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Dear Friends and Supporters,

We celebrate and reflect on our sixth year of helping schools deliver student-centered learning models for the benefit of every student, every day. *Teach to One: Math* (TTO), our first school-based model, served students in 35 schools this year.

We’re pleased to share that students participating in TTO continue to see consistent growth on NWEA’s Measure of Academic Performance (MAP) Growth assessment, a norm-based interim assessment derived from more than 10 million students in the U.S. This year, students in our program made gains at 1.5 times the national average.

The 2017–18 school year proved to be a momentous one for the organization. TTO was featured in the Financial Times piece, “The 50 Ideas to Change the World,” as an exemplar demonstrating how personalized learning can reshape the future of education. Thanks to a $1.07 million grant from the Michael & Susan Dell Foundation, New Classrooms bolstered its Algebra program for ninth- to eleventh-grade students. We have expanded into new states, begun our first-ever state partnership with the State of New Mexico, and refined the model to succeed in rural settings.

As we look ahead, we are more excited than ever for what is possible for students. We’re exploring big questions that we expect will lead to truly innovative solutions in education. Given the data we’re collecting on a daily basis, we have the unique opportunity to learn about learning—to better understand which combinations of learning experiences are most impactful.

Over the last seven years, New Classrooms has continued to develop and refine *Teach to One: Math* while also growing the number of partnership schools and districts across the country. This year, Teach to One served over 11,000 students in 35 schools nationwide.

Solving a Core Problem

Our work is grounded in the belief that the traditional school model makes it nearly impossible for teachers to meet each student’s unique needs. With one teacher, a set of textbooks, and 30 or so same-aged students in an 800-square-foot-room, this model prioritizes grade-level material over a tailored approach that meets students where they are. Too often, it fails those who enter behind grade level and hinders those who enter near the top.

This problem is especially acute in mathematics, a major obstacle preventing students from achieving college- and career-ready standards. Mastery of math concepts builds on itself over time, so when students fall behind, those gaps carry over and their chances of catching up dwindle. If a student goes into ninth grade off track in math, they have a less than 1 in 5 chance of graduating high school college-ready. Currently, two-thirds of students nationwide enter high school off track in math. Math is essential to success beyond high school and college. To be successful in the new global economy, having strong math skills is a necessity. If we really want students to be ready, we have to think about what skills they need no matter their age or assigned grade level. That’s a major driver behind Teach to One’s growth to high schools, which you can read about in greater depth in this report.

Teach to One: Math is just one of what we hope will be many new learning models that emerge over the next decade. Some of these models may be focused on specific subjects or grade spans, while others may apply more broadly. They will incorporate different pedagogical approaches, different educator roles, different ways to use technology, and different ways of using time and space. And they will reflect the very best thinking from those operating both inside and outside of the system today. Our theory of change is rooted in replacing the century-old classroom model and looking at personalization through the lens of what, when, how and where students learn.

Who We Are

In June 2011 we launched New Classrooms Innovation Partners as a 501(c)(3) to personalize learning by redesigning how a classroom works—from the use of technology, time, and physical space to the instruction and content that engages each student. New Classrooms was founded by many members of the team that created School of One, an initiative incubated within the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) under Chancellor Joel Klein and Mayor Michael Bloomberg. Co-Founders Joel Rose and Chris Rush launched School of One to determine whether it was possible to ensure that each student is learning the right math lesson, at the right time, and in the right way that best meets their strengths and needs. *Teach to One: Math*, New Classrooms’ flagship learning model, is the realization of this vision.

Over the last seven years, New Classrooms has continued to develop and refine *Teach to One: Math* while also growing the number of partnership schools and districts across the country. This year, Teach to One served over 11,000 students in 35 schools nationwide.

A NEW APPROACH TO PERSONALIZED LEARNING

Who We Are

In June 2011 we launched New Classrooms Innovation Partners as a 501(c)(3) to personalize learning by redesigning how a classroom works—from the use of technology, time, and physical space to the instruction and content that engages each student. New Classrooms was founded by many members of the team that created School of One, an initiative incubated within the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) under Chancellor Joel Klein and Mayor Michael Bloomberg. Co-Founders Joel Rose and Chris Rush launched School of One to determine whether it was possible to ensure that each student is learning the right math lesson, at the right time, and in the right way that best meets their strengths and needs. *Teach to One: Math*, New Classrooms’ flagship learning model, is the realization of this vision.

Over the last seven years, New Classrooms has continued to develop and refine *Teach to One: Math* while also growing the number of partnership schools and districts across the country. This year, Teach to One served over 11,000 students in 35 schools nationwide.

Solving a Core Problem

Our work is grounded in the belief that the traditional school model makes it nearly impossible for teachers to meet each student’s unique needs. With one teacher, a set of textbooks, and 30 or so same-aged students in an 800-square-foot-room, this model prioritizes grade-level material over a tailored approach that meets students where they are. Too often, it fails those who enter behind grade level and hinders those who enter near the top.
LEARNER PROFILES
Each student has an up-to-date record of his or her individual strengths, needs, motivations, and goals.

COMPETENCY-BASED PROGRESSIONS
Each student’s progress toward clearly defined goals is continually assessed. A student advances as soon as he or she demonstrates understanding.

PERSONALIZED LEARNING PATHS
All students are held to clear, high expectations, but each student follows a customized path that responds and adapts based on his or her individual learning progress, motivations, and goals.

A FLEXIBLE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
Student needs drive the design of the learning environment. All operational elements—staffing plans, space utilization, and time allocation—respond and adapt to support students in achieving their goals.

DEFINING PERSONALIZED LEARNING
Personalized learning describes the practice of making each student’s needs the driving force in his or her education. It is an alternative to the traditional “one-size-fits-all” approach where students who happen to be the same age learn the same things at the same time.

Personalized learning does not have to mean students are working in isolation. They can experience a variety of instructional approaches and can be continually regrouped with other students who share common needs. While technology can play a role, it does not mean that students must spend all of their time on computers.

DEVELOPING SCHOOL-BASED LEARNING MODELS
Schools have several options when exploring how best to support personalization. At one end of the spectrum are digital products and tools that teachers can use as learning supplements for their classroom. These products generally require the classroom teacher to determine how best to integrate them into their daily activities and workflow.

On the other end are comprehensive, school-based learning models such as Teach to One: Math that typically replace a school’s core curriculum and embed personalization into all aspects of learning. School based models combine an academic design that articulates what students learn with a set of operating structures that shape where, when, and how students learn. They affect what the teacher does, what the student does, and the organization of the classroom.

Models developed by organizations such as New Classrooms have teams of academic, operational, and technological experts focused on the research and development required to support personalization. To date, hundreds of thousands of hours have gone into the details of Teach to One: Math on everything from learning progressions, to instructional content, to assessment, to the logistics that enable personalized homework. Schools are then able to customize the model to meet the needs of their particular community.
Collective Teacher Responsibility
Teachers cultivate a culture of adult collaboration to benefit the needs of all students. Adult learning communities thrive when teachers grow together, share their practices, and partner with one another (and with us) in support of student learning.

