

Innovation Partners for Learning



2013 Annual Report



Innovation Partners for Learning

Table of Contents

Dear Friends and Supporters

Who We Are

Our Roots
The Problem We're Solving
Our Solution
Our Values
Our Team

What We Do

Model Design School Implementation Current School Partnerships

Our First Model: Teach to One: Math

Personalizing the Traditional Classroom to Accelerate
How the Model Works
Step 1: Source the Lessons
Step 2: Assess Students
Step 3: Change the Classroom
Step 4: Match Each Student to the Optimal Lesson
Step 5: Pulling It All Together
Teacher Role in *Teach to One: Math*

Year 1 Results

Summary of Year 1 Results Lesson 1: *Teach to One: Math* Shows Promising Ear Math Achievement on State Assessments Lesson 2: *Teach to One: Math* Is Accelerating Stude Lesson 3: ELLs and Special Education Students Also Lesson 4: Struggling Students Demonstrate the Lar Lesson 5: We Need to Do More to Accelerate Learn Looking Forward: Building on Early Successes

Our Funding Partners

Appendices

Appendix A: 2013-14 New Classrooms Schools Appendix B: School Data Sheets

					4
					6
					6
					7
					9
					10
					11
					12
					12
					13
					14
					16
e Learning	a				17
					17
					17
					20
					20
					25
					26
					28
					28
rlv Sians a	of Accel	eratir	ια		
J - J -			5		28
ent Learn	ina				29
o Show P	roaress				30
rgest Gair	าร				30
ning for Si	tudents	at or	Above	Grade Leve	el 30
<u> </u>					31
					32
					34
					34
					35





New Classrooms

Innovation Partners for Learning

Dear Friends and Supporters,

Our lives are fundamentally different from the lives of our grandparents and great-grandparents. We have new medicines, new modes of transportation, new ways of communicating, and new forms of entertainment. The innovations that have transformed almost every aspect of our lives, however, have bypassed our classrooms. For nearly two centuries, education in America has looked and felt remarkably similar: A teacher teaches 20 to 30 students in a classroom; all the students learn the same material at the same time; and students are tested intermittently to measure how much they have mastered.

America has not maintained this model because it has proven to work. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that it is not working for students. Only 9% of low-income students end up graduating from college.¹ High-income students are falling further behind their similarly situated peers in other countries.² Overall, roughly a third of U.S. high school students end up graduating from high school ready for college or careers.³

The current model is not working for teachers either. Nearly half of all teachers leave the profession within five years,⁴ while a recent national survey of teacher satisfaction found teacher satisfaction is at an all-time low, with only 39% of teachers reporting that they are very satisfied in their jobs.5

We created New Classrooms because we believe there is a better way.

Our first personalized instructional model, Teach to One: Math, reimagines education, leveraging the combination of the talents of teachers and modern technology to deliver personalized instruction to each student each day. Teach to One: Math aims to meet each student at his or her own academic level and then accelerate learning through a recommendation engine that helps to determine what skill each student is ready to learn and the instructional approach that is most likely to be successful.

We believe that by partnering with schools to provide this powerful, integrated instructional model, we can transform students' learning trajectories so that more are able to finish the eighth grade prepared for advanced high school level math like algebra and geometry. That's important because students who successfully pass algebra in the ninth grade and geometry in the tenth triple their odds of attending college.⁶

During the 2012-13 school year, we partnered with seven schools nationally for the full year four in New York City, two in Chicago, and one in Washington, D.C. We partnered with each school's existing teaching staff to replace its traditional, textbook-based math program with Teach to One: Math. In all, we served around 3,000 students in grades 6-8.

While we are still early in our work, we are beginning to see encouraging results on proficiencybased exams. In the one school where we worked with students for all three years of middle

school, exiting eighth graders improved from performing 1 percentage point below the citywide average in 2011 to 11 percentage points ahead of the citywide average by 2013.

We are also seeing promising gains on growth-based assessments such as the Northwest Education Alliance's (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP). A study by Teachers' College at Columbia University across all seven New Classrooms schools found that the students in Teach to One: Math classrooms achieved almost 1.2 years of growth in the 2012-13 school year - or 20% more than the average student nationally. While noting that the results are too young to draw final conclusions, the study finds that the students who entered the school year below grade level – and faced the greatest challenges in math – achieved the strongest gains.

These early results are a reflection of the joint efforts by New Classrooms and the administration and staff at each of our partner schools. Teach to One: Math provides schools with the opportunity to personalize learning for each student each day, but it is participating teachers who bring Teach to One: Math to life and who help us to improve the model through their experiences, suggestions, and ongoing feedback.

We've come a long way, but there is still a great deal for us to learn and improve upon. We are taking this opportunity to describe what we do, why we do it, our progress to date, and our goals for the coming years. We believe it is important to assess our early results, to understand the strengths and weaknesses our model, and to be transparent with our data and our learning. We also hope that this analysis can help to inform a broader, education-related policy agenda that is focused on innovation.

We are eager to share our story and the most recent results and welcome feedback from partners, supporters, or people we haven't yet had the chance to meet. We hope you will choose to join us on our quest to create new models for America's classrooms – and to help more children succeed in school and beyond.

Sincerely,

Joel Rose

Chris Rush

15 mg

Dominick D'Angelo, Principal, I.S. 228

This is a game changer. We are changing the way we do the business of education, of teaching, and of learning. We are focusing on the learning of every student.

1. Bailey, Martha J. and Susan M. Dynarski. Gains and Gaps: Changing Inequality in U.S. College Entry and Completion. NBER Working Paper No. 17633. Issued in December 2011 2. Carnoy, Martin and Richard Rothstein, What do international tests really show about U.S. student performance?; Economic Policy Institute. January 2013 http://www.epi.org/publication/us-student-performance-testing/ 3. The Condition of College and Career Readiness 2013, ACT Inc. < http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/cccrl3/pdf/CCCRl3-NationalReadinessRpt.pdf> 4. Hunt, James B. and Thomas G. Carroll. No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children. National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. January 2003. 5. MetLife Survey of the America's Teacher. MetLife, Inc. February 2013. 6. Adelman,



C., Answers in the toolbox: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment, US Department of Education: 1999

Who We Are

Our Roots

We launched New Classrooms Innovation Partners as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization in June 2011 in order to bring transformative innovation to K-12 schools. We believe that personalization is not simply about new software, technology, or teacher training, but instead requires thoughtfully reimagining and reconfiguring all that goes into the classroom experience.

New Classrooms was founded by much of the same team that created School of One for the New York City public schools. The NYC Department of Education launched its School of One pilot in the summer of 2009. By November, the model was named one of the top inventions of 2009 by *TIME* magazine. It also received positive recognition in *The New York Times, Huffington Post, Atlantic Monthly, Education Next,* and *Education Week.*

After School of One's incubation at the Department of Education, cofounders Joel Rose and Chris Rush established New Classrooms in 2011 to build a new model using the lessons they had learned and bring personalized instruction to more schools and districts across the United States.

