	-477	8.4	3.7	-4.7
(Redacted)	8/8/11	955	1316	361	8.8	12.9	4.1
(Redacted)	8/8/11	897	1240	343	8.1	12.9	4.8
(Redacted)	8/8/11	1320	1334	14	12.9	12.9	0
(Redacted)	8/8/11	1254	1285	31	12.9	12.9	0
(Redacted)	8/10/11	1305	1338	33	12.9	12.9	0
(Redacted)	8/23/11	898	1140	242	8.2	11.5	3.3
(Redacted)	8/8/11	420	491	71	3.5	4.5	1
(Redacted)	8/29/11	710	1211	501	6.4	12.9	6.5
(Redacted)	8/8/11	967	954	-13	9	8.8	-0.2
(Redacted)	8/16/11	653	895	242	6.1	8.1	2
(Redacted)	10/3/11	770	850	80	6.8	7.7	0.9
(Redacted)	8/10/11	732	1052	320	6.6	9.8	3.2
(Redacted)	8/10/11	906	871	-35	8.3	7.9	-0.4
(Redacted)	8/16/11	903	888	-15	8.2	8	-0.2
(Redacted)	8/10/11	622	898	276	5.8	8.2	2.4
(Redacted)	8/9/11	723	674	-49	6.5	6.2	-0.3
(Redacted)	2/8/12	1331	1317	-14	12.9	12.9	0
(Redacted)	8/9/11	1008	978	-30	9.4	9.1	-0.3
(Redacted)	8/10/11	628	697	69	5.9	6.4	0.5
Totals				2018			23.5
Averages				+91.7273			+1.0682

Appendix B: Graduate Data

Class of 2011	Date Enrolled	Grade Enrolled	Beginning Credits	GPA	Previous School GPA	Change in GPA	Passed AIMS	Passed AIMS	Passed AIMS
Total = 35							Math	Reading	Writing
(Name Redacted)	8/10	11	11.5	2.75	2.24	0.51	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	11/9	11	16.5	3.38	3.34	0.04	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/10	11	14.25	3.44	3.45	-0.01	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/10	12	16	2.17	1.74	0.43	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/8	11	7	2.33	0.97	1.36	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/9	11	12.5	2.68	3.12	-0.44	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	11/7	10	3	1.87	2	-0.13	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	2/9	12	10.5	1.51	0.69	0.82	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/6	9	0	2.36	0	0	SE	X	SE
(Name Redacted)	8/6	9	0	1.92	0	0	X	X	SE
(Name Redacted)	8/10	11	10	2.51	1.81	0.7	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	11	8	1.97	1.3	0.67	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/11	12	14.75	3.17	3.54	-0.37	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	2/10	11	16	2.69	2.35	0.34	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/11	12	20	2.43	2.02	0.41	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	10	16.5	2.45	1.91	0.54	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	4/7	11	8.5	2.8	2.31	0.49	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/11	12	17	3.57	3.48	0.09	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	10/10	12	18	2.43	2.32	0.11	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	12/9	12	15.5	2.71	2.16	0.55	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	11/9	12	11	1.85	0.65	1.2	SE	SE	SE
(Name Redacted)	1/10	12	21	2.07	1.72	0.35	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	12/10	11	8.5	2.62	1.84	0.78	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/10	12	20.75	2.31	2.17	0.14	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	10/9	11	15	3.38	3.42	-0.04	X	X	X

(Name Redacted)	8/10	12	15	2.66	2.87	-0.21	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/7	9	0	2.64	0	0	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/10	11	12.5	2.36	2.02	0.34	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/9	10	10	2.15	2.21	-0.06	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	10/10	12	19	1.89	1.57	0.32	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	10	8.5	1.7	1.26	0.44	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	11/9	11	15.5	2.67	1.95	0.72	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/10	12	16	2.12	1.8	0.32	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/11	12	17	2.13	1.77	0.36	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/10	12	17	3.15	2.91	0.24	X	X	X
				Average Change in GPA = 0.3440625					