Shared Ownership Between Students and Teachers
Students and teachers build deep, caring relationships that enable them to share ownership for learning and feel collectively accountable for ambitious student learning outcomes.

Competency-Based Learning
Student pace is driven by their individual progress, rather than that of a group. As students demonstrate their understanding of mathematical skills or concepts, they are able to move ahead to new ideas.

Timely, Actionable Data
Teachers access info every day that allows them to plan their lessons based on timely, up-to-date, actionable data about student progress and lesson activities. Teachers always know what their students understand and what they are working toward.

Continual Regrouping
Students work with anyone who shares their strengths and needs. Different students ready to learn the same mathematical skill or concept are continually regrouped with one another to work together and achieve their goals.

Flexible Use of Space
Students learn in flexible classroom environments that can simultaneously support multiple approaches to learning in order to accommodate each student’s daily activities.

CORE DESIGN TENETS
We designed Teach to One: Math (TTO) to enable students to explore the beauty and complexity of mathematics while also building habits for lifelong success. The following 10 core design tenets guided the development of the model.

Complete Learners
Students explore, question, defend, and build mathematical ideas, while also growing as curious, motivated, and collaborative members of their school community.

Able to Meet Students Where They Are
Students learn what they’re ready to learn in ways that are mindful of—but not exclusive to—gradelevel expectations. This allows some students to catch up on pre-grade skills and others to get ahead with post-grade material.

Personalized Pathways
Students have personalized learning paths that are frequently and thoughtfully tailored just for them. They are able to accelerate their own learning, regardless of their individual starting point.

Multiple Integrated Approaches to Learning
Students coherently experience math through multiple integrated approaches to learning. This variety allows them to develop deep conceptual understandings, explore complex situations, and share their ideas.
Anyone who’s tried to master a complicated task—such as preparing the perfect coq au vin to impress your dinner guests—knows there’s a disconnect between instruction and execution. You could have the greatest cookbook in the world, but conquering a difficult new recipe means trying, failing, changing your approach, and trying again (and again).

Neurological research helps us understand why. The more dendritic pathways the brain develops in association with a particular task, concept, or object, the deeper its understanding. In other words, there are a lot of learning steps to avoid serving your dinner guests a rubbery bird. You might spend some time on YouTube watching how to de-bone a chicken and consult a more experienced chef for braising techniques. And it wouldn’t hurt to try out the recipe ahead of time before building a dinner party around it.

It’s no different for an eighth-grader trying to understand linear functions. Having multiple and varied exposures to material when learning about skills and concepts leads to deeper learning. Some students may prefer to spend more time on the theory before tackling a tough math problem, while others might want to dive right in. Teacher-led instruction, small-group work, and independent learning are other approaches that improve retention and lead to deeper learning.

In response to research showing the benefit of multiple modalities, it is becoming more and more common for teachers to augment traditional teaching methods with learning centers or learning stations. These are places where students can learn individually or in small groups, often in ways that are more hands-on or employ different problem solving strategies than they would use in traditional teacher-student instruction.

Teach to One: Math harnesses the power of multiple modalities by creating a learning experience in which students are exposed to learning skills in different ways. In one day, for example, a student might move from teacher guided live investigation to virtual instruction on a laptop or small group collaboration.

In total, TTO offers nine different instructional approaches grouped into three categories: Teacher Delivered Modalities, Student Collaboration Modalities, and Independent Modalities.

We’re excited to see students are responding positively to these changes. According to a November 2016 survey, 80% of students said that having multiple opportunities to master a math concept helps them learn.

HOW IT WORKS
Deeper Learning Through Multiple Modalities

OUR TEAM
New Classrooms is committed to an organizational culture that values imaginative thinking, superior execution, ongoing professional development, and open and purposeful collaboration. The individuals who make up the New Classrooms team possess a diverse set of talents. Our team of professionals is made up of educators, technologists, curriculum designers, and school leaders.

CO-FOUNDERS
Joel Rose, New Classrooms Co-Founder and Chief Executive Officer, began his career in education as a fifth grade teacher in Houston in 1992. Since then, Joel has served in a variety of leadership roles in education, including as Chief Executive for Human Capital at the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE), where he led the creation of School of One. Joel’s published articles include pieces in The Atlantic, Education Nation, and EdTech Magazine. He has spoken at numerous convenings, including the Aspen Institute’s Ideas Festival; NBC’s Education Nation; and the annual conferences for the American Federation of Teachers, National School Boards Association, and the National Association of Independent Schools. Joel earned a bachelor’s degree in political science from Tufts University and a law degree from the University of Miami School of Law. Joel lives in Manhattan with his wife and two children.

Christopher Rush, New Classrooms Co-Founder and Chief Program Officer, previously led the design and development of Amplify’s mCLASS reporting systems and initiated the creation of their consulting services group, serving as its Executive Director. Additionally, Chris worked with the NYCDOE, co-leading the design of their citywide parent, teacher, and administrator longitudinal data system. Prior to that, Chris specialized in financial management & IT development services at IBM and also founded a pair of small tech startups during the early dot-com era. He holds a BS in Information Systems from Penn State with concentrations in Computer Science, Technological Ethics and Critical Thinking and an MS in Information Technology from the American InterContinental University. He lives in Brooklyn with his wife and daughter.
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KEY HIGHLIGHTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The 2017-2018 school year was marked by expansion into new states, our first-ever state partnership with the State of New Mexico, and the expansion of our partnerships with rural school districts.
In New Mexico, state leaders worked with New Classrooms to launch a three-year pilot grant for schools to implement the Teach to One: Math learning model. Teach to One integrates a combination of teacher-led, collaborative, and independent learning, and features a first-of-its-kind scheduling algorithm that uses daily assessment data to determine the optimal lesson for each student each day. The goal of this partnership was twofold: To understand how personalized learning models could fit into their state’s strategy and under what conditions they are most likely to achieve sustainability.

After the first year of the pilot, early indicators are promising. Across all three schools, students made average learning gains on the NWEA MAP Growth assessment at 1.6 times the national average. At Taos Middle School, where implementation was particularly strong, students grew at 1.8 times the national average. Taos Middle School has added Teach to One to include grades 6-8 and high school Algebra.

“We often hear teachers talk about the challenges of planning and designing instruction for so many different students. A personalized learning model like Teach to One is a resource that we believe superintendents should have access to.” – Yanira Vasquez, Math and Science Bureau Director

In 2012, Chicago’s William P. Gray Elementary School became one of the first schools in the country to adopt Teach to One: Math. In doing so, the Gray math team reoriented every academic and operational aspect of its learning model around its students’ individual needs.

Nearly six years later, Gray’s shift to personalized learning is paying off for students. In 2017, we found that eighth graders in Teach to One made an equivalent of 4.7 years growth in three years on NWEA’s tests.

