

Correspondence Log 2016-17

[illegible]

***Please note: The correspondence log reflects verbatim copies of all material sent. It does not imply or represent anything that the board has approved, endorsed or agreed to.**

Lori Medlin

From: Ginger Krueger <kruegerice@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 3:41 PM
To: John Simpson; Kristin Denbow; Amy Clendennen; Steve Loher; David Addison; Arnold Stricker; Emerson Smith; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Lori Medlin
Subject: Questions regarding School of Today, Strategic Plan, Grant for WGHS
Attachments: LettertoBOE (1).pdf

Hello Dr. Simpson, Dr. Denbow and BOE members -

I received an email from John asking for my thoughts and or questions regarding the School for Today document and the "Vision" of the WGSD on June 10th.

Since that time I have been researching, reading the available documents from the WGSD website and looking into the topic as a whole. The attachment reflects a few of the resulting questions/concerns I have.

I do believe wholeheartedly in the WGSD and know that each and every person involved has the very best interests for our district and our learners in mind.

I respectfully ask that these questions be a part of not only your on-line FAQ regarding the School of Today and Vision for WGSD but a part of a much larger and what needs to be very public discussion regarding the future direction of the WGSD.

With many warm regards,

Ginger Krueger

kruegerice@sbcglobal.net

attached PDF Letter to BOE

Dear Administrators and Board of Education Members -

I thought I'd ask you as a board or as administrators directly. I apologize for the length of this letter, but I have many questions. My questions center around three items:

- 1) Methodology - How WGSD is teaching?
 - a) How is the new "Democratic Learning" being implemented and measured?
- 2) Curriculum - What WGSD is teaching?
 - a) How is success or failure of the change in methodology being measured regarding the expectations for curricular success?
- 3) Budget - How are any new or "innovative" initiatives being funded.

- How did the study prior to S&W to conceptualize a "School of Innovation" become an initiative for a methodology shift for the **entire** WGSD?

- *Beginning in February, 2014, the Webster Groves School District Board of Education charged the Department of Curriculum and Instruction with conceptualizing an "innovation school". The primary reason for initiating this project stemmed from a Vertical Study of Learning in the Webster Groves School District which was conducted from May of 2013 through January of 2014. The report provided preliminary data and findings to help the Board of Education and the staff of the Webster Groves School District understand the current dynamic of learning, preschool through grade twelve, and offered insight for envisioning and realizing an enhanced learning paradigm. . . . For the purpose of this study an "innovation school" is purely conceptual.*

- Was the vision (below) approved by the BOE with the intention of adopting a conceptual idea into the broader methodology of the district?

- *As a learning community, the Webster Groves School District will lead in purposeful innovation that challenges each of us to discover and pursue our passions and make a positive impact on the world*

- Was there any kind of public discussion surrounding this "Vision"?

- What does the “road-map” look like for the implementation of this “Vision” now and in the future?
 - Why has this not been a broader and open conversation with your number 1 "stakeholder"- the Parents and Guardians of your currently enrolled students?
 - Do you have an executable plan to communicate with your 2nd largest Stakeholder - the community/taxpayers?
- What is the plan for PD for the teachers to make the shift from "educator to curator"? This concept has been around for many, many years but adopting this as a methodological shift district wide is going to involve extensive training. It's all well and good to say "the teacher will be a facilitator", but only works if they actually know how to do that effectively.
 - One example is the use of the "Cardboard Boat Regatta" as a teaching opportunity in Middle School. This is a very cool idea and has the potential to be an awesome and successful facilitated experience. But there **must** be a plan on how to facilitate learning; otherwise the opportunity to learn just turns into a fun time and the chance to actually learn principles of science, engineering, mathematics, team building and more is just lost. I truly believe that this methodology shift is making tremendous leaps of faith that have the potential to negatively affect our learners' educational future.
- How does the district plan to continue to implement standards of learning that focus on academic rigor and

excellence? And Why has this apparently shifted to a second tier focus as appears in the Strategic Plan?

