

**Sargent School District  
Annual Report to the Public  
January 1, 2009**

*(To fulfill Colorado's Accreditation and No Child Left Behind Reporting Requirements)*

**District Improvement Plan Progress Report**

(Goals are from the 2007-08 Board of Education Charge to Administration, Faculty and Committees)

**Goal #1 –**

Continue to work with the community, architects and bonding company to develop a long-range plan for improvement of the district's education facility.

**Objectives:**

The district's objective is to improve educational facilities and create a safe and up-to-date environment which is conducive to student achievement.

**Implementation:**

In January, 2007 architects were interviewed and Neenan Company was selected. The district's Facility Committee and Board of Education worked throughout the year to develop a long range plan for facilities. In February, 2008 a collaborative design session took place; board members, staff and community members worked with Neenan representatives to develop a plan for construction of a new secondary school building and gymnasium.

**Results/Status of Goal:**

In November, 2008 voters approved a bond issue to help fund the project. It is anticipated applications for BEST funds will be available in January 2009, and the district will submit an application at that time. The scope of the project may be adjusted depending on the outcome of the BEST application and funds available.

**Goal #2 –**

Set a standard of high achievement for the SAR report as generated from Colorado Department of Education

**Objectives:**

It is the district's objective to maintain a high standard of academic achievement as indicated by High ratings on each school's School Accountability Report.

**Implementation:**

In order to maintain or increase the academic achievement level of all Sargent students, an RTI (Response to Intervention) model will be put into place. The RTI approach will assess student performance, monitor achievement growth, and will recommend appropriate interventions when necessary. RTI teams including teachers, parents, principals, and any other individuals that would be required to make decisions concerning individual students will meet as often as necessary to ensure academic growth.

Building principals and teachers will monitor individual student growth, classroom and grade level growth, school and district-wide growth.

**Results/Status of Goal:**

Sargent Elementary, Sargent Junior High and Sargent High School each received a high rating on the overall academic performance on state assessments.

**Goal #4 –**

Continue to review secondary math curriculum with new staff. Goals include alignment with state standards, articulation between all secondary math classes and begin to identify bench marks and assessments.

**Objectives:**

It is the district's objective to align math curriculum with state standards for secondary grades, and to achieve efficient transition between grade levels. Also to begin the process of identifying benchmarks and assessments; these objectives will improve student learning and achievement.

**Implementation:**

The Jr./Sr. High is underway with 7-12 curriculum alignment. We have worked from state standards from the start of the school year. The junior high is benchmarking with STAR testing, NWEA is sending on MAPS information for benchmarking and progress monitoring at the high school level (2009-2010), alignment ideas are being developed regarding grade school to junior high transitions and pre and post testing is being done to gauge growth in students in secondary math. Consideration and selection of new text books will contribute to the efficient transition between grade levels as they will provide consistency when it comes to presenting concepts, use of vocabulary, etc. Established math teachers are mentoring younger teachers regarding the raising of rigor and relevance within the department. Math teachers are meeting as a department as well as forwarding information and recommendations regarding students and the RTI process. Also, the discussion concerning forming a vertical team k-12 is beginning.

**Results/Status of Goal:**

Math staff is going through samples from publishers to narrow down the book series of interest. Junior high testing has afforded the junior high the ability to place students according to their abilities and their measured growth during the school year. High school testing will be implemented to start the 2009-2010 school year. The mentorship and department meetings have allowed for students to be placed in the RTI process to develop growth plans and goals. The 7-12 alignment process is expected to be complete by the end of the spring semester, with in-tandem alignment with the primary grades continuing into the summer. The purchase of new materials and books, based on the aligned recommendations are expected for arrival to start the next school year.

**Goal #5 –** Implement objectives of the enhancing Education Through Technology Grant (Elementary and Secondary)

**Objectives:**

It is the district's goal to achieve one on one computing for students, and also to provide 24 hour access to laptops for teaching staff. Accomplishing this objective would not only enable teachers to improve classroom learning it would provide access for all students and allow for research and a connection for students and parents to teachers and class information.