“There’s a reason that students make that much growth,” says Gray Principal Susan Gross. “When you stick with a program, work to improve it, and give it time to develop, it can flourish and grow on its own.”

Playing the Long Game

Gray’s success is a microcosm of Chicago Public Schools (CPS), where increasing academic growth has earned national attention. Last year, an analysis of student data found that when looking at growth over multiple years:

• CPS students are learning and growing faster than 96% of students in the United States.
• On the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), scores from CPS students improved about 20% faster than those in other large districts or the national average.

While there are several factors that go into this level of success, it is important to note that CPS is one of the few districts where school accountability measures focus on results from the NWEA MAP, rather than on standardized state assessments.
Why does this matter?

In many states and districts, student growth measures used for school and teacher evaluations are based on a comparison of scores from different standardized tests taken in separate years. Because these assessments are almost exclusively focused on grade-level skills, they are not as effective at picking up gains on pre- and post-grade skills.

This version of “growth” is essentially comparing how students do against one set of standards to how they did on another set of standards.

Conversely, the MAP is adaptive. Questions get harder or easier depending on student responses, leading many students to work on a combination of on-, above-, and below-grade skills. As a result, performance on the MAP can better reflect learning gains than state test outcomes, which focus exclusively on grade-level proficiency.

By basing its accountability system on the MAP, CPS has been empowering schools and teachers to focus less on grade-level content and more on meeting the unique needs of individual students.

That’s not to say that state assessments don’t matter. They do. But it’s worth considering: Chicago’s quiet district-level initiative to focus on student growth may be a key driver of long-term success. Gray principal Susan Gross certainly believes so.

“"It starts with a long-term commitment from the district to support students' growth," she says. "In order to effectively implement change, what is often overlooked is the time needed to root the idea, support its growth, and then do the work to sustain the improvement."
because they are so amazing. They faced all those difficulties when they were small and still got past it and started a family.

Currently I am a fifth-grade student at Passaic Gifted and Talented Academy. In my opinion, we are by far the smartest children in the district. I started using Teach to One (we call it TTO) this school year and at first I felt a little weird because I was used to my teacher writing on the Smartboard and me taking notes and solving problems in my notebook. My cousins had been using TTO and told me I had to work with different teachers and on my computer. I was really excited, but a little nervous because it was SO different.

But it ended up being super helpful...and I felt great. What’s been different (but fun) about TTO from my previous experiences in math class is that now I can learn at my own pace and not have to wait for my classmates. For me, that means that I can have more advanced math. Before we had TTO we had to wait for our classmates to understand the skill for us to move on, but now it is different and I like that new freedom.

One of my dreams when I grow up is to become a lawyer and help people who are innocent. TTO helps me become a lawyer because everyone studying in college and law school needs a good understanding of complex math. TTO also helps me because it teaches me problem-solving. When you are a lawyer you are going to need to problem-solve and come to an agreement either with the judge or the other person—depending on the case. My experience with TTO math also influenced me to persevere because even if I get a “Room for Growth” on the exit slip, the next day I work on the same skill until I get it right. I have to keep pushing and TTO helps make sure I succeed.

I would like to thank you for allowing me to speak tonight at Geek Out. I have enjoyed being here. I am honored to represent all the TTO students. Thank you and goodnight.

CONTENT PARTNERS
Ensuring High-Quality Content

All Teach to One: Math content undergoes a comprehensive review to ensure high standards for every student’s personalized curriculum. In addition to creating high-quality lessons, we partner with leading digital and print-based curriculum providers, including Ready from Curriculum Associates, LearnZillion, and Illustrative Mathematics. To date, our team of academic and curriculum experts has designed, curated, and assessed over 9,000 of the highest-quality lessons to incorporate into Teach to One: Math.

How does it work?
At the heart of the review process is TTO’s research-based Content Quality Rubric. Lessons are evaluated against academic constructs and mathematics practices aligned to principles of quality content, including Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Math Practice Standards. High-quality lessons must meet standards in four categories.

Alignment: The lesson covers the full breadth of the skill, allows for preparation and extension, fosters conceptual and procedural understanding, and sets up students to demonstrate skill mastery on assessments following the lesson.

Communication: The lesson’s directions and text are clear and concise. Vocabulary is appropriate and student-friendly, prompts students to test multiple strategies, and provides positive reinforcement and motivation. The lesson balances visual and text.

Instructional Strategies: The lesson employs important instructional strategies, such as providing multiple strategies with which to approach problems, in-lesson feedback, support for struggling students, and guidance on how to check work.

Critical Thinking: The lesson provides students opportunities to grapple and reflect in a way that has them make sense of the math being presented. Common misconceptions are identified and addressed.
YEAR 6 RESULTS

In the 17—18 school year, students in Teach to One: Math (TTO) demonstrated strong growth on NWEA’s MAP assessment, a norm-based interim assessment derived from more than 10 million students in the U.S. Participating TTO students, on average, achieved gains in math at 1.5 times the national average.

For the first time, we also have preliminary longitudinal data for students participating in TTO for three years. The results are promising. At all 14 schools that used TTO from 2015—16 to 2017—18, students made the equivalent of 3.8 years of growth on MAP. Perhaps most interestingly, we find that students made extraordinary gains when they attend “MAP Growth-aligned” schools – those subject to external accountability systems that prioritize growth on the MAP test. We have partnered with an independent researcher to validate and further explore these findings, which we expect to be released in early 2019.

OUR FUNDING PARTNERS

The accomplishments outlined in this report could not have been possible without the generosity and strategic guidance of our supporters during the 2017-18 fiscal year and through December 2018.

The following institutions have made single or multi-year commitments of $1 million or more to support New Classrooms:
Anonymous
Arthur & Toni Rembe Rock
Bezos Family Foundation
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Carnegie Corporation of New York
Chan Zuckerberg Education Initiative
Dalio Foundation
Koshland Family Foundation
Michael & Susan Dell Foundation
New Profit
Oak Foundation
Robin Hood Foundation
The Moriah Fund

The following institutions and individuals have contributed support in the 2018 fiscal year:
Anonymous
Anonymous
Anonymous
Ayoka Jackson
Barr Foundation
Benjamin Friedman
Bloomberg Philanthropies
Bloria Gordon
BNY Mellon Foundation
Carson Family Charitable Trust
Cedomir Crnkovic
Centerbridge Foundation
Charissa Fernandez
Chockstone Fund
Chris Rush & Blair Heiser
Crown Family Philanthropies
Danielle Collamer
Douglas Borchard & Barbara Talcott
Emma Bloomberg
Epic Foundation
Finnegan Family Foundation
Freeport-McMoRan Foundation
George Link, Jr. Foundation
IPC Systems, Inc.
J.C. Kellogg Foundation
Jeff Wetzler
Joel Rose & Doris Cooper
John Jarvis
Joseph & Carson Gleberman
Julie Rubenstein
Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation
LearnZillion, Inc.
Marsha & Jim McCormick
Matthew Hooper
Max Goodman
Namita Mody
Nasiri Foundation
Neeraj Bewtra & Barbara Deli
Neil Barua
News Corp. Foundation
Palmina M. Fava
Paul J. Massey, Jr.
Relativity
Robert & Lorraine Reeder
Robert Camp
Robert Jain
Shavar Jeffries
Stavis Charitable Foundation
Stephen Kohut
Susan & Louis Zinterhofer
The Anderson Family Charitable Foundation
The Bewtra Charity Fund
The David B. Golub & Lisa Piazza Charitable Fund
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The Mark Zurack & Kathy Ferguson Foundation
The Nellie Mae Education Foundation
The Trey Beck Charitable Fund
Tiger Foundation
Timothy Finley
Todd H. Larsen/Larsen Fund
Vera Aryeh
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APPENDIX A: SCHOOL DATA SHEETS