- Will there be a plan to provide clear direction on approved resources? ie I am looking for a clear set of guidelines and resources for the teachers to give to students and families as a very basic starting point. Where is basic information coming from?
 - To date it has been my personal experience that standardized information/resources are not provided and the district office's response to consistency has been to allow the teachers and individual administrators so much latitude in teaching the curriculum that there is absolutely no consistency of information and resources within the district, schools, grades, teams and individual classrooms.
- Where in the plan for the "School for Today" as a methodological shift for our district is the plan to ensure that our students have the knowledge they need whether they think they need it or not as per the 2004 Curriculum Development and Program Evaluation Document?
- How will the success of the implementation of this methodological plan be measured by independent and unbiased sources?
 - How will this plan be measured for the continuation of the high standards that WGSD residents expect and

assume are in place? Nowhere in the document
"Crafting a School for Today" are the words excellence

nor rigor. *In the School for Today, "school" is a premise for research. Research means to search and search again. Innovation will require not only showing the numbers as related to data as data, in the traditional sense, can be backward looking. A continuous process of reflection and reflexivity involves examining both learning systems and the research relationship in addressing assumptions and preconceptions and how these affect decisions. . . . Research in the School for Today requires identifying and measuring with new, not old, "lodestones", such as citizenship, meaningful innovation, happiness, learner as doer, etc..*

- Is it the goal of the WGSD to shoot for higher than the National or Missouri average or to prove excellence among peer institutions? Your current measure of "High Achieving Students" page <http://wgsdstrategicreport.org/measures-of-success/high-achieving-students/>) shows "excellent" in the percentage of students attending college. What it does not show is that in comparison WGSD has over the past few years a lower % of students attending a 4 year college program and a higher percentage of students attending a 2 year program - when compared to other "like" districts and even the state.(DESE charts available if needed).
- How will the implementation of this plan be funded?
 - In the past (to cover what's been done so far), this year, over the next five years?
 - What exactly is the budget for this and how is that being paid?
 - Just a little more than a year ago the district was publicly threatening to eliminate basic enrichment programs like the strings program and cutting student related faculty and aide positions, but spending nearly a million dollars on a space that is

non-educational nor for the voted on purpose of upgrading the current HS facility. This new initiative cannot possibly have come free of cost nor can it be implemented without cost.

- What does this mean for MY student(s)? *WGSD will foster curiosity and exploration throughout the school community to establish a culture of innovation.*
 - Some personal (as relate to my students) concerns and/or examples below.
 - Programs that were meant to foster "deeper exploration" Like Math Enrichment are being eliminated and teachers are being asked to provide that "deeper learning" on their own and during precious class time. This while WGSD as a whole is not succeeding in Mathematics as we all expect (as shown in your own "Standard Measure of Success" - <http://wgsdstrategicreport.org/measures-of-success/annual-performance-report/>)
 - Our newly hired superintendent is tweeting about how dividing fractions is NOT a part of The School of Today! User Actions

○ Follow



○ John Simpson · jdsnwg

Simply ask, "What and who is needed in the world right now?" and designed school from there? Would division of fractions be included? #NO

- My older child is spending more and more time on the computer at school, which is a double edged sword. He is NOT a motivated learner, so while this allows him to complete his work faster - it also encourages him to "play" more in non-educational ways (ie. gaming during class). Even his 20% time project in 7th grade was to "blog about video game play" and his GEMS Independent Study project was to discuss the merits of one gaming system over the others. These were both approved by the teachers!

- How does the following environment work for my unmotivated learner? *The School for Today promotes education based on learner directed and learner-managed learning. This supports a shift from dependency to independence and interdependence of the learner, from managed to co-constructed learning, from projects that are temporary attention grabbers to invitational learning and choice in opportunities. Passion and interest of the learner are central to this transferal. There is no "done" with passion. For the learner, there is a drive to learn even when things are difficult, further empowering passion. Interest brings hope and inspiration to this pursuit. The learner is comfortable learning new things; develops a confidence in relying on his/her own judgment; and is capable of pursuing his/her passions and interests to a high level of competency. This is valued as a 'right' of the learner*

Thank you for your time and patience! I truly do believe in innovation with a clear plan, choice, open communication and the dollars to pay for it!