**Implementation:**

The goal is to be accomplished over a two year period. We evaluated present numbers and types of computers which included an analysis of an initial six-month trial of six tablets and our network access capacity. Upon approval of the EETT Grant Gateway Notebook Tablets were purchased for teachers and students. Teachers received intensive training and implemented one-to-one computing for students. One to one computing has been established in grades 7-12 and two to one in grades K-6. The computers were purchased with a combination of grant and district funds.

**Results/Status of Goal:**

The impact of moving to one to one computing has been very positive. In addition to the obvious benefits for students at the secondary level, classroom learning is enhanced through the use of smart boards and individual instruction improved through this technology. Communication has greatly increased through the improvement of the district website and addition of teacher pages. Parents and students may access information and communicate with staff members. At the elementary level the first year of implementation revealed many parents preference was for their children to have access to the laptops at school, but not have 24-hour access. The inventory of all computers was thoroughly reviewed and in the second year of implementation smaller laptops which are more appropriate for younger students were purchased. With the addition of the new laptops and a redistribution of existing computers, the one to two computing ratio is working well at the elementary level.

**Goal #7 –**

Complete the elementary math curriculum with a focus on bench marks and assessments

**Objectives:**

Completion of the math curriculum, bench marking and assessments is a first step toward improving student learning and achievement.

**Implementation:**

Results from our 2007 CSAP assessments and AIMS web Early Numeracy and Mathematics-CBM measures indicate a need for a concentrated focus in the area of mathematics. Sargent Elementary School will be using the current Math Benchmarks and Standards document on file.

**Results/Status of Goal:**

A committee of teachers has been selected and the review, evaluation and selection of a new Math text book/program will begin the end of March. Following our selection, a team of teachers will be aligning assessments with our curriculum. Professional development will be planned for late summer, in order for teachers to implement the new math material in an efficient and effective manner.

## ASSESSMENT DATA

Colorado's state assessment system includes three different types of assessments to measure student achievement. The main assessment used in the state is the CSAP, which assesses students in reading, writing and math state standards in grades 3 through 10. The CSAP science assessment is also given in 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade. The second assessment available is for students in third and fourth grade who are receiving instruction in Spanish. The Lectura is the Spanish reading version of the CSAP and the Escritura is the Spanish writing version of the CSAP. These assessments are scored with the following ratings: Unsatisfactory (student is not demonstrating knowledge of the content standards), Partially Proficient (student is beginning to demonstrate knowledge on the standards), Proficient (student is meeting the standards), Advanced (student is above and beyond the standards), and No Score (the student was unable to complete the test). The third assessment, the CSAPA (CSAP Alternate), is available for use with students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. It is used to assess reading, writing, math and science content knowledge. Only about 1% of students in Colorado take the CSAPA.

The following show our district and schools' results from the various assessments:

*(Please note—"NA" indicates numbers are too small to report)*

### Third Grade CSAP- Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	Percent Unsatisfactory	Percent Partially Proficient	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced	Percent No Score
All	2008	5.56%	2.78%	91.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	2007	0.00%	11.11	74.07%	14.81%	0.00%
White	2008	3.57%	3.57%	92.86%	0.00%	0.00%
	2007	0.00%	5.56%	72.22%	22.22%	0.00%
Hispanic	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian	2008	8.70%	4.35%	86.96%	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English language learners	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
State Average	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
					NA	NA

**Colorado Department of Education**

**CSAP Results**

**District:** 2750 - Sargent RE-33J

**3rd Grade CSAP Results: Writing**

<b>Disaggregated Groups</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>% Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient</b>	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced</b>	<b>% No Score</b>
State Average	2008	6.68%	42.93%	39.73%	10.39%	0.27%
	2007	5.59%	39.79%	45.58%	8.74%	0.30%
District Average	2008	2.78%	47.22%	47.22%	2.78%	0.00%
	2007	3.70%	25.93%	55.56%	14.81%	0.00%
White	2008	3.57%	46.43%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	2007	0.00%	33.33%	44.44%	22.22%	0.00%
Hispanic	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2008	4.35%	43.48%	52.17%	0.00%	0.00%
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Colorado Department of  
Education**