School Data Sheets
The test result data included in this report were drawn from the implementations of Teach to One: Math (TTO) at 35 partner schools during the 2017–18 school year. At each participating school, students in Teach to One: Math took at least two assessments: one that measures growth (MAP) and one that measures student performance relative to grade-level standards (annual state math exams).

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP) Growth Assessments
In order to measure student gains in mathematics, New Classrooms administers NWEA’s MAP Growth assessment three times per year, or in accordance with a partner district’s own MAP administration calendar. A pre- and post-test is necessary for determining student growth during the course of a school year.

The MAP is aligned with the Common Core State Standards. Students who take the MAP receive a RIT score, which is assigned against a curriculum scale that uses the difficulty of individual questions to estimate student achievement. Individual student RIT scores have the same meaning independent of a student’s grade level, but these scores can be compared to national averages for a given grade, and gains made from fall to spring can be compared to the national average for students in a given grade, as determined and released by NWEA.

In the summer of 2015, NWEA released new national average growth norms, based on an extensive study of a larger pool of student test data than was available when NWEA did its last norming study in 2011. Across most grades and growth periods, the 2015 growth norms are slightly higher than the 2011 norms, while the 2015 status norms are slightly lower. In other words, under the new norms, students, on average, start the year with lower RIT scores, but grow more during the school year. This change better captures the summer learning loss that many students experience.

Both norms, however, are an inadequate counterfactual to how students in TTO would have performed had they not experienced the TTO learning model. While the national average provides some mooring in what is normal growth for students in the same grade, it doesn’t control for all the variables that make a school environment unique: school culture, teacher quality, peer effects, district mandates, etc. Thus, in the absence of a more rigorous study that can control for these variables, it is important to keep in mind the limitations of national norms.

Because these exams measure growth, only students who were present for both the pre- and post-administrations of the MAP exam are included in the MAP data sample for each school. Furthermore, to help ensure data integrity, New Classrooms only includes students who meet the NWEA’s high stakes testing guidelines. Acknowledging that MAP tests, which are designed to be formative assessments, are sometimes used in high-stakes scenarios, NWEA has published guidelines for MAP testing that help ensure the validity and reliability of the data. Because MAP is the primary means of stakeholder evaluation of TTO, New Classrooms follows the high-stakes guidelines for MAP re-testing recommendations and evaluation data filtering.

Guidance for Administering MAP Growth
New Classrooms also uses student MAP scores to determine where students are academically in relation to a national sample of students. On each of the following school data sheets, we provide the Approximate Starting Point for incoming students, comparing the average starting point in the school’s incoming grade to the national average incoming MAP score for that grade.

Each assessment is evaluated separately. Once an assessment is identified as potentially invalid, it is kept out of any growth period analysis. When analyzing growth for a student, both tests from the time period chosen need to be valid. For example, fall to spring comparison requires fall and spring MAP tests to be “good”, but not the winter MAP. Approximately 30% of our students are filtered out of each growth period. We only report on subgroups with 25 students or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score Based Guidelines</th>
<th>Time Based Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical Scenario</td>
<td>Typical fall to winter MAP Growth ranges from approximately 2 RIT points (9th grade norms) to 6 RIT points (5th grade norms), and typical Winter to Spring MAP growth ranges from approximately 1 RIT point (9th grade norms) to 5 RIT points (5th grade norms)</td>
<td>Typical time spent on the MAP test is approximately 30—50 minutes. If a student spends a great deal less time on an assessment compared to the previous or subsequent test, it calls into question the student’s level of effort. The test will thus be considered invalid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>- For returning students with prior year MAP data, drop of 10 points or more from spring of prior year</td>
<td>- For returning students with prior year MAP data, student spent 30 minutes or more on spring test than fall test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>- Drop of 10 points or more from fall test</td>
<td>- Student spent 30 minutes or more on fall test than winter test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>- Drop of 10 points or more from winter test</td>
<td>- Student spent 30 minutes or more on spring test than winter test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for an Invalid Assessment
- Student spent 30 minutes or more on winter test than fall test
- Student spent 30 minutes or more on test than winter test
State Exams
Students participating in Teach to One: Math across 35 partner schools also took state-mandated exams specific to their school’s home state:

- Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)
- Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium
- New York State Math Exam
- Georgia Milestones Exam
- Oklahoma Common Core Curriculum Exam
- Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System Exam

All students who were on TTO rosters at the end of the school year are included in the state test results summary. We have not applied any filters. In instances where we could not obtain student level results matched to our rosters, we use publicly reported data, which may include a handful of students who were not served by New Classrooms. We hope that the following School Data Sheets will help further our goals of transparency and shared learning.

ASCEND (Education for Change)
Education for Change Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Morgan Alconcher
Initial Program Year: 2014—15
Grades Served: 6—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 155

Demographic Information:
- White: 1%
- Black: 1%
- Hispanic: 94%
- Asian: 3%
- ELL: 60%
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 93%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 204
Approx Starting Point: 2 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ascend MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>215.35</td>
<td>218.80</td>
<td>224.28</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>206.80</td>
<td>209.85</td>
<td>214.97</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering map-growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ascend SBAC Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bear Creek Middle School**  
Fulton County School District: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Anthony Newbold  
**Initial Program Year:** 2015—16  
**Grades Served:** 6—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 985

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 3%  
- Black: 84%  
- Hispanic: 12%  
- Asian: <1%  
- ELL: 0%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 83%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 205.51  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bear Creek MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>212.03</td>
<td>214.80</td>
<td>217.08</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>205.51</td>
<td>210.19</td>
<td>213.53</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>211.61</td>
<td>212.91</td>
<td>215.05</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>216.81</td>
<td>218.67</td>
<td>220.07</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>208.13</td>
<td>211.41</td>
<td>213.71</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>228.86</td>
<td>229.57</td>
<td>231.77</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth).