Lori Medlin

From: John Simpson
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 7:27 PM
To: Lori Medlin
Cc: Sarah Riss; Shari Meyers
Subject: FW: Questions regarding School of Today, Strategic Plan, Grant for WGHS

For correspondence log.
John

From: John Simpson
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 11:54 AM
To: 'Ginger Krueger'; Kristin Denbow; Amy Clendennen; Steve Loher; David Addison; Arnold Stricker; Emerson Smith; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Lori Medlin
Cc: Sarah Riss
Subject: RE: Questions regarding School of Today, Strategic Plan, Grant for WGHS

Hi Ginger,

I've prepared a response to what I feel were the questions you wanted answered. I do hope that I have the opportunity to clarify and/or expand on these answers when we hopefully get together in July. I've dedicated a few hours to the below, and do think a face to face would be best for many reasons. I do appreciate you reaching out!

Take care and have a great summer,
John

● **How did the study prior to S&W to conceptualize a "School of Innovation" become an initiative for a methodology shift for the entire WGSD?**

The conceptual work on an innovation school (School for Today) was the first step of multiple stages (had the props passed) to ultimately establish a school of innovation. When the props didn't pass, we felt confident that what we learned from the study could benefit student learning district-wide. It's not a particular methodology per se, but we are encouraging teachers to look for ways to give students more autonomy with their learning when possible, to place a priority on the design of the physical environment and the tools within, to partner with the community when applicable, and to continue growing and learning in a responsive way.

● **Was the vision (below) approved by the BOE with the intention of adopting a conceptual idea into the broader methodology of the district? Was there any kind of public discussion surrounding this "Vision"?**

The adoption of the vision preceded the School for Today report and thus wasn't an endorsement of the concepts within (methodology part addressed above). The vision, by nature, did give us a direction to use for all aspects of the district's functioning.

There was quite a bit of discussion and stakeholder input given to the Strategic Planning Committee in support of the development of the vision and the plan. Ultimately, the Strategic Planning Committee crafted the vision statement considering much data and information including stakeholder feedback.

● What does the “roadmap” look like for the implementation of this “Vision” now and in the future? Why has this not been a broader and open conversation with your number 1 “stakeholder” the Parents and Guardians of your currently enrolled students? Do you have an executable plan to communicate with your 2nd largest Stakeholder the community/taxpayers?

The path toward the vision is the district’s Strategic Plan which was developed by the Committee and ultimately approved by the board. Similar to the development of the vision, stakeholder feedback was sought and collected. We do recognize improved communication is needed, and have made it a priority to do so moving forward.

● What is the plan for PD for the teachers to make the shift from “educator to curator”? This concept has been around for many, many years but adopting this as a methodological shift district wide is going to involve extensive training. It's all well and good to say “the teacher will be a facilitator”, but only works if they actually know how to do that effectively.

One example is the use of the “Cardboard Boat Regatta” as a teaching opportunity in Middle School. This is a very cool idea and has the potential to be an awesome and successful facilitated experience. But there must be a plan on how to facilitate learning; otherwise the opportunity to learn just turns into a fun time and the chance to actually learn principles of science, engineering, mathematics, team building and more is just lost. I truly believe that this methodology shift is making tremendous leaps of faith that have the potential to negatively affect our learners' educational future.

I agree with you on the importance of professional development. Teachers will continue to have a variety of opportunities to learn about the visionary direction of our school district including the concepts in the SFT report. For example, this past year teachers had the opportunity to sign up for a 12-hour workshop in which participants learned (from other district staff) to develop and maintain classroom spaces responsive to the needs of students and conducive to their learning (ex: collaborating on problems together). Also, this summer we again collaborated with Webster University to host a “STEAM” (Science Technology Engineering Arts and Math) professional development opportunity in which participants learned how to help their students develop deeper understandings and skills in those content areas.