In 2012-13, New Classrooms implemented its first personalized instructional model, *Teach to One: Math*, for around 3,000 students in grades 6-8. The model was adopted by seven schools around the country, including one New York City school that has been operating as a School of One site since 2010. Today, *Teach to One: Math* has replaced traditional mathematics instruction in 15 schools around the country and is serving more than 6,000 students in grades 5-8.

The Problem We're Solving

Our nation's current system of schooling — with one teacher and between 20 and 30 students in a factory-model classroom — has gone relatively unchanged for well over a century. It is an approach that assumes all students come to school at the same academic starting point and learn at the same rate and in the same way.

This assumption simply does not reflect reality. In all types of classrooms and across all income levels, there is great variability of incoming performance levels, learning rates, and individual learning styles. This presents teachers with the nearly impossible challenge of meeting dozens of individual students' separate and unique needs simultaneously each day.

New students' wide range in skills and knowledge is the clearest example of this challenge. For example, at one of our partner

the law of the law of



schools, participating sixth graders took an assessment (NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress) at the beginning of the school year to determine their incoming academic proficiency level. The chart below shows the distribution of scores in this one grade of students.

As the chart shows, some students can enter a sixth-grade class at a fourth-grade level alongside some peers at a second-grade level and others at a seventh-grade level. To address this range in students' academic starting points, educators often use a technique called "differentiated instruction." It is an educational strategy that requires the classroom teacher to provide different types of instruction to different types of learners. In theory, the approach makes great sense: the only way for an individual teacher to meet each student's unique needs is to develop different strategies and lessons for different students.

Incoming Distribution of Math Knowledge

Figure 1. Students who are in the same grade can enter with very different skill sets.





In practice, however, expecting a teacher to do this every day – while also following a school district's standard curriculum – is almost impossible. A teacher can teach only one lesson at a time. And even if a teacher aspires to use technology tools and other resources to meet each student's needs, the time and effort required to plan even one day of differentiated instruction is enough to dissuade most teachers from making it routine.

Our Solution

We believe there is a better way. Over the last quarter century, digital technology has helped to transform and advance nearly every other industry. Yet previous efforts to leverage technology to support teachers have largely tinkered at the margins of the classroom itself — three computers in the back of the classroom, an interactive whiteboard instead of a chalkboard, and access to on-demand videos, to name just a few.

The partnership between Spencer Technology Academy and Teach to One shows students that we care about education. They see the investment right away when they walk in the room. They're able to have opportunities to collaborate quickly, rather than waiting for a teacher-centered model of instruction. It's fast paced. And it's how students learn in the 21st century.

These innovations have largely failed to solve the fundamental challenge of differentiated instruction. Most are simply tools for teachers to use within the same, standard, factory-model classroom. That's why our efforts focus less on designing technology-based tools and more on redesigning the classroom experience itself in ways that leverage both the talents of teachers and the power of technology. We call this approach a "personalized instructional model."

At New Classrooms, we design personalized instructional models that reimagine the use of time, talent, technology, and physical space in order to support personalized learning. We then support the implementation of these models within existing schools while sharing in the accountability for student outcomes.

Teach to One: Math is our first personalized instructional model. Over time, we expect to design new models for different subjects and different grade levels.

Dr. Shawn Jackson, Principal, Spencer Technology Academy



Our Values

Our organizational strength is rooted in our core values. As we pursue a vision to personalize learning for each student, these values guide us through the little decisions and the big ones.

A Student-Centered Orientation:

Everything we do is focused on helping students learn more in ways that are personalized, engaging, meaningful, and measurably effective.

Support for Great Teaching:

We believe that We are great teachers committed to are vital to our innovations work, and we are that are more committed to than tools for innovations that educators. Rather, help teachers we aspire to spend more time develop new focusing on the models for quality of their instruction that instruction. are both bold in their design and flexible in their adaptability

to schools.

Bold SolutionsResponsiblefor Schools:Growth:

We believe in learning by doing. We incubate earlystage innovations in lower-stakes environments such as in summer school and afterschool contexts where we can rapidly iterate, troubleshoot, and closely measure impact. We believe widespread scale should come only once these innovations have been validated.

A Culture that Fosters Innovation and Learning:

We are committed to learning from our experiences, from our partners, and from the students we serve. We are a team that values imaginative thinking, superior execution, and open and purposeful collaboration.

Our Team

Our team is composed of individuals committed to our core values and dedicated to helping New Classrooms achieve its vision. Our work ranges from direct, hands-on work with teachers and students to assessing the value of different lessons to designing, deploying, and managing technology. Accordingly, members of our team have experience in education, technology, law, finance, operations, design, and data systems in the public, private, and notfor-profit sectors.

In all, our team includes more than 60 employees who work in the field with our partner schools and in our central office supporting the research, development, academic, technical, and logistical support of our programs.

New Classrooms is divided into five core groups: academics, field, technology and operations, business administration, and external.

Our Leadership



Joel Rose is the cofounder and Chief Executive Officer of New Classrooms. Previously, he was the Chief Executive Officer of *School of One*. Prior to

conceptualizing and leading *School of One*, Joel served as Chief Executive for Human Capital and as Chief of Staff to the Deputy Chancellor at the New York City Department of Education. He has been involved in education for more than 15 years, first as a fifth grade teacher in Houston and later as a senior executive at Edison Schools, where he served as the company's Associate General Counsel, Chief of Staff, General Manager, and Vice President for School Operations. Our **academics team** is responsible for designing our academic framework and content by determining what students should be learning and how they should be experiencing *Teach to One: Math.* This means designing content; forging partnerships with content creators; identifying skills; and developing and refining assessment questions.

Our **field team** is responsible for coaching teachers, troubleshooting issues that arise at the school level, overseeing implementation, and working to support schools and students.

Our **technology and operations team** produces, refines, and manages IT products and services and oversees daily central operations to power our model.

Our **business administration team** is responsible for finance, human resources, recruiting, contracting, and office operations.

Finally, our **external team** manages our expansion and partnership efforts, communications, and fundraising.



hristopher Rush is

the cofounder and Chief Program Officer of New Classrooms. Most recently, he led the overall conceptualization, design,

and implementation of *School of One* as well as leading design and development of Wireless Generations' (now Amplify) mCLASS reporting systems. Additionally, Chris worked with the NYC Department of Education, co-leading the design of the initial versions of the parent, teacher, and principal data system. Previously, Chris specialized in financial management and IT development services at IBM. Chris started his career as an Outdoor Education Specialist at an environmental education center in Pennsylvania.



What We Do



Model Design

We create personalized instructional models designed to enable schools to meet the unique needs of each student each day. By coherently integrating academics, operations, and technology into a holistic approach to instruction, our models are designed to make better use of time and other school resources by maximizing the full potential of teachers and technology.

conduct extensive research and development. The costs of developing new models can be high because significant academic, operational, and technical hurdles must be addressed and iterated upon over multiple years of trials. However, the investment pays off: once a new model is fully developed, it can be implemented in schools across the country, affecting thousands of students over multiple years.