**Bennie Dover Jackson Middle School**  
New London Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Alison Burdick  
**Initial Program Year:** 2015—16  
**Grades Served:** 6—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 307

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 13%  
- Black: 28%  
- Hispanic: 52%  
- Asian: 1%  
- ELL: 21%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 81%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 205.03  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bennie Dover MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>210.22</td>
<td>214.13</td>
<td>216.96</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>205.03</td>
<td>208.82</td>
<td>212.64</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>209.03</td>
<td>212.44</td>
<td>215.39</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>216.01</td>
<td>220.48</td>
<td>222.40</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>205.15</td>
<td>208.86</td>
<td>211.35</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>228.52</td>
<td>233.16</td>
<td>236.87</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>194.67</td>
<td>196.09</td>
<td>198.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>198.51</td>
<td>200.30</td>
<td>202.74</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth).

**Bear Creek Georgia Milestones Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bear Creek Georgia Milestones Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bennie Dover SBAC Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bennie Dover SBAC Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Building 21 High School**
Allentown School District: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Janine Mathesz
**Initial Program Year:** 2016—17
**Grades Served:** 9
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 168

**Demographic Information:**
- White: 14%
- Black: 67%
- Hispanic: 2%
- Asian: 0%
- ELL: 14%
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 100%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**
Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 208.46
Approx Starting Point: 4 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building 21 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>208.46</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>211.60</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>208.46</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>211.60</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>208.46</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>211.60</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Camp Creek Middle School**
Fulton County School District: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Keynun Campbell
**Initial Program Year:** 2014—15
**Grades Served:** 6—8
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 537

**Demographic Information:**
- White: 1%
- Black: 96%
- Hispanic: 2%
- Asian: <1%
- ELL: 0%
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 91%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**
Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 206.51
Approx Starting Point: 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Creek MAP DATA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>212.63</td>
<td>213.56</td>
<td>217.05</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>206.51</td>
<td>207.38</td>
<td>211.84</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>213.80</td>
<td>214.15</td>
<td>218.24</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>217.58</td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td>221.10</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>205.74</td>
<td>206.78</td>
<td>209.93</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>229.93</td>
<td>230.69</td>
<td>234.86</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Camp Creek Georgia Milestones Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Creek Georgia Milestones Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering map-growth.

***There is no culminating state test for 9th graders in Pennsylvania
Cornerstone Academy for Social Action
New York City Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Jamaal Bowman
Initial Program Year: 2017—18
Grades Served: 6—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 258

Demographic Information:
White: 3%
Black: 64%
Hispanic: 33%
Asian: 0%
ELL: 2%
Free/Reduced Lunch: N/A

CASA MAP Data | N | TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score | TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score | TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score | TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
All Students** | 171 | 215.75 | 216.95 | 220.04 | 4.29
6th Grade | 58 | 207.31 | 209.73 | 214.22 | 6.91
7th Grade | 49 | 213.72 | 214.08 | 215.86 | 2.14
8th Grade | 64 | 225.63 | 226.92 | 229.19 | 3.56
Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT) | 105 | 207.74 | 209.22 | 211.86 | 4.12
On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher) | 66 | 231.94 | 232.64 | 236.50 | 4.56
Special Education | 25 | 205.65 | 205.40 | 208.09 | 2.44
English Language Learner* | 3 | NA | NA | NA | NA

* N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup
** Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

Casa New York State Exam | N | % Level 1 | % Level 2 | % Level 3 | % Level 4 | % Proficient
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
All Students | 128 | 59% | 30% | 10% | 1% | 11%
6th Grade | 73 | 57% | 34% | 6% | 3% | 9%
7th Grade | 55 | 61% | 25% | 13% | 0% | 13%
8th Grade*** | 55 | 61% | 25% | 13% | 0% | 13%

***8th grade not included in data file shared by school

Chestnut TAG Middle School
Springfield School District: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Colleen O’Connor
Initial Program Year: 2016—17
Grades Served: 6—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 255

Demographic Information:
White: 14%
Black: 15%
Hispanic: 66%
Asian: 3%
ELL: 7%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 66%

Chestnut TAG MAP Data | N | TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score | TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score | TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score | TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
All Students** | 186 | 228.93 | 232.78 | 236.05 | 7.12
6th Grade | 71 | 223.55 | 225.83 | 229.89 | 6.34
7th Grade | 63 | 227.06 | 232.21 | 235.82 | 8.76
8th Grade | 52 | 236.02 | 239.92 | 242.21 | 6.19
Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT) | 52 | 213.10 | 217.40 | 220.98 | 7.88
On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher) | 134 | 235.04 | 238.69 | 241.86 | 6.82
Special Education* | 2 | NA | NA | NA | NA
English Language Learner | 35 | 224.60 | 228.15 | 231.49 | 6.89

* N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup
** Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

Chestnut TAG PARCC Exam | N | % Level 1 | % Level 2 | % Level 3 | % Level 4 | % Proficient
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
All Students | 269 | 5% | 36% | 55% | 4% | 59%
6th Grade | 100 | 5% | 44% | 48% | 3% | 31%
7th Grade | 89 | 2% | 33% | 62% | 3% | 65%
8th Grade | 80 | 6% | 30% | 58% | 8% | 64%

---
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### William P. Gray Elementary School
Chicago Public Schools: 2017–2018 SY

**Principal:** Susan Gross  
**Initial Program Year:** 2012–13  
**Grades Served:** 6–8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 330

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 11%  
- Black: 2%  
- Hispanic: 84%  
- Asian: 2%  
- ELL: 26%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 93%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 214.64

**Approx Starting Point:** 1 year below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gray MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220.32</td>
<td>225.63</td>
<td>231.29</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>216.90</td>
<td>223.47</td>
<td>230.47</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>224.04</td>
<td>228.91</td>
<td>233.85</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>220.35</td>
<td>224.64</td>
<td>228.37</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>210.21</td>
<td>215.81</td>
<td>222.29</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>230.96</td>
<td>236.02</td>
<td>240.93</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>207.89</td>
<td>215.54</td>
<td>220.42</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** *N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

### Nathan Hale Jr. High School
Tulsa Public Schools: 2017–2018 SY

**Principal:** Jody Parsons  
**Initial Program Year:** 2016–17  
**Grades Served:** 7–8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 419

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 21%  
- Black: 21%  
- Hispanic: 41%  
- Asian: 1%  
- ELL: 20%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 91%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 207.68

**Approx Starting Point:** 2.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hale JHS MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>208.72</td>
<td>212.72</td>
<td>215.07</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>207.68</td>
<td>211.31</td>
<td>214.01</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>209.33</td>
<td>213.55</td>
<td>215.69</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>203.78</td>
<td>208.17</td>
<td>210.44</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>230.76</td>
<td>233.10</td>
<td>235.84</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>197.05</td>
<td>202.26</td>
<td>205.16</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>209.42</td>
<td>214.12</td>
<td>215.69</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** *Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

### Gray PARCC Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gray JHS Oklahoma State Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hale JHS Oklahoma State Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hale JHS Oklahoma State Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holyoke High School
Holyoke Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Stephen Mahoney
Initial Program Year: 2017—18
Grades Served: 6—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 210

Demographic Information:
White: 23%
Black: 2%
Hispanic: 73%
Asian: 1%
ELL: 20%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 70%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 9th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 209.17
Approx Starting Point: 4 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holyoke MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>209.17</td>
<td>210.26</td>
<td>213.95</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>209.17</td>
<td>210.26</td>
<td>213.95</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>207.99</td>
<td>209.08</td>
<td>212.61</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>204.57</td>
<td>209.08</td>
<td>210.27</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering map-growth.