**CSAP Results**

**District:** 2750 - Sargent RE-33J

**3rd Grade CSAP Results: Math**

<b>Disaggregated Groups</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>% Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient</b>	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced</b>	<b>% No Score</b>
State Average	2008	7.99%	22.04%	39.84%	29.81%	0.32%
	2007	7.39%	24.02%	42.97%	25.33%	0.29%
District Average	2008	2.78%	25.00%	63.89%	8.33%	0.00%
	2007	3.70%	7.41%	48.15%	40.74%	0.00%
White	2008	3.57%	25.00%	60.71%	10.71%	0.00%
	2007	0.00%	11.11%	50.00%	38.89%	0.00%
Hispanic	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2008	4.35%	17.39%	69.57%	8.70%	0.00%
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Colorado Department of Education**

**CSAP Results**

**District:** 2750 - Sargent RE-33J

**4th Grade CSAP Results: Reading**

<b>Disaggregated Groups</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>% Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient</b>	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced</b>	<b>% No Score</b>
State Average	2008	10.25%	23.53%	61.70%	4.17%	0.36%
	2007	13.41%	22.02%	57.74%	6.45%	0.38%
District Average	2008	7.41%	18.52%	70.37%	3.70%	0.00%
	2007	10.00%	2.50%	85.00%	2.50%	0.00%
White	2008	5.26%	15.79%	73.68%	5.26%	0.00%
	2007	7.14%	0.00%	92.86%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	15.79%	5.26%	78.95%	0.00%	0.00%
Female	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	4.76%	0.00%	90.48%	4.76%	0.00%
English Language Learners	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Colorado Department of  
Education**

**CSAP Results**

**District: 2750 - Sargent RE-33J**

**4th Grade CSAP Results: Writing**

<b>Disaggregated Groups</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>% Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient</b>	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced</b>	<b>% No Score</b>
State Average	2008	6.72%	41.05%	42.51%	9.25%	0.47%
	2007	8.42%	42.44%	41.13%	7.62%	0.38%
District Average	2008	7.41%	25.93%	51.85%	14.81%	0.00%
	2007	10.00%	35.00%	52.50%	2.50%	0.00%
White	2008	5.26%	21.05%	52.63%	21.05%	0.00%
	2007	7.14%	35.71%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	15.79%	47.37%	36.84%	0.00%	0.00%
Female	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	4.76%	23.81%	66.67%	4.76%	0.00%
English Language Learners	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2007	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

# Colorado District and School Diagnostic Growth Summary

Colorado's Growth Model provides a way for educators to understand how much growth a student made from one CSAP administration to the next. The Growth Model compares each student's performance to students in the same grade throughout Colorado who had similar CSAP scores in past years, and calculates a Student Growth Percentile. If the student grew as much or more than 60 percent of her peers, the student would have a 60th Growth Percentile.

1. Student Growth Percentiles can be used to determine "How much growth is enough?", specifying the amount of growth necessary for each student to reach proficiency ("catch up") or maintain proficiency ("keep up") within three years or by 10th grade. In the table below, the 2008 data for **Percent on Track to Catch Up** gives the district percentages of students, scoring Unsatisfactory or Partially Proficient in 2007, making enough growth during the 2007-08 academic year to reach proficiency within three years or 10th grade. Similarly, the 2008 data for **Percent on Track to Keep Up** gives the district percentages of students, scoring Proficient or Advanced in 2007, making enough growth during the 2007-08 academic year to remain at or above proficient over the next three years or 10th grade.
2. Student Growth Percentiles can be aggregated at the grade, school, and district levels to provide a summary number. This is done through finding the median score (the middle score if you rank the scores from highest to lowest). Below you will find **Median Student Growth Percentiles** for your district reflecting growth from 2005 to 2006, from 2006 to 2007, and from 2007 to 2008.

The state median growth percentile is always 50, so it is useful to examine substantial differences from 50 when looking for high and low growth. Median Student Growth Percentiles of 50 and above are colored in green in the tables below. Data are provided only for those students who are not new to the school after October 1st of the academic school year. If data are not shown below, fewer than 16 students were included in the group.