To create the most effective models, we leverage national philanthropic support to Teach to One: Math is our first personalized instructional model.



Figure 2. New Classrooms designs personalized instructional models that reimagine every aspect of the classroom.



School Implementation

Once New Classrooms designs a new model, we work in close collaboration with principals, teachers, school management organizations, administrators, local philanthropy partners, and other stakeholders to ensure the model fits into the DNA of each new partner school.

After selecting our school partners, our team consults extensively with schools about space planning, school programming, and other operational details. We also implement a robust on-site support model that includes extensive training and instructional support for participating staff members and on-site support for technology and program logistics.



Figure 3. New Classrooms partners with schools to adapt the model to each school's unique culture.



Chicago, Illinois

Spencer Technology Academy William P. Gray Elementary School

Marguette School of Excellence



15 Schools 6,000 Students

Figure 4. Fifteen partner schools are operating Teach to One: Math in the 2013-14 school year.

School Partnerships

During the 2012-13 school year, Teach to One: Math replaced the traditional mathematics instruction for around 3,000 students in seven schools across NYC, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. In the 2013-14 school year, we expanded to serve a total of more than 6,000 students across 15 schools, including new implementations in Charlotte, NC; Perth Amboy, NJ; Elizabeth, NJ; and Newark, NJ. Teach to One: Math is currently available for students in grades 5-8.

New Classrooms is a nonprofit organization that strives to keep our program as affordable as possible for schools and districts. Costs to schools include two types of expenses: (1) fees to New Classrooms to implement and operate *Teach to One: Math* on a daily basis, and (2) school-based investments in technology and

I.S. J.H I.S. I.S. I.S. 286 Rena

Northern New Jersey

<u>lew</u>	York	<u>City</u>	

228 David A. Boody
S. 88 Peter Rouget
I.S. 381
2 George L. Egbert
49 Berta A. Dreyfus
ssance Leadership Academy

infrastructure to redesign space and upgrade hardware to operate our model. The precise costs vary from school to school, and we work closely with our school partners to ensure that the program can be implemented at a reasonable cost while maintaining operational fidelity.



Our First Model:





Personalizing the Traditional Classroom to Accelerate Learning

New Classrooms' first model is Teach to One: Math, a personalized middle school math program that leverages a combination of live, online, and collaborative learning modalities to provide students with personalized learning each day.

Teach to One: Math is designed to help participating students complete middle school prepared for advanced high school mathematics courses such as algebra and geometry. Academic research makes it clear that algebra and geometry are the gateway for students' success not only in higher-level mathematics but also in college and careers. A 2008 study from the Annenberg Institute at Brown University found that "success in algebra opens doors to more advanced math, a college preparatory high school curriculum, higher college going rates, and higher college graduation rates." Another study found that 80% of students who both passed Algebra in 9th grade and Geometry in 10th grade attended college, and that passing these courses more than tripled the odds of attending college.⁷

For some students who enter middle school well behind their national peers, this approach has students focus on the foundational skills

7. Evan, Aimee, Tracy Gray and Joseph Olchefske. The Gateway to Student Success in Mathematics and Science: A Call for Middle School Reform – the Research and its Implications. Washington DC: The American Institutes for Research, with the Microsoft Corporation, November 2006. p. 10.

required to succeed in ninth grade algebra. For more advanced students, the model enables them to master subjects such as algebra by the end of eighth grade.

How the Model Works

Step 1: Source the Lessons

Our team of experienced educators carefully reviews thousands of educational lessons for a number of key qualities:

- Does the lesson include high-interest contexts and visuals appropriate for middle school students?
- Does the lesson provide students with opportunities to practice with supports?
- Does the lesson provide connections to previous units or other subjects within real-world contexts?
- Does the lesson provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their communication skills (either written or oral)?
- Can the lesson be completed within a 30-40 minute window (to align with how the model works)?
- Do lessons include pictures, photos, and other visuals to support English Language Learners?

We aim to understand the characteristics of each lesson so that we can later find the ideal course for each student.

To date, we have reviewed more than 50,000 lessons by publishers and digital content developers such as Pearson, LearnZillion, and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, and have built an advanced database that easily identifies a lesson on a particular topic, with particular characteristics.













100 miles

SOPHIA





Continental Press

EA hand

hands-on learning minds



The **McGraw·Hill** Companies





Step 2: Assess Students

Throughout the school year, we continually assess each student's skills. Which students are ahead of their peers? Which are struggling? Which specific skills have they already grasped? Which skills are "gaps" that we have to address?

In the elementary and middle school grades, students gather up a set of important "building blocks" that form the foundation they will need to learn more advanced math skills — like algebra and geometry — in high school. In assessing students, it is our goal to figure out which of the building blocks each student already has, and which ones each student still needs.



Figure 5. It is important to build foundational skills before advancing to the more advanced skills necessary to achieve algebra readiness.



These are just some of the content partners that teachers and students have access to through *Teach to One: Math.*

Andy, 6th Grader, J.H.S. 88

We're getting access to more math because we get to try different things every day.





Step 3: Change the Classroom

Next, we reimagine the physical classroom by combining multiple individual classes of students and teachers into a large, shared classroom experience, which we call a Math Center. In a small, traditional classroom, there are a few students who are far behind their peers in a particular skill and a few who are ahead; others fall along the continuum. It is a distribution that might change from day to day and from skill to skill: Ben might be advanced with fractions but struggling with decimals and Madison might be great with decimals but confused about fractions. In combining the classrooms, there are more students who share common sets of skills and needs at any one point in time. In this combined model, the classroom is more flexible. It becomes possible to tailor instruction to meet the individual needs of students.

Traditional Classroom

	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$	••••	
$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$			
$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$			

Redesigned Classrooms



Figure 6. New Classrooms has adopted a new model for the physical space of a classroom that enables students to learn in multiple ways at the same time.

Each day, students break off to work on specific skills with classmates who are on the same level for a particular skill. In doing so, they are then able to receive instruction through a number of different modalities, or teaching approaches, as seen in Figure 7 on the opposite page.



Step 4: Match Each Student to the **Optimal Lesson**

At the end of each class, students take a short computer-based quiz (called an "exit slip") on the material they learned that day. We use this and other assessment information to determine if students have mastered the skills and can move ahead, or if they need to keep learning the same skills but in different ways. All student assessments are individualized to what students are learning, and information from these assessments is constantly being updated and analyzed to help determine what skills children have mastered and what they should work on or review next.

Combined, we developed an integrated solution that leverages our extensive database of lessons and student assessment results to create recommended custom schedules for each student each day.



Multiple Instructional Modalities





Teacher-led Instruction

Students work with a teacher to explore a particular concept or skill. Teachers can use lessons suggested by Teach to One: Math or use their own

approaches.

- Tasks
- Live Investigation

Learning Students work collaboratively to

solve a math problem, or work to teach one another strategies to solve a math problem.

- Small Group Collaboration
- Peer to Peer

Collaborative

Math Advisory

Figure 7. Students receive instruction through a number of different modalities, or teaching approaches.



