

Communication Log 2014-15

Initiated By	Date	Responded By	Date	Topic	Phone	Letter	Email	Meeting	Other
Pat Zach	7/1/14	Emerson Smith	7/1/14	Full-Day Kindergarten Tuition			x		
Barb Buck	7/1/14	N/A		Full-Day Kindergarten Tuition			x		
Dave Buck	7/1/14	Sarah Riss	7/1/14	June Update			x		
Chris Wilhelm	10/13/14	Emerson Smith, Sarah Riss		property issues (ongoing conversation from July 2014)			x		
Dave Buck	10/24/14	Sarah Riss	10/24/14	Creative Thinking Seminars			x		
Jonathan Browne	11/7/14	N/A		Property Assemblage		x			
Pat Zach	11/12/14	Amy Clendennen	11/12-11/13	Proposals at BOE meetings			x		
Chrissie Stewart	11/13/14	Steve Loher	11/13-11/14	BOE Meeting question			x		
Chrissie Stewart	11/14/14	Sarah Riss	11/17/14	Bond Questions			x		
Dave Buck	11/15/14	Sarah Riss	11/17/14	Retreat Feedback			x		
Jean Dugan	11/16/14	Diane Moore	11/16/14	Moss Field timetable			x		
Dave Buck	11/20/14	Sarah Riss	11/20/14	Do High School Rankings Really Matter?			x		
Dave Buck	12/3/14	Sarah Riss	12/3/14	Creative Kids Chaos Day			x		
Sara Howard	12/4/14	Sarah Riss, Emerson Smith	12/4/14	HS ECHO survey distribution			x		
Anothony Stricker	12/6/14	Sarah Riss	12/8/14	Tax Levy/Bond Issue			x		
Bob Sherwood	12/8/14	David Addison	12/12/14	Tax Increase			x		
		Amy Clendennen	12/12/14	Tax Increase			x		
		Emerson Smith	12/12/14	Tax Increase			x		
		Emerson Smith	12/14/14	Tax Increase			x		
Tracy Smith Clyburn/CS parents	12/17/14	Sarah Riss	12/17/14	Letter from CS parents about grandfathering CS students			x		
Dave Buck	1/16/15	Sarah Riss	12/20/15	40 Acres Master Plan Status			x		
Dave Buck	1/27/15	Sarah Riss	1/27/15	Four Key Words to Improve WGSD			x		
Dave Buck	2/24/15	Sarah Riss	2/24/15	Propositions S & W	x		x		
Max Wolfrum	3/11/15	Sarah Riss		Props S & W		x			
Dave Buck	3/19/15	Sarah Riss	3/19/15	Spend Wisely or Educate Beautifully?			x		
Dave Buck	3/23/15	Sarah Riss	3/23/15	There is Nothing More Powerful Than an Idea Whose Time Has Come			x		
Dave Buck	4/1/15	Sarah Riss	4/1/15	Online Q&A session feedback			x		
Dave Buck	4/8/15	Sarah Riss	4/8/15	My Favorite Quotes for Times Like These			x		
Dave Buck	4/10/15	Sarah Riss	4/10/15	Reimagining WGSD's Window of Opportunity			x		
Drew Gillow	4/8/15	Diane, Emerson	4/11, 4/13	Next steps for WGSD			x		
Kim Mumm	4/27/15	David Addison	5/1/15	WGSD Budget Suggestions		x	x		
Megan Havice	4/26/15	David Addison, John S.	4/27/15	Removal of Japanese courses			x		
Marty Walter	4/27/15	David Addison	4/27/15	Enrollment of children of staff members			x		

Jane Baumgartner

From: Sarah Riss
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 11:06 AM
To: Jane Baumgartner
Subject: FW: letter

For the communication log

Sarah

Dr. Sarah Booth Riss
Superintendent of Schools
Webster Groves School District
314-961-1233

From: Addison, David [<mailto:DAddison@rgare.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 10:40 AM
To:
Cc: Sarah Riss
Subject: RE: letter

Dear Kim:

Thank you for your comments and interest in the district. The board appreciates the time you have spent gathering and sharing your thoughts. The Board of Education has instructed the district administration to develop a balanced budget for the 2015/2016 School year, based on best estimates of income and expenses for the coming year. To achieve a balanced budget, it will be necessary for the district to make approximately \$1.6 million in cuts from the previously presented budget. Because salaries and benefits make up 80 percent of the district budget, the cuts include a reduction in the number of staff members. The Board of Education has an obligation to every member of the community to keep The Webster Groves School District strong. We are working together to find solutions that are best for the district's students.

Thank you for your continued devotion to WGSD.

David

David Addison
President, Webster Groves School District Board of Education

From:
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 1:48 PM
To: 'addison.david@wgmail.org'; 'clendennen.amy@wgmail.org'; 'emerson.smith10@gmail.com'; 'loher.steve@wgmail.org'; 'dugan.jean@wgmail.org'; 'wgsdshipley@gmail.com'; 'oliver.joel@wgmail.org'
Subject: letter

Dear WGSD board members, I have attached a (loonngg) letter, as well as 2 files to which I refer in the letter.

I'm sure you are buried in documents today; when you get time to read my thoughts, I hope some of my ideas might help you as you finalize the budget.

Thank you for taking the time to read what I send today.

Kim Mumm, WG resident

First, thank you sincerely for your service to our community for representing us on the school board. Each of you is a busy professional who has a family and is volunteering your time on our behalf.

Having attended BOE meetings for many years and, having read the minutes and documents posted online, I can tell you are on a fast moving "treadmill" and must make quick decisions. I know you are the current experts. You "live and breathe" all this. I hope you won't mind reading a few of my ideas.

Now is the time to examine all/any financial matters. Voters just rejected the tax levy and bond issue. We were warned even of the " phasing out of a \$5,000 elementary strings program" , so literally no expenditure is sacred.

Now is time to PAUSE, do thorough research, critique and evaluation. Whereas, even a \$5,000 education program was at risk before the election, it behooves you (and those of us, who are interested) to REALLY dig, examine, question and critique anything and everything. I have been doing some of just that, albeit, from outside the system. I haven't paid close attention in a few years, following ~15 years of thousands of volunteer hours of time/money and skills donations.

I decided to do some learning and research. It is possible my perspective (and one I have presented w/ some sources) might be different than the one you have been accustomed to hearing. I will outline my thoughts and hope they will help you in your critique process.

There is a growing chasm between the public and private sectors. Private and public sectors are literally on different trajectories. Many retirees in Webster Groves are living on merely what they saved carefully over the years, along with a small social security income (which is based upon the highest 35 total years of employment, indexed).

Working citizens, earning modest salaries (if they haven't lost their jobs) are saving their own money for retirement in 401K, 403B or IRA accounts. Traditional pensions in the private sector are a thing of the past.

The economic downturn that occurred in 2008 affected most of us profoundly. I know many people in their 40s, 50s and 60s who lost jobs in the subsequent few years, some, more than once. Businesses were required to restructure, salaries were often frozen, cuts were made, employees took on double or triple their former work load for the same pay and people have been grateful to be employed at all. Many have had to start entirely new careers.

In addition to this (as you well know, since you certainly have heard it), Webster Groves property taxes have doubled for many, just since 2005. The citizens also pay the increased insurance and utility rates the WGSD also contend with; we are all in this together. The private sector is trying mightily to sustain the public one, but the latter must do its part.

I beg you to consider a few things that I have written and researched for you. Perhaps you already do know them all, if not, thank you for allowing me to repeat them. I am a very honest, frank person. I don't mean to be harsh in any way, just direct. I love the WG schools. I also appreciate your time.

The article (written by MU economists) I have linked here is profound, and touches on some of what is at the heart of the private/public sector divergence. Although its title refers to teachers funding administrator pensions (and that is a big consideration), please also note facts about the "disconnect" between the public/educational systems and the private sector. Study the discussion and the retirement "peak/retirement age" graph for teachers, administrators and superintendents. Please, try to realize there are citizens who are hurting financially; they very much want to support the school district as much as they can, but they see a completely foreign world, one with staggering salaries and astronomical retirements. This is unsustainable. Please note the final statement in the article. It is up to YOU, the board members (with the help of the community) to lead the way toward a more sustainable future.

<http://educationnext.org/the-school-administrator-payoff-from-teacher-pensions/>

With that perspective background, I have sincerely researched as much of the school district as I can in the past few weeks. I was intensely and intimately involved for so many years, but had not paid close attention of late. I wanted to be certain I read the meeting minutes, documents, budgets, district audit and as many measures as I could find so I could determine your decision making processes to some degree. The voters have implored you to find ways to lower expenditures and to evaluate priorities. I have a few suggestions/considerations. I hope they will be helpful to you.

ADMINISTRATOR SALARIES

WGSD Administrator Salaries have, risen, inordinately, in comparison to the trajectory of the average administrator salaries in Missouri. You can see this on the graph posted on the DESE web site quite well. Comparing the % change to those in Missouri over the past 7 years, WGSD salary increase is double. That is stunning.

Average Administrator salaries

Missouri average- 2007- \$77,644 to 2014- \$87,199 - an increase of 12%

Webster Groves average- 2007- \$97,184 to 2014- \$120,773- an increase of 24%

I know you have "frozen" administrative salaries for now, but much more critique is in order, I feel.

I have a few ideas/suggestions.

- 1. Remove the one Walter Ambrose director salary (~100K) not currently tuition/program funded from the general administrative salary budget. Both W.A. director salaries should be funded from the tuition based programs.**

The Adventure Club and Preschool, I have been assured by Dr. Moore, are entirely self-sufficient and 100% tuition based, in other words, revenue=expenditures. If/since that is true, one director salary should be funded by the preschool and the other from Adventure Club tuitions. I realize the W.A. and A.C. building space is provided by the district, as (I assume) is payment for utilities, maintenance, etc.

There are two Walter Ambrose directors. I realize the W.A. Center encompasses three programs, but FACE has its own funding and state director, from what I understand. The two directors (one whose salary is ~117K and the other ~94K) supervise both the preschool, as well as the Adventure Club/after school program. An Adventure Club coordinator (~65K) manages day to day A.C. operations. I spoke /w her to ask a question last week and know she plans to retire soon. Whether or not her position is filled, I would still call for the director salary to be funded from the tuition. While my personal feeling is that ~100 K are very large salaries for preschool/Adventure School directors, (I think "market value" would be ~40-60K), my feelings are a moot point if both the director salaries were to be funded by the tuition based programs. A self-funded program has a way of "self-regulating".

In the 1990s, by the way, I was part of a large group of parents who were very frustrated by the fact that (at that time) the ~700K revenue tuition budget of Adventure Club did not result in the A.C. staff at that time even having basic supplies, creative programming nor basic safety measures in place for the children. The parents (just knowing there was more than adequate money on hand from tuition) commissioned an independent audit to examine the Early Childhood and Adventure Club budgets, which, at the time, were co-mingled.