Holyoke State Test Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

***There is no culminating state test for 9th graders in Massachusetts

IPrep Academy
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Larry Roodenburg
Initial Program Year: 2013—14
Grades Served: 5—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 184

Demographic Information:
White: 9%
Black: 24%
Hispanic: 65%
Asian: 1%
ELL: 12%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 83%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 5th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 209.94
Approx Starting Point: On Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPrep8 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>216.58</td>
<td>219.53</td>
<td>223.64</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>220.46</td>
<td>222.77</td>
<td>226.94</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>222.00</td>
<td>225.45</td>
<td>228.27</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>210.03</td>
<td>214.13</td>
<td>217.43</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>226.73</td>
<td>228.05</td>
<td>233.30</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering map-growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPrep8 PARCC Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***There is no culminating state test for 9th graders in Massachusetts
**Learn 6 Campus in North Chicago**

**LEARN Charter School Network: 2017—2018 SY**

**Principal:** Kelly Tyson  
**Initial Program Year:** 2015—16  
**Grades Served:** 5—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 194

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 16%  
- Black: 42%  
- Hispanic: 36%  
- Asian: 2%  
- ELL: 16%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 54%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 5th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 217  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1 years above grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP DATA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>219.48</td>
<td>223.88</td>
<td>227.09</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>217.00</td>
<td>221.93</td>
<td>225.87</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>217.37</td>
<td>221.24</td>
<td>224.89</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>220.33</td>
<td>226.94</td>
<td>229.21</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>209.47</td>
<td>213.20</td>
<td>216.24</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>228.03</td>
<td>232.94</td>
<td>236.32</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
- *N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup  
- **Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.*

**PARCC Exam**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCC Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**McCurdy Charter School**

**Fulton County School District: 2017—2018 SY**

**Principal:**  
**Initial Program Year:** 2017—18  
**Grades Served:** 5—6  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 84

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 1%  
- Black: N/A  
- Hispanic: 98%  
- Asian: N/A  
- ELL: N/A  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: N/A

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 5th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 199.52  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1 year below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>202.20</td>
<td>206.93</td>
<td>211.58</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>199.52</td>
<td>206.23</td>
<td>211.69</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>204.62</td>
<td>207.85</td>
<td>211.62</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>197.54</td>
<td>201.84</td>
<td>206.87</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
- *N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup  
- **Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.*

**PARCC Exam***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCC Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
- ***School did not provide state test data.
McLain Junior High School  
Tulsa Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** John Williams  
**Initial Program Year:** 2016—17  
**Grades Served:** 8—9  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 337

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 12%  
- Black: 49%  
- Hispanic: 21%  
- Asian: 0%  
- ELL: 13%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 83%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 8th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 202.12  
**Approx Starting Point:** 4 years below grade level

**McLain MAP Data**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>207.32</td>
<td>213.14</td>
<td>215.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>202.12</td>
<td>207.26</td>
<td>209.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade +</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>210.32</td>
<td>216.53</td>
<td>218.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>205.87</td>
<td>211.85</td>
<td>213.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup
*Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA's High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth).

**Oklahoma State Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade +</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mendota Junior High School  
Mendota Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Travis Kirby  
**Initial Program Year:** 2017—18  
**Grades Served:** 7  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 92

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: N/A  
- Black: N/A  
- Hispanic: N/A  
- Asian: N/A  
- ELL: 55%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 99%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 7th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 201.3  
**Approx Starting Point:** 3 years below grade level

**Mendota MAP Data**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>201.18</td>
<td>207.09</td>
<td>209.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>201.18</td>
<td>207.09</td>
<td>209.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>201.18</td>
<td>207.09</td>
<td>209.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>199.95</td>
<td>204.95</td>
<td>207.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup
*Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA's High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth).

**Mendota SBAC Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental implementation of TTO, state test data not provided to New Classrooms**
### Mesa Alta Junior High School
Bloomfield School District: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Elvira Crockett  
**Initial Program Year:** 2017—18  
**Grades Served:** 7—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 374

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 24%  
- Black: 1.6%  
- Hispanic: 34%  
- Asian: 1%  
- ELL: N/A  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 76%

#### MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
**Average Incoming 7th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 213.23  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mesa Alta MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>216.70</td>
<td>220.41</td>
<td>224.05</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>213.23</td>
<td>216.99</td>
<td>221.28</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>219.72</td>
<td>223.44</td>
<td>226.48</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>209.20</td>
<td>213.59</td>
<td>216.84</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>232.57</td>
<td>234.81</td>
<td>239.27</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>211.16</td>
<td>214.45</td>
<td>217.45</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  
- *N* too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup
- **Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA's High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth).

#### PARCC Exam***  
**N** | **% Level 1** | **% Level 2** | **% Level 3** | **% Level 4** | **% Level 5** | **% Proficient**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*School only provided proficiency results, not results by level

### Moreau Catholic High School
Hayward Unified School District: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Lisa Tortorich  
**Initial Program Year:** 2016—17  
**Grades Served:** 9—12  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 56

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 14%  
- Black: 4%  
- Hispanic: 19%  
- Asian: 43%  
- ELL: N/A  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: N/A

#### MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
**Average Incoming 9th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 224.9  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moreau MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>224.89</td>
<td>230.67</td>
<td>231.49</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>224.89</td>
<td>230.67</td>
<td>231.49</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>221.81</td>
<td>228.14</td>
<td>228.87</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  
- *N* too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup
- **Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA's High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth).

#### PARCC Exam***  
**N** | **% Level 1** | **% Level 2** | **% Level 3** | **% Level 4** | **% Level 5** | **% Proficient**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***There is no culminating state test for 9th graders in California
**MS 4 - Frank R Conwell Middle School**
Jersey City Public Schools: 2017–2018 SY

**Principal:** Elvira Crockett  
**Initial Program Year:** 2017–18  
**Grades Served:** 6–8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 330

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 16%  
- Black: 25%  
- Hispanic: 49%  
- Asian: 9%  
- ELL: 12%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 67%  

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 207.85  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS4 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>212.68</td>
<td>214.35</td>
<td>215.69</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>207.85</td>
<td>211.11</td>
<td>213.34</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>212.33</td>
<td>212.93</td>
<td>217.13</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>219.06</td>
<td>219.93</td>
<td>220.27</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>208.36</td>
<td>210.66</td>
<td>211.39</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>227.73</td>
<td>227.56</td>
<td>230.68</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

**MS4 PARCC Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MS 88 Peter Rouget**
New York City Public Schools: 2017–2018 SY

**Principal:** Ailene Mitchell  
**Initial Program Year:** 2012–13  
**Grades Served:** 6–8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 339