Virtual Instruction Students can also learn new skills, work with a live tutor, or practice and reinforce concepts through digital learning sessions.

- Coached Virtual
- Instruction
- Virtual
- Reinforcement
- Virtual Live Tutor



Independent Learning

A student may work alone to practice a specific skill. These include in-class sessions and out-ofclass resources for students to review concepts or get ahead.

- Independent Practice
- Jolts
- Prove-Its



As we select new skills to focus on and lessons to suggest, our philosophy is to ensure that students have mastered foundational skills before moving them up to more advanced skills. Since math skills build on each other, it doesn't make sense to advance to higherlevel skills without first mastering the basics. For some students, this can mean going back and fortifying skills that were initially taught in the third, fourth, and fifth grades to ensure a sufficient level of conceptual understanding for more advanced concepts. For other students who have mastered foundational skills, the model is designed to enable them to both accelerate and deepen their learning in preparation for advanced high school mathematics.

As a result, students with significant learning gaps with pre-grade skills may not be exposed

to each and every grade-level skill that is included on the relevant end-of-year state summative assessment. However, as these students master pre-grade basic skills, they will be able to accelerate their learning throughout the middle school years so that by the time they complete the eighth grade, they are more prepared for algebra or other advanced high school mathematics courses than they otherwise would have been.

At the same time, this approach also enables high-performing students to accelerate beyond the skills that would otherwise be included on end-of-year state summative assessments. For example, even though *Teach to One: Math* was serving a high-needs population, 11% of our eighth grade students were learning ninth and tenth grade skills by the end of the 2012-13 school year.





Figure 8. If a student enters 6th grade without learning multiple 5th grade skills (noted by the dotted blue outlines), *Teach to One: Math* ensures students fill in the blanks so that there is a solid foundation for higher-level skills.

Assessment

User

Profile



Rounds: How We Organize Learning





Out-of-Classroom Learning

Prove-Its

Five-question assessments that a student can request when they feel able to pass them.

Jolts

Lessons available to students outside of scheduled class time. They can be used to help a student practice and review their current skill or to help prepare them for a Prove-It.

Task Session

Projects that take place over multiple days and allow students to use two or more related skills by applying them to real-world problems. Each student has the same task session teacher throughout a round.

Pick-up Session

Single lessons focused on teaching and/or practicing a single skill. Students can have a different teacher for each pick-up.

Exit Slip

A short computer-based quiz students take at the conclusion of each class day to determine whether they have mastered the skill they learned that day and can move on — or if they need more time to work on the skill. Students take their exit slip in their Math Advisory group.

Task Demonstrations (Demos)

In the final Task session, students are required to demonstrate what they learned and the solution that they came up with through a presentation.

Playlist Quiz

At the end of each round, students take a quiz that is customized to the skills worked on during the round.

Math Advisory

Consistent groups of students meet with the same teacher throughout the school year; these sessions are designed to provide a place for students to set goals and reflect on their math learning.



Step 5: Pulling It All Together

In practice, students and teachers experience *Teach to One: Math* through something we call "Rounds," which are two-week periods in which students learn a sequence of new and interrelated skills. During rounds, teachers have different ways of personalizing instruction for students. These might include Pick-up Sessions, which are 30-35 minute lessons focused on a single skill; Task Sessions, which are multi-day real-world applications of academic skills; or "Math Advisory Sessions," when students and teachers discuss learning and set and review goals. At the end of each day, students meet in their Math Advisory groups to take their short

The daily individualized scheduling ensures that math class never moves too fast or too slow.

Figure 10. Learning in Teach to One: Math is organized into approximately two-week rounds.

quizzes, which help inform how the model then produces individualized instructional programs to the teachers for the following day.

Students, parents, and teachers can see realtime schedules and progress during a round in an online portal. Teachers can access information about individual students and groups of students, as well as the lessons that are suggested by New Classrooms. Students and their parents can access information about their own performance, as well as access resources that help them to practice and get ahead.

Joshua Krupitsky, Teacher, I.S. 381

Alexandra Brook, Teacher, Gray Elementary School

Teach to One has been really beneficial for me as a new teacher, coming into teaching math for the first year. The collaborative nature, working with my fellow teachers who are much more experienced has been wonderful. We feed off of each other, we gain new ideas, we help each other. So that has been wonderful.



Teacher Role in Teach to One: Math

Teachers in Teach to One: Math work together and share responsibility for all students' learning. Students may be assigned to individual lessons supervised by any of the teachers in the Math Center. However, one teacher, a student's Math Advisory (MA) teacher, will meet consistently with the same group of students throughout the school year and will be responsible for grading homework and monitoring those students' progress over time.

In a Teach to One: Math classroom, each teacher has more time to devote to delivering high-quality instruction. Our teacher portal provides teachers with up-to-date information about student performance, access to highquality instructional content, and unique daily schedules to help them plan and deliver personalized instruction for each and every student in the classroom. This leaves more time for teachers to develop strategies for delivering material in a teacher-led format, support students during and outside of class through targeted interventions, and devote more energy to parent outreach.

Most teachers embraced the Teach to One: Math experience, with nearly 80% saying they would welcome the chance to use the model for another year and with more than 80% of teachers who participated in the 2012-13 school year returning for the 2013-14 school year.



Figure 11. Almost 80% of teachers from the 2012-13 school year said they'd want to participate in the program again

Q&A with Aaron Kaswell Teacher, J.H.S. 88 in Brooklyn, NY

What makes Teach to One* different?

AK: Teach to One individualizes the student program, and each student feels they are being attended to, which is why student engagement is so high.

How has Teach to One changed your role as a teacher?

AK: Teach to One does an amazing job providing creative content for me to work with and relieving me of administrative functions. I can now spend time on how best to deliver the content for these students – who are coming from different backgrounds and learning styles – and figure out what types of questions I should ask them, how to push their thinking. That's what a teacher's role should be, and Teach to One is designed in a way that makes this a reality.

How has *Teach to One* affected student learning?

AK: I've never seen higher student engagement in any classroom ... Students are on their toes because the program keeps things new and fresh each day.



* Teach to One: Math powers the School of One program in New York City.





Year 1 Results

Summary of Year 1 Results

Teach to One: Math is focused on ensuring that substantially more students finish middle school ready for, or having completed, algebra than would otherwise be the case. It is important to note that our organization does not manage the school itself. Rather, participating schools simply replace their traditional, textbook-based math programs with *Teach to One: Math*.

Because our model serves different types of schools with students who start at different academic levels, we caution against comparing the results of participating schools to one another.⁸ All schools are different, and their overall performance is a reflection of several factors beyond the adoption of *Teach to One: Math.* What matters to us is whether we can help to accelerate learning within a partner school so that far more students are prepared for advanced, high school mathematics than their previous academic trajectory would have suggested.

Taylor, 8th Grader, Gray Elementary School

In 7th grade and lower, I was really bad in math. I never understood it, and I would always fail my classes... And now since we got Teach to One, I started doing everything.