We then embarked in a multi-year parent-staff partnered Adventure Club oversight effort (finance, safety, programming and employee development committees) that resulted in outstanding financial accountability, vastly improved safety and programming, enhanced training as well as initiation of part time benefits for the A.C. staff. All of it was handily covered by the A.C. tuition, without tuition increases and with ALL interested low income students included, on a full scholarship or sliding scale payment schedule.

2. Wrap the Alumni Association into the WG Foundation, eliminating a ~41K administrator salary.

- a. Link the WG Foundation from the WGSD web page.
- b. Link the Alumni Assn from the Foundation web page.
- c. Eliminate the A.A. paid position (that has been held by a retired principal).
- d. Institute a WGSD employee payroll deduction opportunity to the Foundation.

I love the way the Lindbergh Schools Foundation is structured. Here is a link to its web site:

<http://www.lindberghfoundationstl.com/>

With the simple addition of an "Alumni Association" tab at the top of their web page, they link to the A.A, allow for an "introduction", "class notes" and even a "donate to the Alumni Assn" tab, that allows for a unique Alumni Association donation, separate from the Foundation donation opportunities.

I have researched several school districts. Like our Foundation, most are managed by a paid secretary, and are overseen by a volunteer board. Our Foundation has been extremely successful in its fundraising, resulting in proud and plentiful staff grant donations. A more “seamless” coordination of the AA and the WGF could be achieved.

The former and retired HS principal has been paid ~41K/year for part time work for many years to coordinate the alumni. My personal opinion is (as one of thousands of nearly full time WGSD volunteers for ~15 years), the work could have been volunteered from this district retiree. After nurses retire they are recruited to volunteer in hospitals; so many organizations rely on volunteers.

Regardless of my views, wrapping the Alumni Association into the Foundation would eliminate the need for this ~41K (a classroom teacher’s salary) and would, perhaps, even result in more effective fund raising.

I also love the fact that Kirkwood has instituted an employee payroll deduction opportunity to their Foundation.

http://www.kirkwoodschoools.org/pages/Kirkwood_School_District/Departments/Community_Relations_and_Develo/KSD_Foundation/News/KSD_Staff_Pays_It_Foward

In my employment, one of the things I valued the most was to be able to donate a portion of my salary to a fund that helped my fellow employees. I’d like to see such an opportunity for the WGSD staff to donate to such an effort. The parents are often “maxed out”; the administrators, in particular, could put more “skin in the game”, so to speak.

3. BEFORE beginning the superintendent search, lower the expenditures incurred for a new superintendent, while still attracting top candidates.

- a. I would lower the superintendent’s salary to closer to the ~6.5-7% from the top, compared to other superintendent salaries statewide, closer to where we were in 2010-2012.
- b. Eliminate the \$8,000 car allowance. I searched the total benefits/superintendent in Mo. This is excessive. Are tax payers to believe a 200K salary won’t cover car expenses?
- c. Please consider the age of retirement curve in the article, (above). We have had two recent superintendents stay just 7 years, presumably ‘max” out their salaries, then retire. Perhaps an administrator earlier into his/her administrative career would be motivated to stay at least twice as long. I would think the ‘learning curve”/time to become fully up to speed would be at least a full school year. Time precious when children grow so quickly.
- d. Because the retirement mandates are set by the state, the only real cost control the district does have is to set the salary lower, so that the employer retirement 14.6 % of salary match (and salary) are lower expenses. I suspect there are top quality administrators who would consider it an honor to manage such a safe, pleasant district, at the salary ranking I cite.

Rationale/more considerations:

- Is it really necessary to expend \$25,000 on a superintendent search consultant? Can't a committee of administrators and senior educators w/ the board perform this function with less cost?
- Our superintendent's salary ranking, compared to all the superintendents in the state of Missouri (source-DESE) was:
In 2010- it was 39 of 574 Mo superintendents' salaries, or in top 6.79%
In 2011 it was 40 of 592, or top 6.75%
In 2012 it was 36 of 584 or top 6.16%
In 2013 it was 27 of 565 or top 4.77%
In 2014 it was 19th of 571 or top 3.32%

I would argue the salary for the new superintendent should approximately be in the top 6.5-7% of those in the state. This mirrors the quality performance for 2013 (we'll assume 2014 was an outlier and hope for improvement in the future). The rather alarming and dramatic surge of the salary to the top 4.77%, then the top 3.32% added a substantial burden to the district's 14.6% retirement match, aside from the obvious increase in salary to the operating budget for those years.

- The final 3 years of salary determines entire lifetime retirement benefits.
- Our quality did not commensurately improve with the increase in the salary. I know there are MANY measures of quality. The state now uses the comprehensive APR score, as you know. Our score dropped (as did many others) from 2013 to 2014. Please refer to DESE or to the excel table attached, which breaks out the data by difference '13-'14. The "transfers" tab shows Webster's score (and most other districts') was not influenced by the transfer students, even by a point. Scores by building are interesting.

In 2013: Among STL Co districts we ranked 7th (and 38 of 543 assessed Mo schools- **top 7%**)

#1- Brentwood-w/ score of 100%

2. Parkway- 99.6

3. Lindbergh- 99.3

4. Clayton- 98.9

5. Ladue (tied w/ Kwood)- 98.2

6. Kwood, tied w/ Ladue- 98.2

7 Webster w/ the 97.5 score it often reports....

In 2014: Among STL Co districts we fell to 11th (and ranked 103 of 543 assessed Mo. Schools- **top 19%**)

- Our score fell to 95.7 (-1.8). Others' scores also dropped. However, Lindbergh still excelled w/ a score in '14 of 98.6 (top 4.6%)

- We also fell behind Parkway, Brentwood & Rockwood, (each ~7%), Ladue, Kirkwood and Clayton, (all ~7.5%), Pattonville, Francis Howell and Affton

I did not figure our enrollment- percent from top. In glancing at the figures, I would guess we are nearer to the middle in enrollment volume, so this is not a key indicator for a higher superintendent salary, compared to others in the state.

4. **Examine if there are administrators whose duties/responsibilities can be increased, in order to limit administrative overall expenses.**

I suspect most of us have had to take on more and do it with less. The private sector, as I mentioned, has had to adapt to survive. The old adage, "If you want something done, give it to your busiest employee" is true.

5. **Please just be aware, WGSD average administrator salaries don't relate to Missouri average salaries (please see the attached excel file- #s from DESE).**

a. Obviously, ours should be MUCH higher than Mo average. However, of the % higher than average Mo. salaries, ours have increased from **19.35% higher in 2005 to 37.74% higher in 2014.**

b. Looking at the DESE graphs, it appears our average administrator salary ought to be at about \$105K to relate to the state average.

6. **Reduce the expenditures to external consultants.**

WGSD has excellent, bright, well-educated, skilled and well compensated administrators and staff. Often, the "default" seems to be to bring in consultants, for strategic planning, superintendent support, preparation for tax levy/bond issues, post-election analysis, curriculum direction, etc.

While I understand, some external consultancy is necessary; consultants are often retired former public school administrators. This results in a very homogeneous approach (some would say incestuous) to problem solving. In addition, it is dis-heartening (and annoying) to have to pay retired educators MORE money. It seems to me they might think of some volunteer time.

Again, I guess I still recall those days of years and years of volunteering at the schools. Parents like me (and I'm sure, to an even greater degree, each of you, since you are board members) read to students in the classrooms, did playground duty. worked w/ students struggling, donated LOTS of our own money, raised funds for the schools, arranged for business deals to help the schools, donated/built playgrounds, planned and donated funding for after school/in school programming, paid for the cost of field trips for students who couldn't pay, planned and executed science nights, reading nights, safety presentations, theater and music productions, fund raisers, AND functioned as campaign workers each election, etc., etc., etc. all while working our "real jobs".

After the February 7, 1994 failed tax levy and bond issue propositions, I performed a "market research study" for the district- for free, of course. It included calls to thousands of citizens, by elementary area, to determine what the voters deemed the most objectionable, as well as analysis and results. Voters were concerned primarily with the district's effective and efficient management of its funds.

NON ADMINTRATIVE STAFF SALARIES

- 1. I agree with the proposed plan to reduce the "supplemental teacher pay" by 10%.**

I understand the district must stay "competitive" w/ other districts and teachers call for adjustments up of this pay from time to time, I am told, in line w/ neighboring districts.

Again, I have to admit, I was completely and absolutely shocked when my children got into high school and I finally learned of the supplemental pay. My children and their friends ADORED their teachers, especially the ones who did the 'extra" duties/club sponsorships, of course. I had, however, (as I have detailed ad nauseam) been in the company of hundreds of parent volunteers for years. In our own "real jobs" we sat on committees and did "extra" work for the joy of it (and to help w/ our performance evaluations). Several of my friends are teachers in private schools. Not only is their pay about 50% of that at WGSD, but they receive not a penny more for committee/extra tasks/project work. I think a 10% reduction is appropriate.

- 2. Examine if there are non-administrative staff whose duties/responsibilities can be increased, in order to limit administrative overall expenses**
- 3. Please just be aware, WGSD teacher salaries don't relate to Missouri average salaries. (please see the attached excel file- #s from DESE). I think ours should be about 31% higher than the state average to follow the DESE graph curve. That would be an average of ~\$61,000. Perhaps with the 1% salary increase this year, a slight slowing will be achieved, resulting, still, in excellent desirable salaries.**
 - a. Obviously, ours should be MUCH higher than Mo average. However, of the % higher than average mo salaries, **ours have increased from 29.58% higher in 2005 to 39.5% in 2014.**
 - b. When looking at % master's prepared, **WGSD teachers has 40% higher than Mo in 2005, yet this fell to 26.3% in 2014.**
 - c. Lindbergh average teacher salaries are well below ours. Brentwood's trajectory was upward, but has settled to approximately where I think ours should be, related to the state average. They are the top two STL Co. districts for quality in the past couple of years.
 - d. Do other districts (Kirkwood, Ladue) have higher average salaries? Yes. We can help, however, set the tone for a slightly less dramatic rise each year, more in line w/ state averages.

- e. I think our teachers love teaching here. I don't believe they only consider money. Teachers are thrilled to be teaching in this safe district surrounded by other long term, enthusiastic staff and an engaged community of parents.