**GREEN = meets or exceeds state median growth percentile of 50 and higher**

SARGENT RE-33J	Reading			Writing			Math		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
<b>Districtwide Information</b>									
<b>1. On Track to Catch Up and Keep Up</b>									
<b>Percent on Track to Catch Up</b>									
Low Income		45.5%	37.5%		40.8%	45.0%		9.6%	6.8%
Minority		47.6%	47.4%		36.1%	29.6%		6.5%	0.0%
Boys		46.9%	14.3%		34.0%	32.4%		16.3%	10.3%
Girls		66.7%	66.7%		42.9%	55.2%		13.3%	9.3%
<b>Percent on Track to Keep Up</b>									
Low Income		75.4%	80.0%		61.2%	70.3%		54.9%	63.3%
Minority		65.1%	81.8%		56.7%	72.2%		50.0%	67.6%
Boys		75.0%	76.5%		56.9%	77.3%		51.4%	64.4%
Girls		87.5%	89.7%		76.4%	81.9%		60.0%	68.6%
<b>Elementary School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		54.2%	33.3%		45.9%	50.0%		17.2%	21.4%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		77.6%	81.9%		59.7%	74.6%		56.4%	75.3%
<b>Middle School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		46.7%	53.8%		42.9%	35.0%		14.3%	8.3%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		88.0%	77.8%		81.8%	78.7%		48.6%	41.9%
<b>High School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		63.6%	25.0%		15.0%	35.7%		12.9%	6.3%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		79.3%	89.7%		61.9%	87.5%		63.6%	67.7%
<b>2. Median Student Growth Percentiles</b>									
Elementary School(s)	58.5	57.5	55	48.5	44.5	47	49.5	33	45
Middle School(s)	63.5	58	37	64.5	55	59	56.5	49	40
High School(s)	49	49.5	64.5	50	51	69.5	64	65	54
Grade 4	48.5	46.5	55.5	52.5	48.5	74	38.5	51	43
Grade 5	61.5	59	51	50	38	44	59.5	46	52
Grade 6	64	60	59	47	47	41	55	21	31
Grade 7	68	48	33	65	57.5	55	61	55.5	47.5
Grade 8	60	61	45.5	64	51	73	56	45	27.5
Grade 9	46	51	69	49	51	74.5	54	55	59
Grade 10	55.5	48	54.5	51.5	51	52	76	75	45
<b>2. Median Student Growth Percentiles</b>									
<b>SARGENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</b>									
All Students	58.5	57.5	55	48.5	44.5	47	49.5	33	45
Low Income	59	48	44	40	44	44	40	32.5	45.5
Minority	50.5	48	62	47.5	52	44	34.5	32	43
Boys	61	54.5	51	48	45.5	48	49	32	45
Girls	57	59	58	57.5	44.5	44	53	33.5	45

# Colorado District and School Diagnostic Growth Summary

Colorado's Growth Model provides a way for educators to understand how much growth a student made from one CSAP administration to the next. The Growth Model compares each student's performance to students in the same grade throughout Colorado who had similar CSAP scores in past years, and calculates a Student Growth Percentile. If the student grew as much or more than 60 percent of her peers, the student would have a 60th Growth Percentile.

1. Student Growth Percentiles can be used to determine "How much growth is enough?", specifying the amount of growth necessary for each student to reach proficiency ("catch up") or maintain proficiency ("keep up") within three years or by 10th grade. In the table below, the 2008 data for **Percent on Track to Catch Up** gives the district percentages of students, scoring Unsatisfactory or Partially Proficient in 2007, making enough growth during the 2007-08 academic year to reach proficiency within three years or 10th grade. Similarly, the 2008 data for **Percent on Track to Keep Up** gives the district percentages of students, scoring Proficient or Advanced in 2007, making enough growth during the 2007-08 academic year to remain at or above proficient over the next three years or 10th grade.
2. Student Growth Percentiles can be aggregated at the grade, school, and district levels to provide a summary number. This is done through finding the median score (the middle score if you rank the scores from highest to lowest). Below you will find **Median Student Growth Percentiles** for your district reflecting growth from 2005 to 2006, from 2006 to 2007, and from 2007 to 2008.

The state median growth percentile is always 50, so it is useful to examine substantial differences from 50 when looking for high and low growth. Median Student Growth Percentiles of 50 and above are colored in green in the tables below. Data are provided only for those students who are not new to the school after October 1st of the academic school year. If data are not shown below, fewer than 16 students were included in the group.