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 10%  
- Black: 12%  
- Hispanic: 59%  
- Asian: 18%  
- ELL: 14%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 88%  

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 215.88  
**Approx Starting Point:** 0.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS88 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>221.42</td>
<td>226.18</td>
<td>231.62</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>215.88</td>
<td>221.01</td>
<td>227.47</td>
<td>11.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>223.07</td>
<td>226.90</td>
<td>231.84</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>223.61</td>
<td>228.57</td>
<td>233.88</td>
<td>10.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>207.75</td>
<td>212.64</td>
<td>217.70</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>235.51</td>
<td>240.14</td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>209.12</td>
<td>214.34</td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

**MS88 New York State Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nathan Hale Middle School
Norwalk Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Albert Sackey  
**Initial Program Year:** 2016—17  
**Grades Served:** 6—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 623

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 48%  
- Black: 19%  
- Hispanic: 31%  
- Asian: 5%  
- ELL: 6%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 41%

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 216.10  
**Approx Starting Point:** On Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHMS MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>219.39</td>
<td>224.62</td>
<td>227.41</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>216.11</td>
<td>222.43</td>
<td>226.29</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>219.08</td>
<td>223.04</td>
<td>225.33</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>223.26</td>
<td>228.20</td>
<td>230.38</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>209.61</td>
<td>214.94</td>
<td>217.32</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>203.31</td>
<td>208.11</td>
<td>210.31</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NHMS SBAC Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ogden Elementary School**

**Initial Program Year:** 2017—18  
**Grades Served:** 6  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 74

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 0%  
- Black: 1%  
- Hispanic: 99%  
- Asian: 0%  
- ELL: 99%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: N/A

**MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)**

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 205.02  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ogden MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>205.02</td>
<td>206.82</td>
<td>214.47</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>205.02</td>
<td>206.82</td>
<td>214.47</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>201.95</td>
<td>204.05</td>
<td>211.20</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ogden Texas STARR Exam***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***School did not provide state test data. Look for publicly reported data.
Passaic Gifted and Talented Academy
Passaic Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Demographic Information:
White: 1%
Black: 6%
Hispanic: 15%
Asian: 4%
ELL: 13%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 92%

LEARN Romano Butler Campus
LEARN Charter School Network: 2017—2018 SY

Demographic Information:
White: <1%
Black: 95%
Hispanic: 4%
Asian: 0%
ELL: 3%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 96%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 4th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 210.98
Approx Starting Point: 1 year above grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passaic MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>215.10</td>
<td>219.81</td>
<td>225.15</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>210.98</td>
<td>220.17</td>
<td>223.43</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>211.41</td>
<td>215.66</td>
<td>221.48</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>220.26</td>
<td>225.09</td>
<td>230.39</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>217.80</td>
<td>216.76</td>
<td>222.98</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>205.67</td>
<td>211.57</td>
<td>216.54</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>220.75</td>
<td>224.09</td>
<td>229.94</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

Passaic PARCC Exam | N | % Level 1 | % Level 2 | % Level 3 | % Level 4 | % Level 5 | %Proficient
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEARN 6 PARCC Exam | N | % Level 1 | % Level 2 | % Level 3 | % Level 4 | % Level 5 | %Proficient
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.
Roosevelt Middle School
Oakland Unified Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Demographic Information:
- White: 1%
- Black: 96%
- Hispanic: 2%
- Asian: 0%
- ELL: 35%
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 27%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 201.61
Approx Starting Point: 2 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roosevelt MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>210.38</td>
<td>213.27</td>
<td>217.62</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>201.61</td>
<td>205.78</td>
<td>211.81</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>210.04</td>
<td>213.71</td>
<td>217.58</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>218.81</td>
<td>220.34</td>
<td>223.36</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>201.11</td>
<td>203.77</td>
<td>208.04</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>236.47</td>
<td>239.91</td>
<td>244.43</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>199.27</td>
<td>201.83</td>
<td>205.85</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

George Washington School 1
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Demographic Information:
- White: 6%
- Black: 39%
- Hispanic: 54%
- Asian: 1%
- ELL: 7%
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 88%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 209.41
Approx Starting Point: 1 year below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 1 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>209.84</td>
<td>209.53</td>
<td>214.36</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>205.70</td>
<td>206.04</td>
<td>211.09</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

** Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.
### School 3 Nicholas S. La Corte Peterstown
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Jennifer A. Campbell  
**Initial Program Year:** 2015—16  
**Grades Served:** 6—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 226

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 3%  
- Black: 16%  
- Hispanic: 80%  
- Asian: <1%  
- ELL: 23%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 89%

### Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 207.07  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 3 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>210.80</td>
<td>218.17</td>
<td>222.02</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>207.07</td>
<td>213.26</td>
<td>217.42</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>207.67</td>
<td>216.24</td>
<td>220.91</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>218.10</td>
<td>224.25</td>
<td>227.20</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200.99</td>
<td>210.34</td>
<td>214.58</td>
<td>13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>230.93</td>
<td>234.46</td>
<td>237.69</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

### School 9 Jerome Dunn Academy
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Yalitza Torres  
**Initial Program Year:** 2014—15  
**Grades Served:** 6—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 223

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 2%  
- Black: 29%  
- Hispanic: 67%  
- Asian: 1%  
- ELL: 35%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 91%

### Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 206.07  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 9 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>211.55</td>
<td>215.12</td>
<td>216.89</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>206.07</td>
<td>211.54</td>
<td>213.54</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>210.97</td>
<td>215.83</td>
<td>215.27</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>217.16</td>
<td>219.70</td>
<td>221.67</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>204.07</td>
<td>207.60</td>
<td>208.64</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>229.94</td>
<td>233.89</td>
<td>237.06</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200.13</td>
<td>202.48</td>
<td>203.16</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

### PARCC Exam Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 3 PARCC Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 9 PARCC Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School 18 Robert Morris
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Oscar Crespo
Initial Program Year: 2015—16
Grades Served: 5—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 226

Demographic Information:
White: 29%
Black: 11%
Hispanic: 49%
Asian: 5%
ELL: 4%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 47%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 5th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 200.30
Approx Starting Point: 1 year below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 18 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>214.97</td>
<td>218.29</td>
<td>222.42</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200.30</td>
<td>202.52</td>
<td>208.40</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>218.48</td>
<td>221.04</td>
<td>226.48</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>204.98</td>
<td>209.02</td>
<td>212.91</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>229.40</td>
<td>231.61</td>
<td>236.17</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

School 21 Victor Mravlag
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Anthony Newbold
Initial Program Year: 2015—16
Grades Served: 5—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 189

Demographic Information:
White: 34%
Black: 8%
Hispanic: 56%
Asian: 2%
ELL: 16%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 47%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 5th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 213.44
Approx Starting Point: On Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 21 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>218.37</td>
<td>223.15</td>
<td>225.93</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>213.44</td>
<td>216.45</td>
<td>219.59</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>214.29</td>
<td>220.50</td>
<td>223.47</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>207.64</td>
<td>214.37</td>
<td>215.42</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>226.69</td>
<td>230.29</td>
<td>234.11</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.
School 23 Nicholas Murray Butler
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Berthenia Harmon-Carolina
Initial Program Year: 2015—16
Grades Served: 6—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 190