We will continue to encourage teachers, administrators, and others to ask questions such as:

- “How might students have more voice or ownership in _____?”
- “How might the physical environment better support _____?”
- “Who or what company might help us _____, and how might what we’re learning/doing contribute to the community?”
- “What have we learned from _____ and what are we going to continue or do differently as a result?”

If the teachers were in school, I would ask them about the Regatta experience as I really can’t speak to it. I agree with your point about the possibility of missed opportunities absent a skillful facilitator, a teacher who knows the standards well, and the time to process and reflect during and following a learning experience. I do believe that many teachers in the WGSD have done this really well with like experiences for a long time, and we will continue to work with teachers to improve all aspects of their work with students.

- **How does the district plan to continue to implement standards of learning that focus on academic rigor and excellence? And Why has this apparently shifted to a second tier focus as appears in the Strategic Plan?**

One of the district's thematic goals is "personalized learning" which has the following statement underneath: "WGSD will personalize learning for all students to increase engagement and rigor resulting in improved student achievement." While we are placing a priority on learning that is not tied to standardized assessments, we still place a high priority on rigor and excellence as measured through such assessments (and in other ways). In addition, we'll continue to place a greater priority on creating learning opportunities that challenge all students which can only be accomplished if special attention is placed to the uniqueness of each student and his/her needs.

Here is a sample of district data that demonstrates our commitment to rigor and excellence as defined through more standardized measures. First of all, last year more district students scored "proficient/advanced" on state MAP tests in ELA, science, and social studies than in any year in the district's history. In math, it was the second best year in the district's history. Next, our high school AP (Advanced Placement) offerings including students participating has scaled quite well over the past 7-8 years. For example, in 2009 we didn't have any district students participate in an AP science exam. In 2015, there were 94 AP exams taken. Last year, our students' average composite score was the highest it has ever been in the school's history and we had significantly more students taking exams. We'll be adding an additional AP course in the social department this year and will be adding 1 -2 additional AP math courses in the near future.

- **Will there be a plan to provide clear direction on approved resources? I am looking for a clear set of guidelines and resources for the teachers to give to students and families as a very basic starting point. Where is basic information coming from?**

I would encourage you to work with your children's teachers regarding physical and/or online resources either they and/or you need to support their learning. While some classes have them, some do not for many reasons. Some classrooms have primary resources but not student textbooks to accompany them. We are working to provide more support for families in need of additional support.

- **To date it has been my personal experience that standardized information/resources are not provided and the district office's response to consistency has been to allow the teachers and individual administrators so much latitude in teaching the curriculum that there is absolutely no consistency of information and resources within the district, schools, grades, teams and individual classrooms.**

Teachers are supported and encouraged to access and utilize relevant resources for their students. This is by no means a shift that has occurred in my 11 years in the district. The internet does provide a wealth of resources in support of learning, and we do encourage teachers to find and use them in their classrooms. At the majority of levels, there is usually a primary resource of some sort. It may not be a physical textbook that comes home, but there is often a primary resource. I would say that overall we are much more consistent in our practices than not.

- **Where in the plan for the "School for Today" as a methodological shift for our district is the plan to ensure that our students have the knowledge they need whether they think they need it or not as per the 2004 Curriculum Development and Program Evaluation Document?**

The WGSD, like every other public school district in the state, must ensure students are engaged in learning aligned with state standards.

- **How will the success of the implementation of this methodological plan be measured by independent and unbiased sources? How will this plan be measured for the continuation of the high standards that WGSD residents expect and assume are in place?**

We will continue to use the same standardized and local assessments we use now, and will continue to look for other measures as well in support of student learning.