**GREEN = meets or exceeds state median growth percentile of 50 and higher**

SARGENT RE-33J	Reading			Writing			Math		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
<b>Districtwide Information</b>									
<b>1. On Track to Catch Up and Keep Up</b>									
<b>Percent on Track to Catch Up</b>									
Low Income		45.5%	37.5%		40.8%	45.0%		9.6%	6.8%
Minority		47.6%	47.4%		36.1%	29.6%		6.5%	0.0%
Boys		46.9%	14.3%		34.0%	32.4%		16.3%	10.3%
Girls		66.7%	66.7%		42.9%	55.2%		13.3%	9.3%
<b>Percent on Track to Keep Up</b>									
Low Income		75.4%	80.0%		61.2%	70.3%		54.9%	63.3%
Minority		65.1%	81.8%		56.7%	72.2%		50.0%	67.6%
Boys		75.0%	76.5%		56.9%	77.3%		51.4%	64.4%
Girls		87.5%	89.7%		76.4%	81.9%		60.0%	68.6%
<b>Elementary School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		54.2%	33.3%		45.9%	50.0%		17.2%	21.4%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		77.6%	81.9%		59.7%	74.6%		56.4%	75.3%
<b>Middle School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		46.7%	53.8%		42.9%	35.0%		14.3%	8.3%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		88.0%	77.8%		81.8%	78.7%		48.6%	41.9%
<b>High School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		63.6%	25.0%		15.0%	35.7%		12.9%	6.3%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		79.3%	89.7%		61.9%	87.5%		63.6%	67.7%
<b>2. Median Student Growth Percentiles</b>									
Elementary School(s)	58.5	57.5	55	48.5	44.5	47	49.5	33	45
Middle School(s)	63.5	58	37	64.5	55	59	56.5	49	40
High School(s)	49	49.5	64.5	50	51	69.5	64	65	54
Grade 4	48.5	46.5	55.5	52.5	48.5	74	38.5	51	43
Grade 5	61.5	59	51	50	38	44	59.5	46	52
Grade 6	64	60	59	47	47	41	55	21	31
Grade 7	68	48	33	65	57.5	55	61	55.5	47.5
Grade 8	60	61	45.5	64	51	73	56	45	27.5
Grade 9	46	51	69	49	51	74.5	54	55	59
Grade 10	55.5	48	54.5	51.5	51	52	76	75	45
<b>2. Median Student Growth Percentiles</b>									
<b>SARGENT SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL</b>									
All Students	55.5	49.5	64.5	55	51	69.5	62	65	54
Low Income	68	47	62	55	51	73	62	61.5	56
Minority	66	49.5	.	50.5	54.5	.	65	63.5	.
Boys	46	53	53	60	48	52	70	76.5	40
Girls	65	47	75	55	54	74	50	53	56.5

# Colorado District and School Diagnostic Growth Summary

Colorado's Growth Model provides a way for educators to understand how much growth a student made from one CSAP administration to the next. The Growth Model compares each student's performance to students in the same grade throughout Colorado who had similar CSAP scores in past years, and calculates a Student Growth Percentile. If the student grew as much or more than 60 percent of her peers, the student would have a 60th Growth Percentile.

1. Student Growth Percentiles can be used to determine "How much growth is enough?", specifying the amount of growth necessary for each student to reach proficiency ("catch up") or maintain proficiency ("keep up") within three years or by 10th grade. In the table below, the 2008 data for **Percent on Track to Catch Up** gives the district percentages of students, scoring Unsatisfactory or Partially Proficient in 2007, making enough growth during the 2007-08 academic year to reach proficiency within three years or 10th grade. Similarly, the 2008 data for **Percent on Track to Keep Up** gives the district percentages of students, scoring Proficient or Advanced in 2007, making enough growth during the 2007-08 academic year to remain at or above proficient over the next three years or 10th grade.
2. Student Growth Percentiles can be aggregated at the grade, school, and district levels to provide a summary number. This is done through finding the median score (the middle score if you rank the scores from highest to lowest). Below you will find **Median Student Growth Percentiles** for your district reflecting growth from 2005 to 2006, from 2006 to 2007, and from 2007 to 2008.