OTHER EXPENDITURES

1. **Please be VERY careful before entering into major curriculum agreements with external/centralized agencies/organizations. Whereas the cost may appear low on the front end, it is doubtful it will be on the back side.**
 - a. I read in the meeting minutes that, about a year ago a BOE member stated objection to a Mo. State legislative bill that would have tied teacher evaluation to student performance. She voiced concern about losing local control. I agree; local control is critical. We will lose that local control for our curriculum if the "Crafting a School for Today" aka "Innovative Schools" is adopted as is. I would rather see our creative staff take what was learned in the "Collaborative Planning Project", to use similar strong qualities and to reject what seems unworkable.
 - b. I am ALL about "experiential", learner directed, "vertical" (I consulted w/ the 6th Grade center, Hixson and HS principals in the 90s to help put together a longitudinal curriculum guide so that parents and students could plan -EARLY- what courses they needed to take/preparation required to achieve the outcome they desired entering college) and "unconventional" learning. I also know that can be done without adopting a national program that might impede our local control in the future.
2. **The \$850,000 warehouse was a shock.**
 - a. Certainly people realize the value of purchasing in bulk and storing centrally. They also can see the value in "reclaiming space" at elementary schools, however, we were led to believe the need is urgent. I checked into the STL Co sales records. That building sale closed in August, 2014. I drive by it often and last week peeked in; it appears to be unoccupied.
 - b. In my digging online, I ran across the (pretty fancy) architectural plans for the warehouse renovation. I thought the idea is storage. The WB Public Library used that very building for about 2? 3? years quite effectively. The interior seemed fine for them, their staff, the public and the books. There are already interior walls, as I recall. Building a few more wouldn't be too costly, but the plans I saw look costly. How much \$ are you thinking of spending?
 - c. Will any communication lines need to be run from Central office to the warehouse?
 - d. The \$ associated w/ the warehouse comes from brick and mortar from the schools, right?
 - e. Many people were pretty ticked about the expense of the \$850K on this. It wasn't well publicized, either (I may have certainly missed it).
3. **Moss Field upkeep/upgrades**

- a. Here is my idea: The city of WG has an arrangement by which 100% of all/any revenue from the pool, ice rink, tennis court- (anything Parks and Rec) goes BACK into the parks and Rec! 😊. That is why our WG parks are so spectacular!
- b. Sell Moss Field for a nominal (or full) fee to the City of WG. Then the city can do its upkeep and upgrades. WGSD can rent to space for a nominal fee for usage.
- c. Isn't the "40 Acres" Project looking at Moss Field? If not, why not?
- d. If you don't agree w/ the city plan, then offer naming rights to some of our notable sports alumni or seek donations from former sports alumni (put it on the web site link! 😊)
- e. BTW- I walk that track, too and it is in MUCH better shape (as are the home side bleachers) than when my kids were there in the early to mid 2000s.

4. Crowding

Dr. Wolfrum is right. He discusses it all in his March 11 letter.

5. Fully Funding Full day Kindergarten (taking on the debt of ~100K for now)

Believe it or not, I don't agree w/ you. I loved having the decadent luxury of having my children do ½ day kindergarten then go to friends' homes to "bond" w/ other WG children before they started 1st grade. Some days they attended Adventure Club.

Most of the parents I knew (the work from home moms babysat for we work outside the home moms) loved it, as well. There is NO hurry to be separated from your child. First grade will come soon enough and soon the child will be 20!!! I don't agree w/ the "womb to tomb" school thing. Parents, grandparents, friends and others in the community have equal influence in the lives of many. The school is not and should not attempt to be the panacea.

I could go on, but by now you may be asleep. Thank you for reading all of this.

PLEASE try to consider the totality of the current economic environment outside the school system(s) as you proceed into the future. The WHOLE community is required to help and its needs/status must be considered.

Sincerely,

Kim Mumm, WG resident

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
ACADEMIE LAFAYETTE	80	80	70.0	69.0	87.5	86.3	-1.3
ACADEMY FOR INTEGRATED ARTS	0	0	0.0	0.0			
ADAIR CO. R-I	140	140	125.0	119.0	89.3	85.0	-4.3
ADAIR CO. R-II	140	140	133.5	131.0	95.4	93.6	-1.8
ADRIAN R-III	140	140	129.5	129.5	92.5	92.5	0.0
ADVANCE R-IV	140	140	123.0	124.5	87.9	88.9	1.1
AFFTON 101	140	140	132.0	134.0	94.3	95.7	1.4
ALBANY R-III	140	140	109.0	115.0	77.9	82.1	4.3
ALLEN VILLAGE	80	70	76.5	65.0	95.6	92.9	-2.8
ALTA VISTA CHARTER SCH.	140	140	90.0	108.5	64.3	77.5	13.2
ALTENBURG 48	80	80	79.0	75.0	98.8	93.8	-5.0
ALTON R-IV	140	140	103.5	105.5	73.9	75.4	1.4
APPLETON CITY R-II	140	140	116.0	134.5	82.9	96.1	13.2
ARCADIA VALLEY R-II	140	140	121.0	129.0	86.4	92.1	5.7
ARCHIE R-V	140	140	130.5	135.0	93.2	96.4	3.2
ASH GROVE R-IV	140	140	126.5	128.5	90.4	91.8	1.4
ATLANTA C-3	140	140	106.0	126.5	75.7	90.4	14.6
AURORA R-VIII	140	140	104.0	102.5	74.3	73.2	-1.1
AVA R-I	140	140	127.5	135.5	91.1	96.8	5.7
AVENUE CITY R-IX	76	76	74.0	73.0	97.4	96.1	-1.3
AVILLA R-XIII	80	80	78.0	74.0	97.5	92.5	-5.0
B. BANNEKER ACADEMY	80	80	23.5	57.0	29.4	71.3	41.9
BAKERSFIELD R-IV	140	140	127.5	136.0	91.1	97.1	6.1
BALLARD R-II	140	138	126.0	111.0	90.0	80.4	-9.6
BAYLESS	140	140	111.0	131.5	79.3	93.9	14.6
BELL CITY R-II	140	140	131.5	123.0	93.9	87.9	-6.1
BELLEVUE R-III	80	80	60.0	71.0	75.0	88.8	13.8
BELTON 124	140	140	134.5	117.0	96.1	83.6	-12.5
BERNIE R-XIII	140	140	132.5	120.0	94.6	85.7	-8.9
BETTER LEARNING COMM ACADEMY	0	10	0.0	7.5		75.0	
BEVIER C-4	140	140	129.5	121.0	92.5	86.4	-6.1
BILLINGS R-IV	140	140	129.5	124.0	92.5	88.6	-3.9
BISMARCK R-V	140	140	119.5	126.0	85.4	90.0	4.6
BLACKWATER R-II	80	76	66.0	70.0	82.5	92.1	9.6
BLAIR OAKS R-II	140	140	136.5	130.5	97.5	93.2	-4.3
BLOOMFIELD R-XIV	140	140	99.0	121.0	70.7	86.4	15.7
BLUE EYE R-V	140	140	120.0	137.0	85.7	97.9	12.1
BLUE SPRINGS R-IV	140	140	137.0	138.0	97.9	98.6	0.7
BOLIVAR R-I	140	140	136.0	131.0	97.1	93.6	-3.6
BONCL R-X	76	66	60.0	66.0	78.9	100.0	21.1
BOONVILLE R-I	140	140	124.0	132.0	88.6	94.3	5.7
BOSWORTH R-V	140	138	93.0	110.5	66.4	80.1	13.6
BOWLING GREEN R-I	140	140	105.0	126.5	75.0	90.4	15.4
BRADLEYVILLE R-I	140	140	119.5	113.5	85.4	81.1	-4.3
BRANSON R-IV	140	140	128.0	132.5	91.4	94.6	3.2
BRAYMER C-4	140	140	135.5	129.0	96.8	92.1	-4.6
BRECKENRIDGE R-I	138	138	119.0	108.0	86.2	78.3	-8.0
BRENTWOOD	140	140	140.0	136.5	100.0	97.5	-2.5
BRONAUGH R-VII	140	140	118.5	121.5	84.6	86.8	2.1
BROOKFIELD R-III	140	140	120.5	123.5	86.1	88.2	2.1
BROOKSIDE CHARTER SCH.	70	70	51.0	58.0	72.9	82.9	10.0

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
BRUNSWICK R-II	140	140	125.5	128.5	89.6	91.8	2.1
BUCHANAN CO. R-IV	140	140	121.0	130.5	86.4	93.2	6.8
BUCKLIN R-II	138	140	121.0	129.0	87.7	92.1	4.5
BUNKER R-III	140	140	122.0	115.5	87.1	82.5	-4.6
BUTLER R-V	140	140	114.0	117.0	81.4	83.6	2.1
CABOOL R-IV	140	140	129.5	129.0	92.5	92.1	-0.4
CAINSVILLE R-I	138	138	129.0	129.0	93.5	93.5	0.0
CALHOUN R-VIII	140	140	99.5	90.5	71.1	64.6	-6.4
CALLAO C-8	76	80	43.0	69.0	56.6	86.3	29.7
CAMDENTON R-III	140	140	135.5	131.5	96.8	93.9	-2.9
CAMERON R-I	140	140	124.5	137.0	88.9	97.9	8.9
CAMPBELL R-II	140	140	129.5	115.5	92.5	82.5	-10.0
CANTON R-V	140	140	124.5	131.0	88.9	93.6	4.6
CAPE GIRARDEAU 63	140	140	103.5	123.5	73.9	88.2	14.3
CARL JUNCTION R-I	140	140	132.0	133.0	94.3	95.0	0.7
CARONDELET LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	70	70	41.0	44.0	58.6	62.9	4.3
CARROLLTON R-VII	140	140	111.0	122.0	79.3	87.1	7.9
CARTHAGE R-IX	140	140	119.0	109.5	85.0	78.2	-6.8
CARUTHERSVILLE 18	140	140	85.5	116.0	61.1	82.9	21.8
CASSVILLE R-IV	140	140	124.0	106.5	88.6	76.1	-12.5
CENTER 58	140	140	119.5	129.5	85.4	92.5	7.1
CENTERVILLE R-I	80	76	70.0	76.0	87.5	100.0	12.5
CENTRAL R-III	140	140	132.0	126.0	94.3	90.0	-4.3
CENTRALIA R-VI	140	140	128.0	134.5	91.4	96.1	4.6
CHADWICK R-I	140	140	126.0	133.5	90.0	95.4	5.4
CHAFFEE R-II	140	140	109.5	111.5	78.2	79.6	1.4
CHARLESTON R-I	140	140	115.0	128.5	82.1	91.8	9.6
CHILHOWEE R-IV	140	140	127.5	129.0	91.1	92.1	1.0
CHILLICOTHE R-II	140	140	128.0	116.5	91.4	83.2	-8.2
CITY GARDEN MONTESSORI	66	70	66.0	68.0	100.0	97.1	-2.9
CLARK CO. R-I	140	140	115.0	118.0	82.1	84.3	2.1
CLARKSBURG C-2	80	80	66.5	75.5	83.1	94.4	11.3
CLARKTON C-4	140	140	98.0	101.0	70.0	72.1	2.1
CLAYTON	140	140	138.5	136.5	98.9	97.5	-1.4
CLEARWATER R-I	140	140	114.5	122.0	81.8	87.1	5.4
CLEVER R-V	140	140	108.0	107.0	77.1	76.4	-0.7
CLIMAX SPRINGS R-IV	140	140	127.5	116.0	91.1	82.9	-8.2
CLINTON	140	140	116.5	105.0	83.2	75.0	-8.2
CLINTON CO. R-III	140	140	137.0	138.0	97.9	98.6	0.7
COLE CAMP R-I	140	140	133.5	129.5	95.4	92.5	-2.9
COLE CO. R-I	140	140	135.0	139.5	96.4	99.6	3.2
COLE CO. R-V	140	140	133.0	127.5	95.0	91.1	-3.9
COLUMBIA 93	140	140	111.5	112.5	79.6	80.4	0.7
COMMUNITY R-VI	140	140	121.0	109.5	86.4	78.2	-8.2
CONCORDIA R-II	140	140	123.5	116.0	88.2	82.9	-5.4
CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES	120	130	34.0	42.0	28.3	32.3	4.0
CONSTRUCTION CAREERS CENTER	140	140	22.5	42.5	16.1	30.4	14.3
COOPER CO. R-IV	140	140	110.0	116.5	78.6	83.2	4.6
COOTER R-IV	140	140	111.5	131.5	79.6	93.9	14.3
COUCH R-I	140	140	119.0	109.0	85.0	77.9	-7.1
COWGILL R-VI	66	66	64.0	53.0	97.0	80.3	-16.7