Lesson 1: Teach to One: Math Shows Promising Early Signs of Accelerating Math Achievement on State Assessments

In the 2010-11 school year, I.S. 228 in Brooklyn first implemented School of One, an early approach to personalized learning. It is a diverse school that serves about 800 students. More than 80% of the students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. 14% of the school is black, 24% is Hispanic, 34% is Asian or Native American, and 28% is white. Almost one in five of the students qualify for special-education services.

We feature I.S. 228 in this report because it is the only partner school in our network for which we can assess our model's impact for a cohort of students that participated throughout their entire three-year middle school experience.⁹ By comparing overall student performance to the citywide average over that period, we can begin to see how students performed in relation to other New York City students over time.

As shown in Figure 12, we saw that this cohort of students gradually improved its performance in relation to the New York City-wide average over the course of middle school. In 2010-11, the percent of I.S. 228 sixth graders who scored proficient or advanced on the New York State assessment was 1 percentage point below the citywide average. When this same cohort of students finished eighth grade, the percent of students scoring proficient or advanced on the state's assessment grew to 11 percentage points above the citywide average. Note that in 2012-13, New York State adopted new and more rigorous assessment based on the Common Core standards.



Compared to City Average

Figure 12. I.S. 228 graduating cohort's performance on annual New York State Education Department exams improved over three years.

Lesson 2: *Teach to One: Math* Is Accelerating Student Learning

Our goal is to accelerate learning so that more students are prepared for advanced high school mathematics than their previous academic trajectory would suggest. To measure student growth, we use the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), a standardized online exam created by the Northwest Education Alliance (NWEA) and used by all KIPP schools, Chicago Public Schools, and the Ohio Department of Education, among others. The MAP is aligned with the Common Core State Standards and is grade-level agnostic (meaning that students in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades take the same exam) and adaptive (meaning students get a harder guestion if they answer something correctly, and an easier guestion if they answer something incorrectly). Thus, unlike state assessments that focus on measuring proficiency against grade-level skills, MAP can help to measure the learning gains that students make over the course of a school year regardless of their starting points.

To analyze MAP results, we worked with the Center for Technology and School Change at Columbia University's Teachers College to complete an independent evaluation of the first-year MAP results of *Teach to One: Math.*

The researchers found that students participating in *Teach to One: Math* made significantly more progress in math than the national average over the course of the school year. The report states: "If we understand the national norms to represent one year of academic growth, TtO students achieved almost 1.2 years of growth in each grade, or 20% more than the typical student nationally." In addition, the report said, "Considering the relatively disadvantaged backgrounds of TtO students, the fact that their academic gains were above the national norms is noteworthy."

In the fall of 2012, students who participated in *Teach to One: Math* schools scored more than one half of a year behind the national average on MAP.

By the spring of 2013, participating students achieved average gains in each grade that exceeded the average national gain by 20%. In other words, *Teach to One* students learned the equivalent of 1.2 years worth of math in a single school year.



Figure 13. Students in *Teach to One: Math* grew 1.2 times faster than the national average on MAP.

^{8.} It also does not make sense to compare state test results between states — since each state has different standards. Neither DC nor Illinois have adopted Common Core-aligned assessments. New York has adopted Common Core-aligned assessments. New York State administered the new test for the first time in the 2012-13 school year. New York State has advised against comparing previous results to the most recent results because the tests are entirely different. 9. Note that for the 2010-11 and 2011-12 school year, I.S. 228 operated School of One. For the 2012-13 school year, the *Teach to One: Math* model began powering School of One at I.S. 228.



Lesson 3: ELLs and Special Education students also show progress

English Language Learners and Special Education Students also showed stronger gains than the national average. ELLs gained, on average, 1.3 years using *Teach to One: Math* (this is 30% faster than the national average for all students), and Special Education Students gained, on average, 1.1 years using the model (10% faster than the national average for all students).



Figure 14. English Language Learners and students with Special Needs showed stronger gains than the national average.

* http://ctsc.tc.columbia.edu/about-us/news/ttoreport2013/

Lesson 4: Struggling students demonstrate the largest gains

TTO students who started the year below grade level learned more math over the course of the 2012-13 school year than students who started the year on or above grade level as measured by the MAP. Students who began the year below grade level showed gains that were 1.6 times the national average of all students (not just low performing students).



Figure 15. In *Teach to One: Math*, low-performing students grow 1.5 times faster than the national average.

Lesson 5: We need to do more to accelerate learning for students at or above grade level

Teach to One: Math strives to help students master the basics before presenting them with more advanced skills. We believe that in 2012-13, we may have spent too much time reinforcing foundational skills with students who started the year on or ahead of their peers. On average, these students made one year of progress, compared to 1.2 years of progress for all students in the *Teach to One: Math* program. We have been modifying our model to ensure these students are now more challenged.

Looking Forward: Building on Early Successes

While we are encouraged by these early results, we know we have much more to learn as we continue to evolve *Teach to One: Math* and improve upon the 1.2 years of growth that our partnership schools made last year. We have many reasons to believe that this is possible:

- 1. Teach to One: Math is far more developed today than it was a year ago. Over the past year, we've added new content, refined our algorithms, improved our technology, and significantly enhanced the supports we provide to partnership schools.
- 2. This was the first year of *Teach to One: Math* for each participating school. I.S. 228, which began as a School of One site in 2010, also began implementing this new model for the first time in 2012-13. It can take time for teachers to grow accustomed to any new program, but especially one that is as different as *Teach to One: Math.* Unlike last year, when students in all three grades were new to this approach, only incoming students and students at new partner schools now need to learn about how the model works.
- 3. In 2012-13, because each participating student completed a daily assessment, we accumulated more than 3 million academic data points on student learning. Each data point we gather helps us to recognize patterns and to identify the most effective lessons in our system overall and for different student profiles. More data means we are better able to determine the most efficient and effective lesson for each student each day.

Innovation is a process. Figuring out how best to personalize learning for each student each day requires sustained R&D efforts, pioneering district and school partners, a combination of both successes and failures, and patience.

We are committed to continuing to grow, learn, and improve. We are also hopeful that our early experiences with personalized learning will inspire other organizations and entrepreneurs to consider how they might engage in the sustained research and development efforts required to develop thoughtful personalized instructional models. Our current approach with *Teach to One: Math* is just one way of enabling personalized learning. The possibilities for other ways of designing personalized instructional models are endless.



Steven, 8th Grader, Spencer Technology Academy

Teach to One feels almost like it's a tutor, but I'm in school... It feels like the program itself wants you to do better and to make sure... you are secure in the subject.



Our Funding Partners

The accomplishments outlined in this report would not have been possible without the advocacy, generosity, and strategic guidance of our early supporters. We thank you for joining us on this journey and look forward to your continued support.¹⁰

The following institutions and individuals have made single or multi-year commitments of \$1 million or more.