Class of 2010	Date Enrolled	Grade Enrolled	Beginning Credits	GPA	Previous School GPA	Change in GPA	Passed AIMS	Passed AIMS	Passed AIMS
Total= 30							Math	Reading	Writing
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	8.5	2.94	2.42	0.52	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	16	1.79	1.29	0.5	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/7	10	5	2.2	1.2	1	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	11	12.5	3.31	3.26	0.05	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/10	12	16.5	2.41	2.14	0.27	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/6	9	0.5	1.81	2	-0.19	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	10/7	10	5.5	1.83	2.33	-0.5	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	13.5	1.88	1.37	0.51	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	18	2.26	1.5	0.76	A	X	A
(Name Redacted)	2/10	12	18	1.95	1.5	0.45	SE	SE	SE
(Name Redacted)	3/9	10	6	2.45	1.31	1.14	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	3/9	11	16.25	2.56	1.54	1.02	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/9	12	15.5	1.65	1.44	0.21	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	13	2.81	2.76	0.05	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/8	10	6	2.44	2.67	-0.23	X	X	X

(Name Redacted)	12./	12	0	2.16	2.16	0	A	X	A
(Name Redacted)	10/8	12	13.5	1.77	1.2	0.57	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	21	3.04	2.9	0.14	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	3/9	10	12.5	3.49	2.85	0.64	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	18.25	2.3	2.54	-0.24	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/9	12	15	3.06	3.16	-0.1	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	11/9	12	17	2.04	1.5	0.54	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/8	11	10	1.93	1.13	0.8	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	12/6	9	0	2.28	0	0	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/7	11	10.5	1.86	1.1	0.76	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	14.5	1.69	1.38	0.31	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/10	12	19	2.78	2.81	-0.03	X	A	A
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	17	2.76	2.7	0.06	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/9	12	18	2.91	2.53	0.38	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/9	10	9.5	2.13	1.56	0.57	X	X	X
				Average Change in GPA = +0.343448276					

Class of 2009	Date Enrolled	Grade Enrolled	Beginning Credits	SDS GPA	Previous School GPA	Change in GPA	Passed AIMS	Passed AIMS	Passed AIMS
Total= 35							Math	Reading	Writing
(Name Redacted)	8/6	10	5.5	1.65	0.844	0.806	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/8	11	14	2.87	2.5	0.37	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	15	2.38	2	0.38	AUG	X	AUG
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	15.25	1.77	1.71	0.06	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/9	12	13	3.03	2.89	0.14	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/7	11	8.5	2.59	2.1	0.49	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	10/7	11	6	2.74	3.18	-0.44	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/9	11	15	2.91	2.15	0.76	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/7	11	5.5	1.56	0.71	0.85	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8./08	12	18	2.59	2.28	0.31	X	X	X

(Name Redacted)	9/8	11	13	2.3	1.61	0.69	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	2/6	10	8.5	2.5	2.61	-0.11	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	10/7	12	19	2.83	2.78	0.05	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/7	12	11.5	2.57	2.58	-0.01	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/7	11	14	2.1	1.54	0.56	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	3/9	12	20	2.09	1.96	0.13	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/8	11	12	3.35	3.12	0.23	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/8	12	20	1.77	1.31	0.46	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/9	11	15	2.56	2.3	0.26	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	11/8	12	19.75	2.61	2.5	0.11	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	15.5	1.74	1.83	-0.09	SE	SE	SE
(Name Redacted)	11/8	12	17	2.13	1.88	0.25	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	2/7	11	11.75	1.84	1.32	0.52	A	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/6	11	4	2.28	1.27	1.01	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	2/8	10	10	2.25	2.12	0.13	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	9/8	12	18.75	3.76	3.76	0	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	14	1.8	1.37	0.43	SE	SE	SE
(Name Redacted)	2/9	11	14	2.49	2.32	0.17	X	X	A
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	15.5	2.42	1.68	0.74	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	1/8	11	15	3.41	3.1	0.31	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	17.5	3.08	2.77	0.31	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/6	11	1.5	2.28	1	1.28	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	20.75	2.19	2.2	-0.01	X	X	A
(Name Redacted)	8/8	12	14	2.42	2.11	0.31	X	X	X
(Name Redacted)	3/9	12	20	2.3	2.13	0.17	X	X	X
				Average Change in GPA= +0.341941176					