- **Is it the goal of the WGSD to shoot for higher than the National or Missouri average or to prove excellence among peer institutions? Your current measure of "High Achieving Students" page <http://wgsdstrategicreport.org/measures-ofsuccess/highachievingstudents/> shows "excellent" in the percentage of students attending college. What it does not show is that in comparison WGSD has over the past few years a lower % of students attending a 4 year college program and a higher percentage of students attending a 2 year program when compared to other "like" districts and even the state.(DESE charts available if needed).**

We will continue to work to provide our students with the best learning opportunities possible and included with that help them to perform well on any measure that they have to take. We have a high percentage of students going to 2 and 4-year institutions, and actually encourage students to qualify for the A+ program. If students meet A+ criteria, they can go to 2-year schools for free. There are many benefits to doing this with economics being the biggest. I know a student who wanted to go to Washington U, but didn't want to incur four years' worth of loans. He went to Meramec for two years and then entered the honors college at Washington U as a junior. He graduated in 2 years with a degree from Washington U at half the cost of his peers who went four years.

- **How will the implementation of this plan be funded?**

- In the past (to cover what's been done so far), this year, over the next five years?

- What exactly is the budget for this and how is that being paid?

Our entire district budget is designed to support the district's strategic plan.

- **What does this mean for MY student(s)? WGSD will foster curiosity and exploration throughout the school community to establish a culture of innovation.**

We will work to create opportunities for your children based on their interests and passions. We want to do everything we can to support your children in learning the state standards and much more in the context of something of interest to them. This can be easier or difficult due to a variety of factors. I don't know your son's story beyond what you shared, but I do think there's much to be learned from the experiences you described. However, I also agree that with some children more adult intervention and attention may be needed to help maximize the learning within the experience.

Sent: July 7, 2016

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Dear Council Members and School Board Members:

My husband and I have lived at 752 Newport Ave. since December 1978. WE have improved the property quite a bit so it is valued a lot more than when we moved in. This is good if we were interested in moving, but not so good if we are interested in staying in WG.

I am NOT elderly...yet. However I am a "young senior" who is concerned about the incessantly higher taxes for those of us who reside in Webster Groves.

My two children did attend Webster Groves Public Schools. I know how valuable good schools are to all the neighborhoods. But I see a trend that bothers me. More and more "young seniors" are moving out of Webster Groves partially because of the heavy tax burden. Then more and more young families are coming to WG.

I taught preschool PT for 27 years at a church in Webster Groves. I have worked PT at the WG Rec. Center for 22 years. I DO value our parks and recreation facilities and the amenities they provide and our many churches and schools herein.

I have a few suggestions:

1. Could there be a reduced property tax for seniors? (Those who do not have grandchildren/children living with them and using the schools etc.)

2. Could there be a small earnings tax implemented in Webster Groves?

Many of us feel that WU is expanding and taking over more and more taxable property. Since WU is also a major employer in WG and since many people employed there do NOT live in WG this could help our municipal budget a lot. I wish it could help the school district finances too. I know at the WGRC we give people who work at WU or live in WU housing the Resident Rate.

(When I worked in the City of St. Louis I paid the City Earnings Tax.)

I realize that a "turnover" is often invigorating for communities. But I know from experience that more and more "young seniors" cannot afford to stay in WG. I also know that our schools are bursting at the seams. More students moving in increase the number of teachers and classrooms needed so the WGSD asks for increased taxes....again.

My husband and I have usually supported tax increases but now if we do so we know the increases will cause us to need to move. This is disconcerting.

Please work to keep supportive seniors in their houses at least until they are 80 instead of 60.

Thank you for listening.

Jeanne Samson

Shari Meyers

To: Shari Meyers
Subject: FW: academic concerns
Attachments: WGSD Middle School MAP measured Proficiency, 2008-2015 as defined by DESE, from DESE data.xlsx

From: kmummm@charter.net [kmummm@charter.net]

Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 7:25 PM

To: John Simpson; Kristin Denbow; Jon Clark; 'retzlaff.pamela@wgmail.org'; Angela Thompson; Stacie Smith

Cc: Steve Loher; Amy Clendennen; David Addison; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Emerson Smith; Arnold Stricker; Shari Meyers

Subject: RE: academic concerns

Thank you, John,

When we meet it will be to discuss some remaining financial concerns I have w/ Dr. Ellerman and Ms. Kite. Our time will likely be tight for just discussing that subject.