Demographic Information:
White: 5%
Black: 46%
Hispanic: 45%
Asian: 4%
ELL: 16%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 86%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 201.09
Approx Starting Point: 2 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 23 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All Students** 77 213.25 216.81 220.13 6.88
6th Grade* 20 NA NA NA NA
7th Grade 40 216.61 220.12 224.64 8.03
8th Grade* 17 NA NA NA NA
Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT) 47 205.03 210.22 212.90 7.87
On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher) 30 230.83 231.56 236.16 5.33
Special Education* 8 NA NA NA NA
English Language Learner* 8 NA NA NA NA

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

School 28 Duarte-Marti
Elizabeth Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

Principal: Evelyn Rodriguez-Salcedo
Initial Program Year: 2015—16
Grades Served: 6—8
Total # of Students in TTO: 273

Demographic Information:
White: 3%
Black: 14%
Hispanic: 82%
Asian: 1%
ELL: 27%
Free/Reduced Lunch: 86%

MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017): 205.18
Approx Starting Point: 1 ½ years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 28 MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All Students** 144 208.66 212.71 216.19 7.53
6th Grade 53 205.18 208.52 212.75 7.57
7th Grade 43 205.49 211.47 215.89 10.40
8th Grade 48 215.45 218.52 220.37 4.92
Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT) 114 203.83 208.23 212.28 8.45
On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher) 30 229.26 231.56 233.29 4.03
Special Education* 9 NA NA NA NA
English Language Learner* 18 NA NA NA NA

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.
## Taos Middle School
Taos Municipal Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Principal Alfred Cordova  
**Initial Program Year:** 2017—18  
**Grades Served:** 6  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 130

**Demographic Information:**  
- White:  
- Black:  
- Hispanic:  
- Asian:  
- ELL:  
- Free/Reduced Lunch:

### MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 208.52  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1 year below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taos MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>208.52</td>
<td>212.71</td>
<td>219.20</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>208.52</td>
<td>212.71</td>
<td>219.20</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>203.32</td>
<td>207.33</td>
<td>214.13</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup**

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

## Daniel Webster Middle School
Tulsa Public Schools: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Shelly Holman  
**Initial Program Year:** 2017—18  
**Grades Served:** 6—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 325

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 36%  
- Black: 20%  
- Hispanic: 15%  
- Asian: 4%  
- ELL: 3%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 92%

### MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)
**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 204.93  
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Webster MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Avg Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>209.02</td>
<td>210.55</td>
<td>213.55</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>204.93</td>
<td>205.51</td>
<td>209.53</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>210.70</td>
<td>213.01</td>
<td>216.50</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>211.23</td>
<td>213.05</td>
<td>214.91</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>205.28</td>
<td>207.27</td>
<td>210.11</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>229.36</td>
<td>228.79</td>
<td>232.50</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>195.62</td>
<td>195.76</td>
<td>198.56</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup**

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Webster Oklahoma State Exam</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
<th>% Level 5</th>
<th>% Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)
**Average Incoming 9th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 221.2
**Approx Starting Point:** 2 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wonderful HS MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>221.20</td>
<td>224.68</td>
<td>228.34</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>221.20</td>
<td>224.68</td>
<td>228.34</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>214.42</td>
<td>218.35</td>
<td>221.29</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.)*

### Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)
**Average Incoming 6th Grade RIT Score (Fall 2017):** 205.26
**Approx Starting Point:** 1.5 years below grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wonderful MAP Data</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall 2017 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Winter 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Spring 2018 RIT Score</th>
<th>TTO Average Fall to Spring Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students**</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>210.21</td>
<td>213.67</td>
<td>219.26</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>205.26</td>
<td>208.53</td>
<td>216.11</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>208.81</td>
<td>211.62</td>
<td>216.66</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>215.78</td>
<td>219.29</td>
<td>224.08</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade (Lower than Natl. Avg. RIT)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>204.00</td>
<td>207.59</td>
<td>212.85</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Above (At Natl. Avg. RIT or higher)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>230.35</td>
<td>233.53</td>
<td>240.19</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>202.33</td>
<td>205.33</td>
<td>209.81</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N too small after NWEA High Stakes filtering to report on this subgroup

**Results reflect the performance of all full-time participating students who took the MAP in both time periods needed for a growth score, less those whose administration failed to meet NWEA’s High Stakes Testing Guidelines in either time period. More information can be found at: [https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.](https://www.nwea.org/resource-library/research/guidance-for-administering-map-growth.)*

---

### Wonderful College Prep High School
Kern County Office of Education: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Kenny Moore  
**Initial Program Year:** 2016—17  
**Grades Served:** 9  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 150

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 1%  
- Black: 1%  
- Hispanic: 94%  
- Asian: 3%  
- ELL: 60%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 93%

---

### Wonderful College Prep Middle School
Kern County Office of Education: 2017—2018 SY

**Principal:** Kenny Moore  
**Initial Program Year:** 2016—17  
**Grades Served:** 6—8  
**Total # of Students in TTO:** 427

**Demographic Information:**  
- White: 1%  
- Black: 1%  
- Hispanic: 94%  
- Asian: 1%  
- ELL: 23%  
- Free/Reduced Lunch: 90%
APPENDIX B: NWEA Norms for 2011 and 2015

The following MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP) math growth results use national grade level growth norms, from both 2011 and 2015 norming studies, as a comparison.

### 2011 Student Mathematics Growth Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Winter Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Spring Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Fall of Next Grade Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>143.7</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>25,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>20,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>176.2</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>25,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>195.1</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>25,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>203.8</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>25,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>212.9</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>25,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>219.6</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>25,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>225.6</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>25,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>230.2</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>25,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>233.8</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>25,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>25,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>236.0</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>25,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2015 Student Mathematics Growth Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>To Winter</th>
<th>To Spring</th>
<th>To Next Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>140.04</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>162.42</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>176.90</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>190.40</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>201.94</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>211.44</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>217.62</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>222.65</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>226.30</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>230.27</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>230.06</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C: Audited FY18 Financials

Ending June 30, 2018
Fiscal Year 2018 Financial Snapshot

**FINANCES**

**Fiscal Year 2018 Financial Snapshot**

**Audited**

### CONTRIBUTIONS

- **Individuals** $1,205,312 6.3%
- **Foundations & Corps.** $12,390,400 64.8%
- **Government Grants** $1,024,581 5.4%
- **Program Service Fees Pro Bono Services** $4,324,361 22.6%
- **Other Revenue** $138,228 0.7%

### EXPENSES

- **Program Services** $13,558,256 78%
- **Management and General** $2,818,239 16%
- **Fundraising** $909,950 5%
- **Occupancy & Related Costs** $17,286,445 100%

### Change in Net Assets

$1,829,011