The state median growth percentile is always 50, so it is useful to examine substantial differences from 50 when looking for high and low growth. Median Student Growth Percentiles of 50 and above are colored in green in the tables below. Data are provided only for those students who are not new to the school after October 1st of the academic school year. If data are not shown below, fewer than 16 students were included in the group.

**GREEN = meets or exceeds state median growth percentile of 50 and higher**

SARGENT RE-33J	Reading			Writing			Math		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
<b>Districtwide Information</b>									
<b>1. On Track to Catch Up and Keep Up</b>									
<b>Percent on Track to Catch Up</b>									
Low Income		45.5%	37.5%		40.8%	45.0%		9.6%	6.8%
Minority		47.6%	47.4%		36.1%	29.6%		6.5%	0.0%
Boys		46.9%	14.3%		34.0%	32.4%		16.3%	10.3%
Girls		66.7%	66.7%		42.9%	55.2%		13.3%	9.3%
<b>Percent on Track to Keep Up</b>									
Low Income		75.4%	80.0%		61.2%	70.3%		54.9%	63.3%
Minority		65.1%	81.8%		56.7%	72.2%		50.0%	67.6%
Boys		75.0%	76.5%		56.9%	77.3%		51.4%	64.4%
Girls		87.5%	89.7%		76.4%	81.9%		60.0%	68.6%
<b>Elementary School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		54.2%	33.3%		45.9%	50.0%		17.2%	21.4%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		77.6%	81.9%		59.7%	74.6%		56.4%	75.3%
<b>Middle School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		46.7%	53.8%		42.9%	35.0%		14.3%	8.3%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		88.0%	77.8%		81.8%	78.7%		48.6%	41.9%
<b>High School Students</b>									
Percent on Track to Catch Up		63.6%	25.0%		15.0%	35.7%		12.9%	6.3%
Percent on Track to Keep Up		79.3%	89.7%		61.9%	87.5%		63.6%	67.7%
<b>2. Median Student Growth Percentiles</b>									
Elementary School(s)	58.5	57.5	55	48.5	44.5	47	49.5	33	45
Middle School(s)	63.5	58	37	64.5	55	59	56.5	49	40
High School(s)	49	49.5	64.5	50	51	69.5	64	65	54
Grade 4	48.5	46.5	55.5	52.5	48.5	74	38.5	51	43
Grade 5	61.5	59	51	50	38	44	59.5	46	52
Grade 6	64	60	59	47	47	41	55	21	31
Grade 7	68	48	33	65	57.5	55	61	55.5	47.5
Grade 8	60	61	45.5	64	51	73	56	45	27.5
Grade 9	46	51	69	49	51	74.5	54	55	59
Grade 10	55.5	48	54.5	51.5	51	52	76	75	45
<b>2. Median Student Growth Percentiles</b>									
<b>SARGENT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL</b>									
All Students	.	58	37	.	55	59	.	49	40
Low Income	.	39	35	.	50.5	59	.	43	48
Minority	.	47.5	50.5	.	47	60.5	.	43.5	50
Boys	.	57	31	.	68	53.5	.	56	27.5
Girls	.	60	44.5	.	50.5	63.5	.	46	47

## ACCOUNTABILITY DATA

The Colorado state law requires all districts to be accredited by the Department of Education. Each district is also required to accredit all of its schools. Additionally, Adequate Yearly Progress determinations and Highly Qualified Teacher information are requirements of the federal *No Child Left Behind Act*. The following data shows how our district is doing in relation to these measures.

### Status of School Accreditation in the District

Schools can be recommended for any of the following accreditation status designations using criteria detailed in the district's accreditation contract. The number and identity of schools in each accreditation category as established by the district:

Accreditation Category	Number and names of schools in each accreditation category
Accredited	Sargent Elementary Sargent Junior High Sargent Senior High
Accredited-Notice with Support	None
Accredited-Probation	None
Non-Accredited	None