You all are the experts. I am, please, just bringing to your attention data that, to me, indicates academic core curricula requires strengthening at grades 6-8, in particular. I have long felt the high school is one of the "strongest links" in the district. Since my children were there, the amazing Chelsea Detrick Experiential Learning Center has only improved the already rigorous and comprehensive curricula. I believe the students entering the high school need more academic rigor. This isn't a "high school problem".

I know the 2015 district comprehensive MAP scores rose from the prior year. This afternoon I did look at the DESE data to only look at middle school proficiency, as defined by DESE. The trends from 2008 to 2015 aren't showing improvement.

The proficiency in two grade/subject areas declined, one substantially. Two remained essentially unchanged, one slightly improved and one slightly worse. Only one of the five shows substantial improvement. Graphs help me see data. I have attached the ones I did today.

I know it is summer and there is much for you all to do, some in new leadership roles. However, I hope this issue is one upon which you can focus intensively.

Respectfully,

Kim Mumm

From: "John Simpson"

To: "kmummm@charter.net", "Kristin Denbow", "Jon Clark", "retzlaff.pamela@wgmail.org", "Angela Thompson", "Stacie Smith"

Cc: "Steve Loher", "Amy Clendennen", "David Addison", "Jean Dugan", "Michael Shipley", "Emerson Smith", "Arnold Stricker", "Shari Meyers"

Sent: Mon, 11 Jul 2016 23:33:53 +0000

Subject: RE: academic concerns

Dear Kim,

Thank you for sharing this information. I'd be happy to discuss what you shared when we meet in a few weeks.

Take care,
John

From: kmummm@charter.net [kmummm@charter.net]

Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 1:32 PM

To: John Simpson; Kristin Denbow; Jon Clark; 'retzlaff.pamela@wgmail.org'; Angela Thompson; Stacie Smith

Cc: Steve Loher; Amy Clendennen; David Addison; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Emerson Smith; Arnold Stricker; Shari Meyers

Subject: academic concerns

Dear Drs. Simpson, Clark, Denbow, Smith, Retzlaff, Thompson and BOE members,

I hope you are enjoying summer and a brief break from the school year intensity/joy. If I have inaccurately listed any e-mail addresses (I guessed on yours, Dr. Retzlaff), please would you be able to kindly forward my communication to the proper addresses of the recipients, Shari? Thank you for that.

I have attached a letter. I appreciate you all taking the time (when you have a moment) to read it.

Sincerely,

Kim Mumm

Dear BOE members, John, Jon, Dr. Denbow, Dr. Smith, Dr. Retzlaff, and Dr. Thompson,

It appears new school rankings are emerging; I just did a quick look at some of our area public high schools on the **2016 US News and World Report Best High School Lists**. I have listed some of the scores, below. This ranking system is one I like, because it is based upon objective, academically focused data, with a clear methodology, articulated here:

<http://www.usnews.com/education/best-high-schools/articles/rankings-methodologies>

It appears we have a problem. I know the 2015 MAP scores improved and the 2016 scores are not yet public, but please look at the AP passage, % taking AP and our "math and English readiness". Please look at them in comparison to other high performing STL CO districts. In my opinion, that is what is relevant. Our "College readiness index" is a shocking. Please also note, Ladue and Clayton are on the "Best STEM High Schools in the Nation" list. Our students are just as bright as students in Ladue and Clayton; our parents and citizens are just as capable and engaged here.

Perhaps, rather than having "all (or most of) the eggs" in the "innovation/democratic learning/ responsive spaces/removing books, workbooks, and downloadable lessons/no memorization and drill" basket, you need to consider developing and implementing an intensive plan for getting our students up to speed with rigor in science (from an early age), math, and the basics of language arts. I would like to suggest you consider enacting an intensive core curriculum strengthening plan for the 6-8 grades. The raw, original suggestions (not those summarized) written by members of the "Hixson Dream Team" may be of some help; I understand team members visited other high achieving middle schools and made suggestions regarding academics and curricula which were not regarded. Waiting until WGHS, where the strong college prep honor/AP course options begin, is too late. It appears there is not a moment to lose.