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
CRAIG R-III	138	134	117.5	116.0	85.1	86.6	1.4
CRANE R-III	140	140	123.0	117.0	87.9	83.6	-4.3
CRAWFORD CO. R-I	140	140	96.5	116.5	68.9	83.2	14.3
CRAWFORD CO. R-II	140	140	105.5	117.5	75.4	83.9	8.6
CROCKER R-II	140	140	116.5	108.5	83.2	77.5	-5.7
CROSSROADS ACAD OF KANSAS CITY	0	0	0.0	0.0			
CRYSTAL CITY 47	140	140	123.5	125.5	88.2	89.6	1.4
DADEVILLE R-II	138	140	129.0	131.5	93.5	93.9	0.5
DALLAS CO. R-I	140	140	132.0	132.0	94.3	94.3	0.0
DAVIS R-XII	76	76	76.0	72.0	100.0	94.7	-5.3
DELASALLE CHARTER SCHOOL	130	140	31.5	32.0	24.2	22.9	-1.4
DELLA LAMB ELEM.	70	70	30.0	37.0	42.9	52.9	10.0
DELTA C-7	140	140	114.5	112.5	81.8	80.4	-1.4
DELTA R-V	140	140	123.5	127.0	88.2	90.7	2.5
DENT-PHELPS R-III	80	80	79.0	71.0	98.8	88.8	-10.0
DERRICK THOMAS ACADEMY	70		39.5		56.4		
DESOTO 73	140	140	113.5	119.0	81.1	85.0	3.9
DEXTER R-XI	140	140	113.5	116.5	81.1	83.2	2.1
DIAMOND R-IV	140	140	110.0	99.0	78.6	70.7	-7.9
DIXON R-I	140	140	97.5	100.5	69.6	71.8	2.1
DONIPHAN R-I	140	140	128.5	117.0	91.8	83.6	-8.2
DORA R-III	140	140	115.5	121.0	82.5	86.4	3.9
DREXEL R-IV	140	140	117.5	129.0	83.9	92.1	8.2
DUNKLIN R-V	140	140	118.5	112.0	84.6	80.0	-4.6
EAGLE COLLEGE PREP ENDEAVOR		0		0.0			
EAST BUCHANAN CO. C-1	140	140	132.0	133.5	94.3	95.4	1.1
EAST CARTER CO. R-II	140	140	119.0	121.0	85.0	86.4	1.4
EAST LYNNE 40	80	80	76.5	69.0	95.6	86.3	-9.4
EAST NEWTON CO. R-VI	140	140	125.5	131.5	89.6	93.9	4.3
EAST PRAIRIE R-II	140	140	119.0	103.5	85.0	73.9	-11.1
EL DORADO SPRINGS R-II	140	140	114.0	129.5	81.4	92.5	11.1
ELDON R-I	140	140	128.5	129.0	91.8	92.1	0.4
ELSBERRY R-II	140	140	125.0	128.5	89.3	91.8	2.5
EMINENCE R-I	140	140	135.0	132.5	96.4	94.6	-1.8
EVERTON R-III	138	140	111.0	116.5	80.4	83.2	2.8
EWING MARION KAUFFMAN SCHOOL	0	70	0.0	62.0		88.6	
EXCELSIOR SPRINGS 40	140	140	118.0	121.0	84.3	86.4	2.1
EXETER R-VI	140	140	117.5	124.0	83.9	88.6	4.6
FAIR GROVE R-X	140	140	131.5	133.5	93.9	95.4	1.4
FAIR PLAY R-II	140	140	111.0	135.0	79.3	96.4	17.1
FAIRFAX R-III	140	138	133.5	138.0	95.4	100.0	4.6
FAIRVIEW R-XI	80	80	67.0	77.0	83.8	96.3	12.5
FARMINGTON R-VII	140	140	126.0	125.5	90.0	89.6	-0.4
FAYETTE R-III	140	140	106.0	127.5	75.7	91.1	15.4
FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	140	140	97.0	92.0	69.3	65.7	-3.6
FESTUS R-VI	140	140	135.0	136.5	96.4	97.5	1.1
FORDLAND R-III	140	140	122.5	131.5	87.5	93.9	6.4
FORSYTH R-III	140	140	126.0	121.0	90.0	86.4	-3.6
FORT OSAGE R-I	140	140	101.5	117.0	72.5	83.6	11.1
FOX C-6	140	140	129.0	125.5	92.1	89.6	-2.5
FRANCIS HOWELL R-III	140	140	135.0	135.5	96.4	96.8	0.4

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
FRANKLIN CO. R-II	80	80	80.0	75.0	100.0	93.8	-6.3
FREDERICKTOWN R-I	140	140	113.5	109.5	81.1	78.2	-2.9
FRONTIER SCHOOL OF INNOVATION	110	130	87.5	116.0	79.5	89.2	9.7
FT. ZUMWALT R-II	140	140	130.0	133.5	92.9	95.4	2.5
FULTON 58	140	140	110.0	121.0	78.6	86.4	7.9
GAINESVILLE R-V	140	140	127.5	131.0	91.1	93.6	2.5
GALENA R-II	140	140	106.0	121.0	75.7	86.4	10.7
GALLATIN R-V	140	140	133.0	131.5	95.0	93.9	-1.1
GASCONADE C-4	76	80	76.0	75.0	100.0	93.8	-6.3
GASCONADE CO. R-I	140	140	131.0	134.5	93.6	96.1	2.5
GASCONADE CO. R-II	140	140	104.5	130.5	74.6	93.2	18.6
GATEWAY SCIENCE ACAD/ST LOUIS	70	70	61.5	59.5	87.9	85.0	-2.9
GENESIS SCHOOL INC.	70	70	37.5	50.5	53.6	72.1	18.6
GIDEON 37	140	140	119.0	118.0	85.0	84.3	-0.7
GILLIAM C-4	76	76	66.0	66.0	86.8	86.8	0.0
GILMAN CITY R-IV	138	138	127.5	127.0	92.4	92.0	-0.4
GLASGOW	140	140	118.0	130.0	84.3	92.9	8.6
GLENWOOD R-VIII	80	80	76.0	76.0	95.0	95.0	0.0
GOLDEN CITY R-III	140	140	112.0	125.0	80.0	89.3	9.3
GORDON PARKS ELEM.	70	10	35.0	10.0	50.0	100.0	50.0
GORIN R-III	76	68	65.5	53.5	86.2	78.7	-7.5
GRAIN VALLEY R-V	140	140	117.5	126.0	83.9	90.0	6.1
GRAND CENTER ARTS ACADEMY	50	70	49.0	58.5	98.0	83.6	-14.4
GRANDVIEW C-4	140	140	131.0	126.0	93.6	90.0	-3.6
GRANDVIEW R-II	140	140	119.5	131.5	85.4	93.9	8.6
GREEN CITY R-I	140	140	122.5	130.0	87.5	92.9	5.4
GREEN FOREST R-II	80	80	79.0	79.0	98.8	98.8	0.0
GREEN RIDGE R-VIII	140	140	131.5	134.5	93.9	96.1	2.1
GREENFIELD R-IV	140	140	121.0	118.5	86.4	84.6	-1.8
GREENVILLE R-II	140	140	126.0	126.0	90.0	90.0	0.0
GRUNDY CO. R-V	140	140	133.5	129.0	95.4	92.1	-3.3
HALE R-I	140	140	131.0	128.5	93.6	91.8	-1.8
HALFWAY R-III	140	140	126.0	118.5	90.0	84.6	-5.4
HALLSVILLE R-IV	140	140	119.0	134.5	85.0	96.1	11.1
HAMILTON R-II	140	140	134.5	135.0	96.1	96.4	0.4
HANCOCK PLACE	140	140	124.0	127.0	88.6	90.7	2.1
HANNIBAL 60	140	140	108.5	99.0	77.5	70.7	-6.8
HARDEMAN R-X	76	76	71.0	74.0	93.4	97.4	3.9
HARDIN-CENTRAL C-2	140	140	122.5	120.5	87.5	86.1	-1.4
HARRISBURG R-VIII	140	140	111.5	129.5	79.6	92.5	12.9
HARRISONVILLE R-IX	140	140	116.5	129.5	83.2	92.5	9.3
HARTVILLE R-II	140	140	127.0	128.5	90.7	91.8	1.1
HAYTI R-II	140	140	73.5	74.5	52.5	53.2	0.7
HAZELWOOD	140	140	119.5	116.0	85.4	82.9	-2.5
HENRY CO. R-I	140	140	131.0	132.5	93.6	94.6	1.1
HERMITAGE R-IV	140	140	128.5	128.5	91.8	91.8	0.0
HICKMAN MILLS C-1	140	140	72.5	99.0	51.8	70.7	18.9
HICKORY CO. R-I	140	140	137.0	135.0	97.9	96.4	-1.4
HIGBEE R-VIII	140	140	128.5	126.5	91.8	90.4	-1.4
HIGH POINT R-III	80	80	65.5	55.5	81.9	69.4	-12.5
HILLSBORO R-III	140	140	123.5	124.0	88.2	88.6	0.4