Anonymous

Bezos Family Foundation The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation **Carnegie Corporation of New York Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation** New Profit Inc. **NewSchools Venture Fund**

Implementations in our partner districts are supported by the following individuals and organizations:

The Chicago Public Education Fund **D.C. Public Education Fund Robin Hood Foundation NewSchools Venture Fund** CityBridge Foundation Target* **Malott Family Foundation** Helen Zell

In addition, we would like to thank all of our supporters who sustained our work during the 2012-13 fiscal year. These partners include:

American Architectural Foundation* Heather Anichini Anonymous Martin & Victoria Cooper Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP* Joseph Gleberman George & Teresa Grace Ken Hirsh **Charles Hoffman & Ruth Harfield Hoffman** JP Morgan Chase Foundation John Katzman Tess & Josh Lewis Morrison & Foerster LLP* Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP* **Scully Peretsman Foundation** David N. Shine & Karen E. Lanci **Robert & Lorraine Reeder The Richard Salomon Family Foundation** Arnold & Susan Scharf Foundation Lisa & Brian Shachter-Brooks Janine & William Spigonardo **UNDENY** Campaign Jon Weiner Jaime Weinsier Gruber Wolf Charitable Fund Sandra Zieve

Board of Directors

Mike Bezos Cofounder, Bezos Family Foundation

Joshua Lewis Founder and Mana Principal, Salmon F

Doug Borchard Managing Director, New Profit Inc.

David N. Shine Partner, Fried, Fran Shriver & Jacobsor

Joel Rose and Chris Rush also serve on the Board of Directors.

Board of Advisors

The New Classrooms Board of Advisors is a volunteer team of prominent education leaders who provide New Classrooms with strategic guidance on a range of academic and organizational issues such as student learning progressions, program research and evaluation design, school culture, teacher professional development, organizational design, fiscal management, governmental relations, and communications.

Norman Atkins

Ann Bradley

Anthony Bryk

Tom Carroll

Chris Dede

Technologies

Mike Feinberg

Cofounder, KIPP

Susan Fuhrman

Columbia University

Education

President, Carnegie

Foundation for the

President, National

America's Future

Professor in Learning

Harvard Graduate School of

President, Teachers College

Cofounder and President, Relay Graduate School of Education

of Teachers Innovation Fund

Advancement of Teaching

Commission on Teaching and

John Katzman Chairman & Found Education: Former Founder 2U

Marguerite Kondr President & CEO. Director, American Federation America's Promise

> Wendy Kopp CEO and Founder, Teach For America CEO and Cofounde Teach For All

David Levin Cofounder, KIPP

Arthur Levine President, Woodrov Wilson National Fe Foundation

Ellen Moir Founder and CEO. The New Teacher

Wes Moore Author; CEO, Front

10. The donors and partners listed do not take responsibility for any statements or views expressed in this publication. * Indicates partial or full in-kind support.

	Gideon Stein
aging	Founder and CEO,
River Capital	LightSail Education
	Jeff Wetzler
k, Harris,	EVP, Strategy, Innovation, and
ղ LLP	Organizational Development,
	Teach For America

der, Noodle r Chairman & r acke	Tom Payzant Former Professor of Practice, Harvard Graduate School of Education; Former Superintendent, Boston Public Schools
Alliance	Doug Rohde Engineering Manager and Education Community Liaison, Google Inc.
er,	Jenny Shilling Stein Executive Director, Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation
w	Tom Vander Ark Founder, Getting Smart
ellowship	Gene Wilhoit Former Executive Director, Council of Chief State School Officers
Center	Joe Wolf Board of Directors,
tCort	Innosight Institute



Appendix

Appendix A: 2013-14 New Classrooms Schools

School Name	City	Launch Date	# Students	Grades
Spencer Technology Academy	Chicago, IL	Fall 2012	212	6-8
William P. Gray Elementary School	Chicago, IL	Fall 2012	535	5-8
Marquette School of Excellence	Chicago, IL	Fall 2013	365	6-8
I.S. 228 David A. Boody	Brooklyn, NY	Fall 2012*	880	6-8
J.H.S. 088 Peter Rouget	Brooklyn, NY	Fall 2012	324	6-8
I.S. 381	Brooklyn, NY	Fall 2012	383	6-8
I.S. 2 George L. Egbert	Staten Island, NY	Fall 2012	270	6-8
I.S. 49 Berta A. Dreyfus	Staten Island, NY	Fall 2012	250	6-8
I.S. M286 Renaissance Leadership Academy	Manhattan, NY	Fall 2013	180	6-8
Charles Hart Middle School	Washington, DC	Fall 2012	503	6-8
McClintock Middle School	Charlotte, NC	Fall 2013	803	6-8
University Heights Charter School	Newark, NJ	Fall 2013	150	5-7
Speedway School	Newark, NJ	Fall 2013	125	5-8
William C. McGinnis Middle School	Perth Amboy, NJ	Fall 2013	1,000	6-8
iPrep Academy School No. 8	Elizabeth, NJ	Fall 2013	184	5-8
Total Enrollment Fall 2013			6,164	

* Note that I.S. 228 began operating School of One in the 2010-11 school year. For the 2012-13 school year, the Teach to One: Math model began powering School of One at I.S. 228.

Appendix B: School Data Sheets

School Data Sheets

The test result data included in this report were drawn from the implementations of Teach to One: Math at seven partner schools during the 2012-13 school year. At each participating school, students in Teach to One: Math took two assessments: one that measures growth (MAP) and one that measures student performance relative to grade level standards (annual state math exams).

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) **Growth Assessments**

In order to measure student growth, New Classrooms administers NWEA's MAP assessment to students in the fall and spring. The MAP is aligned with the Common Core State Standards. Students who take the MAP receive a RIT score, which is assigned against a curriculum scale that uses the difficulty of individual guestions to estimate student achievement. Individual student RIT scores have the same meaning independent of a student's grade level, but these scores can be compared to national averages for a given grade, and gains can be compared to the national average gain made from fall to spring for students in a given grade, as determined and released by NWEA. NWEA has also determined that a RIT score of 235 indicates algebra readiness, which is a benchmark New Classrooms also uses internally to help us evaluate our effectiveness.

Because these exams measure growth, only students who were present for both the fall and spring administrations of the MAP exam were included in the MAP data sample for each school. Furthermore, to help ensure data integrity, only students who were present for at least 70% of the school year in the Teach to One: Math program and who spent at least 6 minutes

e	completing both the fall and spring MAP exams were included in the MAP data sample.
	To learn more about the MAP, visit nwea.org/node/98
	State Exams

- Students participating in Teach to One: Math across the seven partner schools also took statemandated exams specific to their school's home state:
 - Students in New York City took the New York State Math Exam. In 2012-13, New York State adopted new and more rigorous assessment based on the Common Core Standards. As such, the test administered in the 2012-13 school year was entirely new, and the state has advised against comparing previous results to the most recent set of data.
- Students in DC took the DC-CAS, and students in Chicago took the ISAT. Neither DC nor Illinois has yet adopted Common Corealigned assessments.
- Only students who were present for the state exams were included in the state exam data samples for each school. Where possible, we also only included students in the sample who were present for at least 70% of the school year in the Teach to One: Math program.
- Because our model serves different types of schools with students who start at different academic levels, we caution against comparing the results of participating schools to one another. We also caution against comparing state test results between states - since each state has different standards – or, in some cases, within a city. We hope that the following School Data Sheets will help further our goals of transparency and shared learning.