Student group	Reading/Language Arts				Mathematics				Other Indicator			
	Percent Tested		Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced *		Percent Tested		Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced *		Advanced Performance Reading *		Advanced Performance Mathematics *	
	Goal: 95%		Goal: 88.46%		Goal: 95%		Goal: 89.09%		Goal: 1.21%		Goal: 1.21%	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	100.00	99.26	98.19	88.79	100.00	99.71	99.14	91.35	12.70	6.84	31.90	28.21
African American	NA	99.58	NA	81.29	NA	99.61	NA	81.32	NA	2.61	NA	13.43
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	99.85	NA	83.68	NA	99.95	NA	87.63	NA	4.31	NA	17.92
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	99.69	NA	93.95	NA	99.60	NA	96.32	NA	10.59	NA	45.90
Hispanic	100.00	98.21	96.65	79.35	100.00	99.74	98.21	84.42	16.19	2.14	36.28	13.06
White	100.00	99.70	99.79	94.17	100.00	99.71	99.79	95.73	16.21	9.51	36.48	36.50
Students with Disabilities	NA	98.53	NA	57.90	NA	99.10	NA	67.99	NA	1.15	NA	7.78
English Language Learners	NA	97.27	NA	74.53	NA	99.69	NA	81.81	NA	1.66	NA	12.13
Economically Disadvantaged	100.00	98.62	97.24	79.92	100.00	99.69	99.69	84.41	6.31	2.03	23.24	13.43

## NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND MEASURES

### Adequate Yearly Progress Elementary School Level Data:

*\*Confidence Intervals Used*

Legend	
	Not Applicable
	Made AYP Goal
	AYP Goal Not Made
	Made Safe Harbor
	Made Matched Safe Harbor

**Middle School Level Data:**

Student group	Reading/Language Arts				Mathematics				Other Indicator			
	Percent Tested		Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced *		Percent Tested		Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced *		Advanced Performance Reading *		Advanced Performance Mathematics *	
	Goal: 95%		Goal: 86.81%		Goal: 95%		Goal: 79.75%		Goal: 1.21%		Goal: 1.21%	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	98.59	99.40	98.39	88.86	98.59	99.47	92.42	81.71	12.89	10.52	22.77	21.31
African American	NA	99.15	NA	82.05	NA	99.16	NA	66.15	NA	4.22	NA	8.59
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	99.21	NA	86.27	NA	99.30	NA	74.14	NA	6.79	NA	13.62
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	99.57	NA	93.01	NA	99.53	NA	91.88	NA	17.72	NA	37.86
Hispanic	NA	99.38	NA	78.71	NA	99.45	NA	67.95	NA	2.82	NA	7.88
White	97.92	99.43	99.58	93.99	97.92	99.50	94.81	89.09	15.79	14.32	27.84	27.87
Students with Disabilities	NA	98.19	NA	54.70	NA	98.41	NA	44.06	NA	1.15	NA	3.63
English Language Learners	NA	99.47	NA	72.48	NA	99.51	NA	64.59	NA	2.02	NA	7.75
Economically Disadvantaged	97.44	99.26	97.04	78.79	97.44	99.36	93.74	68.00	9.89	2.74	22.37	7.98

*\*Confidence Intervals Used*

Legend	
Not Applicable	
Made AYP Goal	
AYP Goal Not Made	
Made Safe Harbor	
Made Matched Safe Harbor	

## High School Level Data:

Student group	Reading/Language Arts				Mathematics				Other Indicator	
	Percent Tested		Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced *		Percent Tested		Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced *		Graduation Rate	
	Goal: 95%		Goal: 89.83%		Goal: 95%		Goal: 73.50%		Goal: 59.50%	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	97.22	97.49	99.07	89.84	97.22	97.79	87.96	67.76	96.00	75.00
African American	NA	96.52	NA	81.89	NA	96.89	NA	45.22	NA	65.40
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	95.14	NA	87.26	NA	96.09	NA	55.97	NA	58.90
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	98.55	NA	93.38	NA	98.90	NA	79.93	NA	83.50
Hispanic	NA	96.45	NA	80.83	NA	96.94	NA	45.50	NA	57.10
White	96.36	97.99	99.62	94.29	96.36	98.20	95.27	78.76	NA	82.10
Students with Disabilities	NA	95.17	NA	58.19	NA	95.73	NA	26.58	NA	63.70
English Language Learners	NA	97.12	NA	75.38	NA	97.51	NA	41.21	NA	55.40
Economically Disadvantaged	96.77	96.33	NA	80.41	NA	96.88	NA	46.01	NA	63.20

*\*Confidence Intervals Used*

Legend	
Not Applicable	
Made AYP Goal	
AYP Goal Not Made	
Made Safe Harbor	
Made Matched Safe Harbor	

## Status of School Improvement in the District

If Title I schools do not make AYP for two consecutive years, in the same content area, they are placed on School Improvement.