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
HOGAN PREPARATORY ACADEMY	140	140	64.0	78.5	45.7	56.1	10.4
HOLCOMB R-III	140	140	120.5	125.5	86.1	89.6	3.6
HOLDEN R-III	140	140	119.0	124.5	85.0	88.9	3.9
HOLLIDAY C-2	76	76	63.5	73.0	83.6	96.1	12.5
HOLLISTER R-V	140	140	120.5	124.0	86.1	88.6	2.5
HOPE ACADEMY	140	140	24.0	0.0	17.1	0.0	-17.1
HOPE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	0	10	0.0	7.5		75.0	
HOUSTON R-I	140	140	113.0	116.0	80.7	82.9	2.1
HOWELL VALLEY R-I	80	80	78.0	72.0	97.5	90.0	-7.5
HUDSON R-IX	76	76	74.0	74.0	97.4	97.4	0.0
HUMANSVILLE R-IV	140	140	132.5	136.0	94.6	97.1	2.5
HUME R-VIII	140	140	106.5	105.0	76.1	75.0	-1.1
HURLEY R-I	140	140	102.0	118.5	72.9	84.6	11.8
IBERIA R-V	140	140	126.0	135.0	90.0	96.4	6.4
INDEPENDENCE 30	140	140	104.5	112.0	74.6	80.0	5.4
IRON CO. C-4	140	140	118.5	119.0	84.6	85.0	0.4
JACKSON R-II	140	140	129.5	128.0	92.5	91.4	-1.1
JAMAA LEARNING CENTER	0	50	0.0	30.5		61.0	
JAMESTOWN C-1	138	140	118.0	127.0	85.5	90.7	5.2
JASPER CO. R-V	140	140	127.0	130.0	90.7	92.9	2.1
JEFFERSON C-123	138	138	133.0	134.0	96.4	97.1	0.7
JEFFERSON CITY	140	140	108.0	109.0	77.1	77.9	0.7
JEFFERSON CO. R-VII	80	80	68.5	69.0	85.6	86.3	0.6
JENNINGS	140	140	92.0	109.5	65.7	78.2	12.5
JOHNSON CO. R-VII	140	140	132.0	131.5	94.3	93.9	-0.4
JOPLIN SCHOOLS	140	140	110.0	119.0	78.6	85.0	6.4
JUNCTION HILL C-12	80	80	74.0	79.0	92.5	98.8	6.3
KANSAS CITY 33	140	140	84.0	92.5	60.0	66.1	6.1
KEARNEY R-I	140	140	133.0	138.0	95.0	98.6	3.6
KELSO C-7	76	76	66.0	69.0	86.8	90.8	3.9
KENNETT 39	140	140	114.0	112.0	81.4	80.0	-1.4
KEYTESVILLE R-III	140	138	124.5	115.5	88.9	83.7	-5.2
KING CITY R-I	140	140	135.0	131.5	96.4	93.9	-2.5
KINGSTON 42	76	76	75.0	74.0	98.7	97.4	-1.3
KINGSTON K-14	140	140	128.5	134.0	91.8	95.7	3.9
KINGSVILLE R-I	140	140	116.0	116.0	82.9	82.9	0.0
KIPP ST LOUIS	70	70	60.0	62.0	85.7	88.6	2.9
KIPP: ENDEAVOR ACADEMY	80	80	60.0	59.0	75.0	73.8	-1.3
KIRBYVILLE R-VI	80	80	80.0	77.5	100.0	96.9	-3.1
KIRKSVILLE R-III	140	140	132.5	128.5	94.6	91.8	-2.9
KIRKWOOD R-VII	140	140	137.5	136.5	98.2	97.5	-0.7
KNOB NOSTER R-VIII	140	140	130.5	131.5	93.2	93.9	0.7
KNOX CO. R-I	140	140	134.5	127.0	96.1	90.7	-5.4
LA MONTE R-IV	140	140	113.0	112.0	80.7	80.0	-0.7
LA PLATA R-II	140	140	131.5	127.0	93.9	90.7	-3.2
LACLEDE CO. C-5	80	80	71.0	78.0	88.8	97.5	8.8
LACLEDE CO. R-I	140	140	123.5	104.0	88.2	74.3	-13.9
LADUE	140	140	138.5	136.5	98.9	97.5	-1.4
LAFAYETTE CO. C-1	140	140	131.0	125.5	93.6	89.6	-3.9
LAFAYETTE PREPARATORY ACADEMY		0		0.0			
LAKE LAND R-III	140	140	109.5	117.0	78.2	83.6	5.4

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
LAMAR R-I	140	140	124.0	125.0	88.6	89.3	0.7
LAQUEY R-V	140	140	115.0	106.5	82.1	76.1	-6.1
LAREDO R-VII	76	76	59.0	76.0	77.6	100.0	22.4
LATHROP R-II	140	140	125.0	130.0	89.3	92.9	3.6
LAWSON R-XIV	140	140	133.5	133.5	95.4	95.4	0.0
LEBANON R-III	140	140	132.5	134.5	94.6	96.1	1.4
LEE A. TOLBERT COM. ACADEMY	70	80	52.0	59.0	74.3	73.8	-0.5
LEE'S SUMMIT R-VII	140	140	134.5	129.5	96.1	92.5	-3.6
LEESVILLE R-IX	80	80	66.0	80.0	82.5	100.0	17.5
LEETON R-X	140	140	129.0	130.5	92.1	93.2	1.1
LEOPOLD R-III	138	138	130.5	133.0	94.6	96.4	1.8
LESTERVILLE R-IV	140	140	128.0	133.5	91.4	95.4	3.9
LEWIS CO. C-1	140	140	116.0	133.0	82.9	95.0	12.1
LEXINGTON R-V	140	140	119.0	112.0	85.0	80.0	-5.0
LIBERAL R-II	140	140	127.0	129.5	90.7	92.5	1.8
LIBERTY 53	140	140	131.0	130.0	93.6	92.9	-0.7
LICKING R-VIII	140	140	113.5	128.0	81.1	91.4	10.4
LIFT FOR LIFE ACADEMY	110	130	75.0	107.5	68.2	82.7	14.5
LINCOLN R-II	140	140	119.5	140.0	85.4	100.0	14.6
LINDBERGH SCHOOLS	140	140	139.0	138.0	99.3	98.6	-0.7
LINN CO. R-I	140	140	121.0	116.0	86.4	82.9	-3.6
LIVINGSTON CO. R-III	76	76	73.5	72.0	96.7	94.7	-2.0
LOCKWOOD R-I	140	140	129.0	116.0	92.1	82.9	-9.3
LOGAN-ROGERSVILLE R-VIII	140	140	130.5	128.0	93.2	91.4	-1.8
LONE JACK C-6	140	140	126.0	128.0	90.0	91.4	1.4
LONEDELL R-XIV	80	80	76.5	75.0	95.6	93.8	-1.9
LOUISIANA R-II	140	140	124.0	124.0	88.6	88.6	0.0
LURAY 33	76	66	66.0	65.0	86.8	98.5	11.6
LUTIE R-VI	140	140	107.5	104.5	76.8	74.6	-2.1
MACKS CREEK R-V	140	140	123.0	135.5	87.9	96.8	8.9
MACON CO. R-I	140	140	132.5	126.5	94.6	90.4	-4.3
MACON CO. R-IV	140	140	128.5	130.0	91.8	92.9	1.1
MADISON C-3	140	140	113.5	124.5	81.1	88.9	7.8
MALDEN R-I	140	140	121.5	120.0	86.8	85.7	-1.1
MALTA BEND R-V	138	138	118.5	121.0	85.9	87.7	1.8
MANES R-V	80	80	77.5	79.0	96.9	98.8	1.9
MANSFIELD R-IV	140	140	126.5	132.5	90.4	94.6	4.3
MAPLEWOOD-RICHMOND HEIGHTS	140	140	124.0	131.0	88.6	93.6	5.0
MARCELINE R-V	140	140	128.5	130.5	91.8	93.2	1.4
MARIES CO. R-I	140	140	124.0	121.5	88.6	86.8	-1.8
MARIES CO. R-II	140	140	97.5	106.0	69.6	75.7	6.1
MARION C. EARLY R-V	140	140	131.0	131.0	93.6	93.6	0.0
MARION CO. R-II	140	140	135.0	139.0	96.4	99.3	2.9
MARIONVILLE R-IX	140	140	112.5	132.0	80.4	94.3	13.9
MARK TWAIN R-VIII	80	80	76.5	72.0	95.6	90.0	-5.6
MARQUAND-ZION R-VI	140	140	104.0	123.0	74.3	87.9	13.6
MARSHALL	140	140	123.0	117.5	87.9	83.9	-3.9
MARSHFIELD R-I	140	140	125.5	134.5	89.6	96.1	6.4
MARYVILLE R-II	140	140	130.0	134.0	92.9	95.7	2.9
MAYSVILLE R-I	140	140	128.0	133.0	91.4	95.0	3.6
MCDONALD CO. R-I	140	140	130.0	132.0	92.9	94.3	1.4