Teach To One All Schools									
MAP RIT Scores 2012-13 MAP by Grade and Subgroup* Fall to Spring									
6th Grade	Fall	Spring	Gain						
All 6th Graders	832	215.4	222.5	7.1					
Below Grade	330	200.6	209.1	8.5					
On Grade	306	219.3	225.9	6.6					
Above Grade	196	234.4	239.9	5.5					
Special Education	103	204.2	210.2	6					
English Language Learners	155	217.6	226.4	8.8					
White	102	218.7	225.8	7.					
Black	321	209.5	214.2	4.7					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A***	N/A	N/A					
Asian/Pacific Islander	151	226.7	236	9.3					
Hispanic	253	214.8	223.5	8.7					
Multi-race	1	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	760	214.8	222	7.2					
7th Grade									
All 7th Graders	819	223.2	228.9	5.7					
Below Grade	289	206.7	214.5	7.8					
On Grade	316	225.8	230.4	4.6					
Above Grade	214	241.7	246.2	4.5					
Special Education	104	215.4	221.1	5.7					
English Language Learners	226	228.2	233.9	5.7					
White	120	226.9	232.9	6					
Black	285	216.2	221.6	5.4					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	232.8	238.1	5.3					
Asian/Pacific Islander	134	235.3	242	6.7					
Hispanic	269	223.1	228.8	5.7					
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	726	222.4	228.2	5.8					
8th Grade									
All 8th Graders	613	223.9	229.2	5.3					
Below Grade	284	210.8	217.6	6.8					
On Grade	237	230.6	234.9	4.3					
Above Grade	92	246.9	250.3	3.4					
Special Education	106	215.4	220.2	4.8					
English Language Learners	134	223.6	228.4	4.8					
White	58	222.5	227.5	5					
Black	193	219.3	221.9	2.6					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	7	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Asian/Pacific Islander	48	233	240	7					
Hispanic	200	224.5	231.6	7.1					
Multi-race	1	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	461	223.2	228.3	5.1					



2012-13

2,856

Initial Program Year

Total # of Students in TTO 2012-2013

State Math Exams**		2012-13 State Exams						
Overall	Total Students	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3	% Level 4	% Proficient		
All Students	2573	28.5	40.9	24.1	6.5	30.6		
6th Grade	933	27.2	43.6	20.1	9.1	29.2		
7th Grade	922	29.5	38.2	26.9	5.4	32.3		
8th Grade	718	29.0	40.9	25.6	4.5	30.1		
Below Grade	980	48.9	43.8	7.3	0.0	7.3		
On Grade	916	18.9	46.9	32.6	1.5	34.1		
Above Grade	515	2.5	26.4	42.5	28.5	71.0		
Special Education	367	55.3	33.8	9.3	1.6	10.9		
English Language Learners	572	28.8	43.2	20.1	7.9	28.0		
White	335	27.5	41.2	26	5.4	31.4		
Black	1012	30.6	46	20.8	2.5	26.8		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Asian/Pacific Islander	368	14.9	35.6	26.9	22.6	49.5		
Hispanic	823	32.6	36.6	26.1	4.7	30.8		
Multi-race	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	2333	28.6	41.4	23.9	6	29.9		

* The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for both the fall and spring administrations of the MAP exam and spent at least 6 minutes on the administration of both exams and who were present for at least 70% of the School Year in the TTO program.

**The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for at least 70% of the school year in the TTO program and who had a State Test Score.

461 223.2 228.3 5.1 *******N/A is used where a subgroup sample size was too small to draw a conclusion from.

Teach To One I.S. 228 Brooklyn, NV			Principal Dominick D'Angelo Initial Program Year 2010-11 Grades TTO Operated In 6-8					('12-'13) ('12-'13)	s) 786 s) 11		
BIOO	KIYN, NY			Grades	s TTO Operated In	6-8					
MAP RIT Scores										. eta	
by Grade and Subgroup*			2012-13		1	11	14.4		<10		
6th Grade	Total Students	Fall	Spring	Gain	nite III			N.E	1	. 1	
All 6th Graders	261	221.2	228.6	7.4				re 6		20.9	A Sta
Below Grade	67	203.9	215.7	11.8		/ 1		Q. L	1.2mg	72	al's
On Grade	101	219.6	226	6.4				and a			ANTE:
Above Grade	93	235.4	240.6	5.2		1	- M		Real		
Special Education	34	2099	216.1	6.2		N III	- Y	Vela	100	-	1 and
English Language Learners	105	2211	229.2	81		- 1			-		福息
White	61	2101	224.6	5.5	Carlos S.	A	Part of		1		12
Black	22	N/A***	N/A	N/A							
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A							
Asian/Pacific Islander	108	226.8	235.5	87	New York Clean Math. Free				2012.12		
Hisnanic	60	215.4	223.5	81	New York State Math Exa	M **			2012-13		
Multi-race	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Overall (by grade)	Total Students	%	% Level 2	% Level 3	%	% Proficient
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	225	220.6	228.6	8		746	22	200	21.6	11	22.6
7th Grade	LLJ	220.0	220.0	0		/40	32	39.9	21.0		32.0
All 7th Graders	263	220	23/1 2	52	All 6th Graders	301	22.6	44.2	20.3	13	33.3
Relow Grade	68	200.8	2160	71	All 7th Graders	302	34.1	37.7	20.2	7.9	28.1
On Grade	88	226.2	231.2	5	All 8th Graders****	262	32.1	31.3	24.4	12.2	36.6
Ahove Grade	107	2/13 3	2/17/1	/1	Overall (by subgroup)						
Special Education	33	2215	22/17	32	Below Grade	217	68.7	30.4	0.9	0	0.9
English Language Learners	178	230.3	2361	5.8	On Grade	247	24.7	57.9	16.2	1.2	17.4
White	70	2274	232.6	5.2	Above Grade	233	3	31.8	373	270	65.2
Black	13	N/A	N/A	N/A	Coosial Education	112	45.2	277	57.5	1.0	0J.L
American Indian/Alaskan Native	13	N/A	N/A	N/A		ΠZ	05.2	21.1	5.4	1.8	1.2
Asian/Parific Islander	07	235.0	2/12	61	English Language	101	28.2	300	215	10 /	310
Hisnanic	70 70	222.6	2272	// 6	White	207	22.0	J7.7	20.2	2.4	51.7
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	4.0 N/A	white	20/	32.9	43.5	20.3	3.4	23./
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	211	228	222.6	5.6	Black	61	49.2	45.9	4.9	0	4.9
8th Grade	211	220	255.0	5.0	American Indian/Alaskan	c	NI /A	NI /A	NI/A	NI/A	NI /A
All 8th Graders	125	22/13	228.2	30		2(2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	IN/A
Relow Grade	61	211 3	2161	/1.8	Asian/Pacific Islander	263	16./	32.7	27.8	22.8	50.6
On Grade	/12	220.7	2317	2	Hispanic	208	46.6	43.3	8.7	1.4	10.1
Ahove Grade	22	N/A	N/A	N/A	Multi-race	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Education	22	N/A	N/A	N/A	Free/Reduced Lunch						
Fondish Language Learners	ມ	226.6	220.6	2	Recipient	627	33.2	40.2	17.2	9.4	26.6
	20	219 5	229.0	25							
Black	5U CI	LI0.J		2.J	 The sample of students include administrations of the MAP or 	ied in this and spec	ilysis are those	e who were p	resent for bi	oth the fall a	and spring
American Indian /Alackan Nativo	<u>دا</u> د	N/A	N/A	N/A	who were present for at least	70% of the S	chool Year in th	he TTO progra	aarninistidul am.	טוו טו גוטנוו פ	
Anichtan mulan/AldSKall NdUVE	2	1N/A 22E 2	N/A	N/A	**The sample of students inclu	ded in this an	alysis are thos	e who were	present for a	t least 70%	of the school
	50	235.2	2241.1	2.9	year in the TTO program and	who had a St	ate Test Score.				
Multi raco	42	221.2	ZZ4.1	2.9 NL/A	***N/A is used where a subgro	up sample siz	e was too sma	all to draw a (conclusion fr	om.	
	U 104	N/A	N/A	N/A	****This sample of students als	so includes stu	idents who gra	aduated TTO	into an adva	nced algebi	ra program
riee/Reduced LUNCh Recipient	IUD	224.3	228.4	4.1	following 7th grade Theory	students bas	a not boon in	une ai hahula	other cuber	nun analyci	ic