Some other rankings are not structured the way this one is. The Niche HS rankings (we fell from #7 in Mo. in 2015 to #13 in 2016) relies heavily on "alumni, parent and student surveys", in fact, survey input, which includes teacher surveys to a small degree, appears to weigh into every category of the rankings. Survey feedback is even part of the "Academics Grade", which Niche weighs at 50%

Academics Grade	Niche Academics grade, which incorporates statistics and student, alumni, and parent surveys regarding academics in the district.	Niche	50.0%
-----------------	---	-------	-------

As we all know, it is possible to have great disparity of opinions regarding an issue. Please refer to the post-election survey (linked from the WGSD web site) to read the reasons people said they voted yes, versus why they said they voted no for a display of opinion divergence. Many of you are on social media. I am told, we have citizens who so fervently support the WGSD in anything/everything it does, that if even another citizen posts a concern or question, he is rebuffed. In the past months, citizens relaying concerns have been told more than once, they should move from WGSD if they can't fully support it. My point is, survey results depend upon whose opinions are sought.

<https://k12.niche.com/rankings/public-school-districts/best-overall/methodology/>

Please look at these findings for yourselves. We may all hope and pray rankings and ratings don't matter, but they do.

Thank you for reviewing these data and for hearing my concern.

Kim Mumm
WGSD citizen

<http://www.usnews.com/education/best-high-schools/search>

College readiness- Webster Groves HS (WGHS) scored a 26.4, compared to Kirkwood's 54.3, Lindbergh's 43.3, Rockwood's 48.3, Marquette's 48.6, Clayton's 59.6, Ladue's 61.6, Metro Academic and Classical- 69.3%

AP % passed- WGHS-75% (33% tested) Kirkwood- 89% (59% tested), Lindbergh- 72% (55% tested), Francis Howell- 75%, Rockwood- 81% (56% tested), Clayton-84%, Ladue- 85%, West- 86%, Marquette- 92%, Lafayette- 95%, Central- 95%

% Math proficiency- WGHS- 59%, Kirkwood -55%, Lindbergh- 81%, Rockwood- 62%, Parkway South- 63%, Francis Howell- 79%, Brentwood- 84%, Clayton- 74%, Ladue- 71%, McKinley Classical Leadership Academy – 73%, Metro Academic and Classical- 74%, Central- 74%, West- 77%, Valley park- 77%, Marquette-78%, Francis Howell- 79%, Lafayette-86%

% English proficiency- WGHS- 77%, Kirkwood- 86%, Lindbergh—89%, Rockwood- 80%, Parkway South- 81%, Francis Howell- 83%, Brentwood- 80%, McKinley Classical Leadership Academy – 81%, Clayton- 85%, Ladue- 81%, Lafayette- 83% Francis Howell- 83%, Central- 84%, Marquette- 85%, West- 89%, Metro Academic and Classical- 91%

Ritenour School District-

College readiness Index- 10.2, **% AP passage-** 37% (19% tested), **Math readiness-** 29%, **English readiness-** 50%

Missouri High Schools on the Best STEM High Schools in the Nation, 2016 list

Clayton- #47 on the list

Ladue- #188 on the list

	Lang Arts7	Lang Arts 8	Math 7	Math 8	Science 8	Math 8	Science 8
2008	64.8	68.3	66.8	71.6	67.6	71.6	67.6
2009	69.9	66	69.3	60.9	56.7	60.9	56.7
2010	63	67.2	64.9	68.8	59.8	68.8	59.8
2011	71.3	65.4	74.1	59.7	56.3	59.7	56.3
2012	73.1	73.6	68.7	69.7	58.3	69.7	58.3
2013	73.1	69.6	76.4	44.1	61.5	44.1	61.5
2014	75	69.1	74.1	48.2	62.1	48.2	62.1
2015	71.6	68.5	54.9	30.7	65.8	30.7	65.8