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
MEADOW HEIGHTS R-II	140	140	124.5	118.5	88.9	84.6	-4.3
MEADVILLE R-IV	140	140	129.5	122.5	92.5	87.5	-5.0
MEHLVILLE R-IX	140	140	129.5	129.5	92.5	92.5	0.0
MERAMEC VALLEY R-III	140	140	125.0	115.5	89.3	82.5	-6.8
MEXICO 59	140	140	110.0	114.0	78.6	81.4	2.9
MIAMI R-I (BATES CO.	140	140	100.5	119.0	71.8	85.0	13.2
MIAMI R-I (SALINE CO.	68	66	57.5	62.5	84.6	94.7	10.1
MID-BUCHANAN CO. R-V	140	140	122.5	126.5	87.5	90.4	2.9
MIDDLE GROVE C-1	76	76	76.0	73.5	100.0	96.7	-3.3
MIDWAY R-I	140	140	129.0	130.5	92.1	93.2	1.1
MILAN C-2	140	140	101.0	100.0	72.1	71.4	-0.7
MILLER CO. R-III	140	140	126.0	117.5	90.0	83.9	-6.1
MILLER R-II	140	140	120.5	123.5	86.1	88.2	2.1
MIRABILE C-1	76	76	76.0	71.0	100.0	93.4	-6.6
MISSOURI CITY 56	68	68	65.5	61.0	96.3	89.7	-6.6
MO SCHLS FOR THE SEV DISABLED	0		0.0				
MO SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND	138	138	105.5	92.0	76.4	66.7	-9.7
MO SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF	140	140	49.5	45.5	35.4	32.5	-2.9
MO VIRTUAL INSTRUCTION PROGRAM	0		0.0				
MOBERLY	140	140	128.0	113.5	91.4	81.1	-10.4
MONETT R-I	140	140	123.5	120.0	88.2	85.7	-2.5
MONITEAU CO. R-I	140	140	125.5	123.0	89.6	87.9	-1.8
MONITEAU CO. R-V	76	76	76.0	75.0	100.0	98.7	-1.3
MONROE CITY R-I	140	140	115.0	106.5	82.1	76.1	-6.1
MONTGOMERY CO. R-II	140	140	122.5	127.5	87.5	91.1	3.6
MONTROSE R-XIV	134	138	125.0	123.0	93.3	89.1	-4.2
MORGAN CO. R-I	140	140	99.5	100.5	71.1	71.8	0.7
MORGAN CO. R-II	140	140	128.0	128.5	91.4	91.8	0.4
MOUND CITY R-II	140	140	131.5	130.0	93.9	92.9	-1.1
MOUNTAIN GROVE R-III	140	140	117.5	119.5	83.9	85.4	1.4
MOUNTAIN VIEW-BIRCH TREE R-III	140	140	118.5	128.5	84.6	91.8	7.1
MT. VERNON R-V	140	140	131.0	134.5	93.6	96.1	2.5
NAYLOR R-II	140	140	120.0	128.0	85.7	91.4	5.7
NEELYVILLE R-IV	140	140	129.5	135.0	92.5	96.4	3.9
NELL HOLCOMB R-IV	80	80	71.5	67.5	89.4	84.4	-5.0
NEOSHO R-V	140	140	125.0	123.5	89.3	88.2	-1.1
NEVADA R-V	140	140	119.5	126.5	85.4	90.4	5.0
NEW BLOOMFIELD R-III	140	140	105.0	126.5	75.0	90.4	15.4
NEW FRANKLIN R-I	140	140	116.0	125.0	82.9	89.3	6.4
NEW HAVEN	140	140	133.0	136.0	95.0	97.1	2.1
NEW MADRID CO. R-I	140	140	91.0	108.0	65.0	77.1	12.1
NEW YORK R-IV	68	72	58.0	62.0	85.3	86.1	0.8
NEWBURG R-II	140	140	94.5	105.0	67.5	75.0	7.5
NEWTOWN-HARRIS R-III	140	140	131.0	127.0	93.6	90.7	-2.9
NIANGUA R-V	140	140	126.0	109.5	90.0	78.2	-11.8
Nixa Public Schools	140	140	137.0	135.5	97.9	96.8	-1.1
NODAWAY-HOLT R-VII	140	140	114.0	129.0	81.4	92.1	10.7
NORBORNE R-VIII	140	140	107.0	107.5	76.4	76.8	0.4
NORMANDY	140	140	15.5	10.0	11.1	7.1	-3.9
NORTH ANDREW CO. R-VI	140	140	106.5	111.0	76.1	79.3	3.2
NORTH CALLAWAY CO. R-I	140	140	129.0	129.0	92.1	92.1	0.0

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
NORTH DAVIESS R-III	138	138	117.0	100.0	84.8	72.5	-12.3
NORTH HARRISON R-III	140	140	136.5	134.0	97.5	95.7	-1.8
NORTH KANSAS CITY 74	140	140	110.5	129.0	78.9	92.1	13.2
NORTH MERCER CO. R-III	140	140	115.0	127.0	82.1	90.7	8.6
NORTH NODAWAY CO. R-VI	140	140	116.0	122.0	82.9	87.1	4.3
NORTH PEMISCOT CO. R-I	140	140	104.0	114.5	74.3	81.8	7.5
NORTH PLATTE CO. R-I	140	140	139.5	138.0	99.6	98.6	-1.1
NORTH SHELBY	140	140	136.0	134.5	97.1	96.1	-1.1
NORTH SIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOL	10	50	10.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
NORTH ST. FRANCOIS CO. R-I	140	140	130.5	126.5	93.2	90.4	-2.9
NORTH WOOD R-IV	80	80	71.5	74.0	89.4	92.5	3.1
NORTHEAST NODAWAY CO. R-V	140	140	120.5	119.0	86.1	85.0	-1.1
NORTHEAST RANDOLPH CO. R-IV	140	140	128.5	129.5	91.8	92.5	0.7
NORTHEAST VERNON CO. R-I	140	140	134.0	133.0	95.7	95.0	-0.7
NORTHWEST R-I	140	140	122.5	117.5	87.5	83.9	-3.6
NORTHWESTERN R-I	138	138	114.5	123.0	83.0	89.1	6.2
NORWOOD R-I	140	140	119.5	124.5	85.4	88.9	3.6
OAK GROVE R-VI	140	140	131.0	133.5	93.6	95.4	1.8
OAK HILL R-I	80	80	73.5	75.0	91.9	93.8	1.9
OAK RIDGE R-VI	140	140	136.0	135.0	97.1	96.4	-0.7
ODESSA R-VII	140	140	130.0	123.0	92.9	87.9	-5.0
ORAN R-III	140	140	128.5	126.0	91.8	90.0	-1.8
ORCHARD FARM R-V	140	140	128.5	132.5	91.8	94.6	2.9
OREARVILLE R-IV	76	76	66.0	65.0	86.8	85.5	-1.3
OREGON-HOWELL R-III	140	140	119.0	121.0	85.0	86.4	1.4
ORRICK R-XI	140	140	120.0	125.5	85.7	89.6	3.9
OSAGE CO. R-I	140	140	128.0	119.5	91.4	85.4	-6.1
OSAGE CO. R-II	140	140	107.0	108.5	76.4	77.5	1.1
OSAGE CO. R-III	140	140	136.0	137.5	97.1	98.2	1.1
OSBORN R-O	140	140	128.0	122.5	91.4	87.5	-3.9
OSCEOLA	140	140	111.5	117.5	79.6	83.9	4.3
OTTERVILLE R-VI	140	140	118.0	123.5	84.3	88.2	3.9
OZARK R-VI	140	140	134.5	137.5	96.1	98.2	2.1
PALMYRA R-I	140	140	132.0	135.0	94.3	96.4	2.1
PARIS R-II	140	140	127.0	132.0	90.7	94.3	3.6
PARK HILL	140	140	136.5	137.5	97.5	98.2	0.7
PARKWAY C-2	140	140	139.5	135.0	99.6	96.4	-3.2
PATHWAY ACADEMY	70	70	52.5	38.0	75.0	54.3	-20.7
PATTONSBURG R-II	140	140	123.5	125.0	88.2	89.3	1.1
PATTONVILLE R-III	140	140	116.0	135.5	82.9	96.8	13.9
PEMISCOT CO. R-III	80	80	44.5	51.5	55.6	64.4	8.8
PERRY CO. 32	140	140	99.0	110.0	70.7	78.6	7.9
PETTIS CO. R-V	140	140	122.5	120.0	87.5	85.7	-1.8
PETTIS CO. R-XII	80	80	67.0	78.0	83.8	97.5	13.8
PHELPS CO. R-III	80	80	76.0	76.5	95.0	95.6	0.6
PIERCE CITY R-VI	140	140	126.5	131.0	90.4	93.6	3.2
PIKE CO. R-III	140	140	130.0	124.5	92.9	88.9	-3.9
PILOT GROVE C-4	140	140	123.0	126.5	87.9	90.4	2.5
PLAINVIEW R-VIII	80	80	72.0	77.0	90.0	96.3	6.3
PLATO R-V	140	140	115.0	129.5	82.1	92.5	10.4
PLATTE CO. R-III	140	140	127.5	132.5	91.1	94.6	3.6

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
PLEASANT HILL R-III	140	140	131.0	133.5	93.6	95.4	1.8
PLEASANT HOPE R-VI	140	140	129.5	129.5	92.5	92.5	0.0
PLEASANT VIEW R-VI	76	76	69.0	76.0	90.8	100.0	9.2
POLO R-VII	140	140	124.0	131.0	88.6	93.6	5.0
POPLAR BLUFF R-I	140	140	97.5	101.5	69.6	72.5	2.9
PORTAGEVILLE	140	140	114.5	111.0	81.8	79.3	-2.5
POTOSI R-III	140	140	110.5	110.0	78.9	78.6	-0.4
PRAIRIE HOME R-V	140	140	112.5	120.0	80.4	85.7	5.4
PRECLARUS MASTERY ACADEMY	0	70	0.0	32.0		45.7	
PRINCETON R-V	140	140	132.0	130.0	94.3	92.9	-1.4
PURDY R-II	140	140	128.5	111.5	91.8	79.6	-12.1
PUTNAM CO. R-I	140	140	117.0	105.5	83.6	75.4	-8.2
PUXICO R-VIII	140	140	128.5	123.5	91.8	88.2	-3.6
RALLS CO. R-II	140	140	114.5	120.0	81.8	85.7	3.9
RAYMONDVILLE R-VII	80	80	75.5	61.5	94.4	76.9	-17.5
RAYMORE-PECULIAR R-II	140	140	130.5	134.5	93.2	96.1	2.9
RAYTOWN C-2	140	140	119.0	100.5	85.0	71.8	-13.2
REEDS SPRING R-IV	140	140	133.0	129.0	95.0	92.1	-2.9
RENICK R-V	80	80	77.0	80.0	96.3	100.0	3.8
REPUBLIC R-III	140	140	134.5	134.0	96.1	95.7	-0.4
RICH HILL R-IV	140	140	105.0	125.5	75.0	89.6	14.6
RICHARDS R-V	80	80	70.0	77.5	87.5	96.9	9.4
RICHLAND R-I	140	140	132.0	135.5	94.3	96.8	2.5
RICHLAND R-IV	140	140	109.0	117.0	77.9	83.6	5.7
RICHMOND R-XVI	140	140	108.0	121.5	77.1	86.8	9.6
RICHWOODS R-VII	80	80	62.5	73.0	78.1	91.3	13.1
RIDGEWAY R-V	140	140	128.0	137.0	91.4	97.9	6.4
RIPLEY CO. R-III	80	80	80.0	68.0	100.0	85.0	-15.0
RIPLEY CO. R-IV	80	80	49.0	71.0	61.3	88.8	27.5
RISCO R-II	140	140	95.5	107.5	68.2	76.8	8.6
RITENOUR	140	140	100.5	113.0	71.8	80.7	8.9
RIVERVIEW GARDENS	140	140	40.0	63.5	28.6	45.4	16.8
ROCK PORT R-II	140	140	128.5	132.0	91.8	94.3	2.5
ROCKWOOD R-VI	140	140	130.0	92.9	94.3	98.2	5.4
ROLLA 31	140	140	134.5	124.5	96.1	88.9	-7.1
ROSCOE C-1	80	80	68.5	52.0	85.6	65.0	-20.6
SALEM R-80	140	140	125.5	130.0	89.6	92.9	3.2
SALISBURY R-IV	140	140	118.0	126.0	84.3	90.0	5.7
SANTA FE R-X	140	140	133.0	123.5	95.0	88.2	-6.8
SARCOXIE R-II	140	140	105.5	111.0	75.4	79.3	3.9
SAVANNAH R-III	140	140	127.5	129.0	91.1	92.1	1.1
SCHOOL OF THE OSAGE	140	140	136.5	133.5	97.5	95.4	-2.1
SCHUYLER CO. R-I	140	140	115.0	122.0	82.1	87.1	5.0
SCOTLAND CO. R-I	140	140	127.5	132.0	91.1	94.3	3.2
SCOTT CITY R-I	140	140	128.0	128.0	91.4	91.4	0.0
SCOTT CO. CENTRAL	140	140	123.5	97.0	88.2	69.3	-18.9
SCOTT CO. R-IV	140	140	127.5	125.5	91.1	89.6	-1.4
SCUOLA VITA NUOVA	80	80	70.0	57.5	87.5	71.9	-15.6
SEDALIA 200	140	140	126.0	118.5	90.0	84.6	-5.4
SENATH-HORNERSVILLE C-8	140	140	100.5	106.0	71.8	75.7	3.9
SENECA R-VII	140	140	125.0	117.5	89.3	83.9	-5.4