Improvement levels	Schools	Percent of schools in the district
Not on Improvement	Sargent	100%
School Improvement- Year 1	N/A	N/A
School Improvement- Year 2	N/A	N/A
Corrective Action	N/A	N/A
Restructuring- Planning	N/A	NA
Restructuring- Implementation	N/A	NA

## Teacher Data:

### Elementary:

Teachers Highly Qualified in the School					
School Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Percentage Highly Qualified	94.12%	94.12%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	96.06%	98.03%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NO	YES	YES	YES

Classrooms in the School Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers					
School Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Percentage Highly Qualified	96.11%	96.11%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	97.39%	98.70%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NO	YES	YES	YES

Professional Qualifications of Teachers	
Professional Qualification	Percent of Teachers
Bachelors Degree	43.75%
Masters Degree	56.25%
PhD	0.00%

Teacher Licenses	
License	Percent of Teachers
Initial	6.25%
Emergency	0%

**Junior High:****Teachers Highly Qualified in the School**

School Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Percentage Highly Qualified	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NA	NA	YES	YES

**Classrooms in the School Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers**

School Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Percentage Highly Qualified	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NA	NA	YES	YES

**Professional Qualifications of Teachers**

Professional Qualification	Percent of Teachers
Bachelors Degree	60.00%
Masters Degree	40.00%
PhD	0.00%

**Teacher Licenses**

License	Percent of Teachers
Initial	20.00%
Emergency	0%

**High School:****Teachers Highly Qualified in the School**

School Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Percentage Highly Qualified	76.92%	92.31%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	84.54%	92.27%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	YES	YES	YES	YES

**Classrooms in the School Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers**

School Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Percentage Highly Qualified	82.86%	98.55%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	88.51%	94.26%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	YES	YES	YES	YES

<b>Professional Qualifications of Teachers</b>	
<b>Professional Qualification</b>	<b>Percent of Teachers</b>
Bachelors Degree	71.43%
Masters Degree	28.57%
PhD	0.00%

<b>Teacher Licenses</b>	
<b>License</b>	<b>Percent of Teachers</b>
Initial	21.43%
Emergency	0%

**POST-SECONDARY READINESS DATA:**

**Graduation Rate:**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Rate</b>
2006/2007	96.00%

**District ACT Results:**

	<b>School Composite Score</b>	<b>District Composite Score</b>	<b>State Average Composite Score</b>
2008	20.2	20.2	19.4
2007	19.4	19.4	19.1

**Number of students enrolled in post-secondary options:**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>
2008-2009	7

**Number and percent of students enrolled in advanced placement courses:**

	<b>Total Number of 9th - 12th grade students taking at least one 1 AP course</b>	<b>Percent of 11th and 12th grade students taking at least 1 AP Course</b>
2006/2007	19	22.22%

Dropout Rate: 0%      Reported on SAR

## Graduation Requirements:

Starting with the graduating class of 2007 and beyond, Sargent High School shall require a minimum of 27 credits for graduation. The following must be included in the 27credits: [Note that the graduating class of 2006 is required a minimum of 30 credits]

- English 4 credits
- Mathematics 4 credits
- Science 4 credits
- Social Studies 4 credits (must include one credit of government/civics)
- Second Language 2 credits
- Technology 2 credits
- Speech/Health 1 credit
- Electives 6 credits

## **OTHER DATA:**

District Attendance rate: 92% Reported on SAR

Evidence of a safe, civil, learning environment: Reported on SAR

District-wide the majority of safety and discipline incidents reported on SAR are for fights, followed by other violations of code of conduct. There were 3 incidents involving tobacco use, one alcohol use and one possession of dangerous weapons. The district's location and "closed campus" status helps to minimize safety and discipline incidents.