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
SEYMOUR R-II	140	140	118.5	116.0	84.6	82.9	-1.8
SHAWNEE R-III	76	76	76.0	76.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
SHEARWATER EDUCATION FOUNDATN	50		0.0		0.0		
SHELBY CO. R-IV	140	140	133.0	123.0	95.0	87.9	-7.1
SHELDON R-VIII	140	140	123.0	116.5	87.9	83.2	-4.6
SHELL KNOB 78	80	80	79.0	79.0	98.8	98.8	0.0
SHERWOOD CASS R-VIII	140	140	109.0	109.5	77.9	78.2	0.4
SIKESTON R-6	140	140	105.5	95.0	75.4	67.9	-7.5
SILEX R-I	140	140	133.5	133.0	95.4	95.0	-0.4
SKYLINE R-II	80	80	80.0	71.0	100.0	88.8	-11.3
SLATER	140	140	93.0	92.5	66.4	66.1	-0.4
SMITHTON R-VI	140	140	124.0	117.0	88.6	83.6	-5.0
SMITHVILLE R-II	140	140	123.0	123.5	87.9	88.2	0.4
SOUTH CALLAWAY CO. R-II	140	140	128.5	128.0	91.8	91.4	-0.4
SOUTH CITY PREPARATORY ACADEMY	0	70	0.0	54.0		77.1	
SOUTH HARRISON CO. R-II	140	140	121.5	123.0	86.8	87.9	1.1
SOUTH HOLT CO. R-I	140	140	125.5	124.0	89.6	88.6	-1.1
SOUTH IRON CO. R-I	140	140	124.5	127.5	88.9	91.1	2.1
SOUTH NODAWAY CO. R-IV	140	140	137.5	137.5	98.2	98.2	0.0
SOUTH PEMISCOT CO. R-V	140	140	97.5	134.5	69.6	96.1	26.4
SOUTHERN BOONE CO. R-I	140	140	132.5	136.0	94.6	97.1	2.5
SOUTHERN REYNOLDS CO. R-II	140	140	82.5	103.5	58.9	73.9	15.0
SOUTHLAND C-9	140	140	96.5	105.0	68.9	75.0	6.1
SOUTHWEST LIVINGSTON CO. R-I	140	140	115.5	117.5	82.5	83.9	1.4
SOUTHWEST R-V	140	140	112.0	124.0	80.0	88.6	8.6
SPARTA R-III	140	140	117.5	120.5	83.9	86.1	2.1
SPECL. SCH. DST. ST. LOUIS CO.	140	140	92.5	103.5	66.1	73.9	7.8
SPICKARD R-II	66	66	66.0	59.0	100.0	89.4	-10.6
SPOKANE R-VII	140	140	132.0	132.0	94.3	94.3	0.0
SPRING BLUFF R-XV	80	80	77.0	79.0	96.3	98.8	2.5
SPRINGFIELD R-XII	140	140	124.5	119.5	88.9	85.4	-3.6
ST LOUIS LANG IMMERSION SCHOOL	10	50	7.5	40.5	75.0	81.0	6.0
ST. CHARLES R-VI	140	140	121.5	126.5	86.8	90.4	3.6
ST. CLAIR R-XIII	140	140	124.0	129.5	88.6	92.5	3.9
ST. ELIZABETH R-IV	140	138	139.0	138.0	99.3	100.0	0.7
ST. JAMES R-I	140	140	127.5	125.5	91.1	89.6	-1.4
ST. JOSEPH	140	140	126.0	118.0	90.0	84.3	-5.7
ST. LOUIS CHARTER SCHOOL	80	80	64.5	68.5	80.6	85.6	5.0
ST. LOUIS CITY	140	140	34.5	60.5	24.6	43.2	18.6
STANBERRY R-II	140	140	136.0	137.0	97.1	97.9	0.7
STE. GENEVIEVE CO. R-II	140	140	130.5	133.5	93.2	95.4	2.1
STEELVILLE R-III	140	140	132.0	122.5	94.3	87.5	-6.8
STEWARTSVILLE C-2	138	138	125.5	122.0	90.9	88.4	-2.5
STOCKTON R-I	140	140	133.5	135.5	95.4	96.8	1.4
STOUTLAND R-II	140	140	105.5	112.5	75.4	80.4	5.0
STRAFFORD R-VI	140	140	136.0	135.0	97.1	96.4	-0.7
STRAIN-JAPAN R-XVI	76	76	76.0	72.0	100.0	94.7	-5.3
STRASBURG C-3	80	76	79.0	74.0	98.8	97.4	-1.4
STURGEON R-V	140	140	130.5	124.5	93.2	88.9	-4.3
SUCCESS R-VI	80	80	65.0	71.0	81.3	88.8	7.5
SULLIVAN	140	140	121.5	114.5	86.8	81.8	-5.0

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
SUMMERSVILLE R-II	140	140	128.0	133.5	91.4	95.4	3.9
SUNRISE R-IX	80	80	70.0	71.0	87.5	88.8	1.3
SWEDEBORG R-III	76	76	73.5	72.0	96.7	94.7	-2.0
SWEET SPRINGS R-VII	140	140	128.5	118.0	91.8	84.3	-7.5
TANEYVILLE R-II	80	80	69.5	80.0	86.9	100.0	13.1
TARKIO R-I	140	140	132.0	129.5	94.3	92.5	-1.8
THAYER R-II	140	140	133.0	133.5	95.0	95.4	0.4
THORNFIELD R-I	80	76	75.0	59.0	93.8	77.6	-16.1
TINA-AVALON R-II	140	140	120.0	129.0	85.7	92.1	6.4
TIPTON R-VI	140	140	132.5	135.0	94.6	96.4	1.8
TRENTON R-IX	140	140	112.0	133.0	80.0	95.0	15.0
TRI-COUNTY R-VII	140	140	126.0	129.5	90.0	92.5	2.5
TROY R-III	140	140	124.5	126.0	88.9	90.0	1.1
TWIN RIVERS R-X	140	140	104.0	104.5	74.3	74.6	0.4
UNION R-XI	140	140	106.0	110.5	75.7	78.9	3.2
UNION STAR R-II	138	140	133.5	126.0	96.7	90.0	-6.7
UNIVERSITY ACADEMY	140	140	135.0	127.0	96.4	90.7	-5.7
UNIVERSITY CITY	140	140	93.5	97.5	66.8	69.6	2.9
VALLEY PARK	140	140	125.0	134.0	89.3	95.7	6.4
VALLEY R-VI	140	140	122.0	109.5	87.1	78.2	-8.9
VAN BUREN R-I	140	140	112.0	109.0	80.0	77.9	-2.1
VAN-FAR R-I	140	140	123.5	114.0	88.2	81.4	-6.8
VERONA R-VII	140	140	115.0	118.5	82.1	84.6	2.5
WALNUT GROVE R-V	140	140	125.5	133.5	89.6	95.4	5.7
WARREN CO. R-III	140	140	107.5	116.0	76.8	82.9	6.1
WARRENSBURG R-VI	140	140	129.0	132.0	92.1	94.3	2.1
WARSAW R-IX	140	140	116.5	115.5	83.2	82.5	-0.7
WASHINGTON	140	140	127.5	133.0	91.1	95.0	3.9
WAYNESVILLE R-VI	140	140	115.0	130.0	82.1	92.9	10.7
WEAUBLEAU R-III	140	140	118.5	139.5	84.6	99.6	15.0
WEBB CITY R-VII	140	140	122.5	133.0	87.5	95.0	7.5
WEBSTER GROVES	140	140	136.5	134.0	97.5	95.7	-1.8
WELLINGTON-NAPOLEON R-IX	140	140	130.0	125.0	92.9	89.3	-3.6
WELLSVILLE MIDDLETOWN R-I	140	140	123.5	120.0	88.2	85.7	-2.5
WENTZVILLE R-IV	140	140	135.0	134.5	96.4	96.1	-0.4
WEST NODAWAY CO. R-I	140	140	116.0	111.0	82.9	79.3	-3.6
WEST PLAINS R-VII	140	140	131.0	129.5	93.6	92.5	-1.1
WEST PLATTE CO. R-II	140	140	131.5	127.0	93.9	90.7	-3.2
WEST ST. FRANCOIS CO. R-IV	140	140	125.0	134.5	89.3	96.1	6.8
WESTRAN R-I	140	140	108.0	117.5	77.1	83.9	6.8
WESTVIEW C-6	80	80	78.0	80.0	97.5	100.0	2.5
WHEATLAND R-II	140	140	136.5	130.0	97.5	92.9	-4.6
WHEATON R-III	140	140	115.0	134.5	82.1	96.1	13.9
WILLARD R-II	140	140	129.5	131.0	92.5	93.6	1.1
WILLOW SPRINGS R-IV	140	140	129.0	120.5	92.1	86.1	-6.1
WINDSOR C-1	140	140	120.0	130.0	85.7	92.9	7.1
WINFIELD R-IV	140	140	123.5	109.0	88.2	77.9	-10.4
WINONA R-III	140	140	128.5	127.5	91.8	91.1	-0.7
WINSTON R-VI	140	140	133.5	132.0	95.4	94.3	-1.1
WOODLAND R-IV	140	140	116.5	128.0	83.2	91.4	8.2
WORTH CO. R-III	140	140	129.5	132.5	92.5	94.6	2.1

District Name	13 Pts. Possible	14 Pts. Possible	13 Pts. Earned	14 Pts. Earned	13 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	14 Pct. Of Pts. Earned	Difference in Pct. Pts. Earned 2013 to 2014
WRIGHT CITY R-II OF WARREN CO.	140	140	127.5	134.5	91.1	96.1	5.0
ZALMA R-V	140	140	130.5	130.0	93.2	92.9	-0.4

Jane Baumgartner

From: Sarah Riss
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 2:45 PM
To: Jane Baumgartner
Subject: FW: "live" links

Please put in the communication log.

Sarah

Dr. Sarah Booth Riss
Superintendent of Schools
Webster Groves School District
314-961-1233

From: Addison, David [<mailto:DAddison@rgare.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 2:10 PM
To: Sarah Riss
Cc: Amy Clendennen
Subject: Fw: "live" links

One more.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

From:
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 2:05 PM
To: 'addison.david@wgmail.org'; 'clendennen.amy@wgmail.org'; 'emerson.smith10@gmail.com'; 'loher.steve@wgmail.org'; 'dugan.jean@wgmail.org'; 'wgsdshipley@gmail.com'; 'oliver.joel@wgmail.org'
Subject: "live" links

Because I attached my letter (due to its length) the source links I cited in the body of the letter are not live (at least on my computer).

I will, therefore, e-mail them to you here. I hope that helps. You don't need it to be difficult!

Thanks,

Kim

<http://educationnext.org/the-school-administrator-payoff-from-teacher-pensions/>

<http://www.lindberghfoundationstl.com/>

http://www.kirkwoodschoools.org/pages/Kirkwood_School_District/Departments/Community_Relations_and_Develo/KSD_Foundation/News/KSD_Staff_Pays_It_Foward

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
WGSD average administrator salaries (\$)	86915	89673	97184	98647	100869	101133	110878	112486	114844	120773
Missouri average administrator salaries (\$)	72821	75180	77644	80204	82244	83224	83581	847887	86019	87199
difference (\$)	14094	14493	19540	18443	18625	17909	27297	27699	28825	32914
% WG higher than Mo ADMIN salaries (percent)	19.35	19.27	25.16	22.99	22.64	21.50	32.65	32.66	33.50	37.74
WGSD average teacher salary (regular term)	50636	52218	55325	57033	58159	59103	60399	61590	63501	65225
Missouri average teacher salary (regular term)	39077	40383	41750	43260	44234	45139	45309	45708	46223	46756
difference (\$)	11559	11835	13575	13773	13025	13964	15040	15882	17278	18469
% WG higher than Mo TEACHER salaries (percent)	29.58	29.3	32.51	31.83	31.48	30.93	33.19	34.74	37.37	39.5
% w/ master's degree at WG	69.5	73.7	76.7	74.7	70.7	74.7	74.6	78.5	75.6	74.4
% w/ master's degree state	49.6	50	50.6	51.3	53.5	56	57.7	58.8	59.1	58.9
difference	19.9	23.7	26.1	23.4	23.2	18.7	16.9	19.7	16.5	15.5
% higher masters degrees in WG than state (percent)	40	47.4	51.8	45.6	43.4	33.4	29.3	33.5	27.9	26.3

(source for salaries- DESE.mo.gov, last updated 4/19/15)
differences and % differences calculated using the data

Jane Baumgartner

From: Sarah Riss
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 4:10 PM
To: Board
Subject: FW: baumgartner.jane@wgmail.org

Below is the response David composed on behalf of the Board to Megan Havice regarding the situation with Japanese at WGHS. He consulted with John Simpson prior to sending to confirm that the information shared was accurate.

Sarah

Dr. Sarah Booth Riss
Superintendent of Schools
Webster Groves School District
314-961-1233

From: Addison, David [mailto:DAddison@rgare.com]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 4:08 PM
To: Megan Havice
Cc: John Simpson; Sarah Riss
Subject: RE: baumgartner.jane@wgmail.org

Dear Megan:

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. I, and I am sure the rest of the Board, share your desire to offer our students as broad a range of options as possible. At the same time, our need to manage available resources carefully forces us to make a number of difficult decisions.

I note from Mr. Simpson's response that the administration has been able to devise a solution that while not ideal, does ensure that all students currently enrolled in the High School's Japanese program can continue in the program through graduation.

I am glad to hear that your daughter has gained from her time learning Japanese and I commend her for her efforts. Unfortunately there have been very few similarly ambitious students in recent years and the decision to cease offering Japanese was made as a result of low enrollment rather than having anything to do with the recent funding decisions made by our community. In an ideal world we would offer a course even if only one child wanted to participate, but sadly we must have minimum levels of enrollment to be able to offer any course on an ongoing basis.

I thank you for taking the time to reach out and I hope that the solution devised by the administration will help your daughter and the other enrolled students reach their goals.

With best regards

David

David Addison
President
Webster Groves School District Board of Education.

From: John Simpson [<mailto:Simpson.John@wgmail.org>]

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 12:37 PM

To: Megan Havice; Addison, David; Amy Clendennen; emmersonsmith10@gmail.com; Steve Loher; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Joel Oliver; Sarah Riss; Linda Holliday; LaNita Harrison; Diane Moore; Jon Clark; Shiree Yeggins; Angela Thompson; John E. Thomas; John Raimondo

Subject: RE: baumgartner.jane@wgmail.org

Good afternoon, Megan,

Thank you for sharing with us.

First of all, I wanted to share that we are going to provide the six students (from what Ms. Powers shared) wanting to take Japanese 3 or 4 with the opportunity to do so in 15-16. Students wishing to take Japanese III or IV may participate in a first hour course taught by Ms. Patricia Powers. The course will meet at Hixson Middle School two to three times per week from 7:45 - 8:30 am. The rest of the course work including interactions with the class and teacher will be done online. We will do our best to work around any impediments which might exist so that any interested students might take the class (ie: providing technology for student to access at WGHS). In addition, the school district will provide Ms. Powers, who incidentally recently completed a certification for online teaching, with all the support she needs (ie: technology) in order to set the students up for a successful experience beginning the fall of 2015.

Next, what follows is our guidance counseling department chair's, Ms. Verstraete, response related to your statement about colleges: "If a college requires a foreign language for admission (not all do) , they typically only require 2 years of the same language. Most highly selective colleges "recommend" four years of the same language. In that case, Mrs. Dempsey or myself will explain that students were unable to complete four years due to the program being dropped. I am 100% certain that colleges will understand that and not hold it against the student." While our gradual discontinuation of the Japanese program will allow students to advance through multiple levels, it's good to know that our students wouldn't have been penalized should the opportunity not have existed.

For your information, the high school will send be sending home a letter that offers some options for students currently enrolled in Japanese (I-IV) and wishing to continue their learning in that language.

Please reach out to your child's assistant principal, guidance counselor, or myself with any other concerns or requests for support!

Take care,
John

From: Megan Havice [<mailto:meghavice@aol.com>]

Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2015 11:43 AM

To: David Addison; Amy Clendennen; emmersonsmith10@gmail.com; Steve Loher; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Joel Oliver; Sarah Riss; John Simpson; Linda Holliday; LaNita Harrison; Diane Moore; Jon Clark; Shiree Yeggins; Angela Thompson; John E. Thomas; John Raimondo

Subject: baumgartner.jane@wgmail.org

Dear Webster Groves School Board and administrators,

I am writing to request that you vote against/find an alternative to removing the Japanese language classes offered at Webster Groves High School. My daughter is currently in her second year of Japanese classes and is thriving and considering using what she has learned to achieve her future educational goals.

As you may be aware, most competitive universities "strongly recommend" (aka require) three to four years of a high school foreign language. From my recent research, I have learned that switching between foreign languages during high school is not looked at positively by college admissions. I have reviewed the local community colleges and Webster University's course offerings, and due to the drop schedule at the high school, there is not a workable alternative. It disappoints me to think that a quick decision could negatively impact student's college admission potential.

Looking at the course offerings at the high school it is easy to spot several classes that are not college requirements that could be reduced without impacting our children's futures. As with all big changes that affect our children, I would recommend a phased-out approach rather than a quick and possibly detrimental change.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments.

Thank you for your consideration.

Megan Havice

Ph.314-518-3726

Jane Baumgartner

From: Sarah Riss
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2015 2:54 PM
To: Jane Baumgartner
Subject: FW: enrollment of children of staff members

Please add to the communication log.
Thanks

Sarah

Dr. Sarah Booth Riss
Superintendent of Schools
Webster Groves School District
314-961-1233

From: Addison, David [<mailto:DAddison@rgare.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2015 2:45 PM
To: Marty Walter
Cc: Sarah Riss
Subject: RE: enrollment of children of staff members

Dear Marty:

It was my pleasure. I wish you and your family all the best.

David

From: Marty Walter [<mailto:walter.marty@wgmail.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2015 10:17 AM
To: Addison, David
Subject: RE: enrollment of children of staff members

Thank you for responding to my letter and explaining the district policy.
I am relieved to see that the board is not suggesting changes to this policy.
I appreciate the time and energy that you dedicate to leading WGSD.
Marty Walter

From: Addison, David [<mailto:DAddison@rgare.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 4:11 PM
To: Marty Walter
Cc: Sarah Riss
Subject: RE: enrollment of children of staff members

Dear Marty:

Thank you for reaching out to me and thank you for all you do for our children. I believe you may also have contacted some of my colleagues on the board, so I hope my response will suffice for all of them.

The current board policy allows the Superintendent to admit students of staff members after one full year of successful employment, if the staff member is a full-time employee, and if there is space available using the board approved class size set in policy IHB. The policy enabling the Superintendent to place children of staff members is policy JECB.

While I can make no guarantees, at no time has the board suggested any change to these policies. We see this as a valuable benefit to our staff and we are encouraged that it helps us recruit the best faculty for our students. If there are space concerns at a particular elementary school, we may not be able to accommodate a specific school request, but I would anticipate that the underlying benefit would continue. Previous practice has been to keep children until they graduate unless the staff member is no longer employed with the district and again there are no plans to change this.

While I cannot provide any guarantee, I hope that this letter serves to give you greater peace of mind and we look forward to welcoming your children into the Webster Groves school community.

Sincerely

David

David Addison
President
Webster Groves School District Board of Education.

From: Marty Walter [<mailto:walter.marty@wgmail.org>]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 1:56 PM
To: Addison, David
Subject: enrollment of children of staff members

Dear David Addison,

As a full-time biology teacher at the high school, I am aware that the board is actively in the process of making responsible and prudent decisions in the best interest of the district. I wish to express the importance and gratitude of one of the benefits that the district has historically offered to the WGSD staff. Many of staff members have been granted permission to enroll their children in WGSD, although they don't live within the district boundaries. Staff members know that this is an incredible privilege and would ask that it continue for those families already enrolled and those staff members that would be using the privilege for the first time.

This benefit was one of the positive factors in my decision to return to teach at WGSD in 2012. I was truly fortunate to have been hired at WGHS from 1995-2003 as my first teaching position. My husband and I were ecstatic when an opportunity became available for me to return to teach here in 2012. This could mean that our children would have the opportunity to attend WGHS. I have been aware that the elementary schools, the sixth grade center, and the middle school were all at or above capacity so we knew that it would be a struggle to be granted permission to attend the other WGSD facilities the last 3 years. Our hope was that our daughter would not create an unmanageable burden on the district once she reached high school age.

My hope is that as you discuss the future of this benefit you will know that this is viewed as a valued asset by the WGSD staff. I hope that the benefit would be extended fully or in some abbreviated form, such as access only being permitted in schools that are not at or over capacity.

Sincerely,