following 7th grade. These students have not been included in any other subgroup analysis

Teach To One
M.S. 88
Brooklyn, NY

Principal Ailene Mitchell Initial Program Year: 2012-13 Grades TTO Operated in

Total # of Students in TTO Total # of Teachers in TTO

315

4



by Grade and Subgroup*	2012-13			
6th Grade	Total Students	Fall	Spring	Gain
All 6th Graders	96	216.9	226.5	9.6
Below Grade	37	203.7	215.7	12
On Grade	38	220	229.3	9.3
Above Grade	21	N/A***	N/A	N/A
Special Education	14	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	31	218.7	228.3	9.6
White	11	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	12	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	17	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	56	213.9	221.7	7.8
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	81	216.5	225.5	9
7th Grade				
All 7th Graders	87	223.3	227.8	4.5
Below Grade	25	N/A	N/A	N/A
On Grade	45	225.6	229.6	4
Above Grade	17	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Education	17	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	36	225.7	228.2	2.5
White	8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	21	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	45	224.62	228.02	3.4
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	73	223.4	227.7	4.3
8th Grade				
All 8th Graders	81	220.2	225.5	5.3
Below Grade	45	211.6	220.8	9.2
On Grade	33	229.9	230.8	0.9
Above Grade	3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Education	32	219.9	224.2	4.3
English Language Learners	34	222.5	227.9	5.4
White	5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	13	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	54	218.7	223.2	4.5
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	64	221.1	226.1	5



6-8

New York State Math Exam**			2012-13				
Overall (by grade)	Total Students	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3	% Level 4	% Proficient	
All Students	301	37.5	45.4	13.3	3.8	17.1	
All 6th Graders	102	25.5	41.2	23.5	9.8	33.3	
All 7th Graders	98	38.8	49	11.2	1	12.2	
All 8th Graders	93	49.5	46.2	4.3	0	4.3	
Overall (by subgroup)							
Below Grade	110	68.2	28.2	3.6	0	3.6	
On Grade	120	20	66.7	11.7	1.7	13.4	
Above Grade	41	4.9	34.1	41.5	19.5	61	
Special Education	74	63.5	33.8	2.7	0	2.7	
English Language Learners	118	32.2	49.2	16.1	2.5	18.6	
White	27	18.5	40.7	33.3	7.4	40.7	
Black	52	42.3	48.1	7.7	1.9	9.6	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	36	19.4	38.9	2.5	16.7	19.2	
Hispanic	176	42.6	46.6	9.7	1.1	10.8	
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	247	36	47	13.8	3.2	17	

* The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for both the fall and spring administrations of the MAP exam and spent at least 6 minutes on the administration of both exams and who were present for at least 70% of the School Year in the TTO program.

**The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for at least 70% of the school year in the TTO program and who had a State Test Score.

***N/A is used where a subgroup sample size was too small to draw a conclusion from.

Teach To One I.S. 49 Staten Island, NY			Prin Initia Grac	cipal al Program Year: les TTO Operated In:	Linda Hill 2012-13 6-8	To To	tal # of Stu tal # of Tea	idents in achers in	TTO TTO	262 8	
MAP RIT Scores by Grade and Subgroup*			2012-13				122				
6th Grade	Total Students	Fall	Spring	Gain	and the second s						
All 6th Graders	80	212.7	219.6	6.9	y Calles	1			21-		
Below Grade	38	198	204.1	61	And a state of the		-		1		ine se
On Grade	25	N/A***	N/A	N/A			-	···· 1			TRANSPORT OF
Above Grade	17	N/A	N/A	N/A				-		P	State of State
Special Education	13	N/A	N/A	N/A		1					mile
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A							
White	10	N/A	N/A	N/A			-	-	-		-117
Black	34	204.5	209.2	4.7				SA-			- 107°
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	- mage	-			-		11 12
Asian/Pacific Islander	13	N/A	N/A	N/A							
Hispanic	23	N/A	N/A	N/A							
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	New York State Math Exa	m **			2012-13		
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	69	211.9	220.2	8.3	0 11/1 1)	Total	%	%	%	%	%
7th Grade			,		Overall (by grade)	Students	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Proficient
All 7th Graders	73	223.2	226.9	3.7	All Students	218	60.1	25.7	8.3	6	14.3
Below Grade	25	N/A	N/A	N/A	All 6th Graders	88	56.8	23.9	10.2	9.1	19.3
On Grade	25	N/A	N/A	N/A	All 7th Graders	82	58	24.7	11.1	6.2	17.3
Above Grade	23	N/A	N/A	N/A	All 8th Graders	49	69.4	30.6	0	0	0
Special Education	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	Overall (by subgroup)						
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	Below Grade	0/1	03.6	64	Ο	Ο	0
White	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	On Grada	60	75.0 40 E	471	4.4	0	4.4
Black	29	N/A	N/A	N/A		00	40.5	4/.1	4.4	0	4.4
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	Above Grade	44	2.3	34.1	34.1	39.5	/3.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	15	N/A	N/A	N/A	Special Education	44	81.8	15.9	0	2.3	2.3
Hispanic	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	English Language	~					
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	Learners	U	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	62	222.6	225.9	3.3	White	25	40	40	12	8	20
8th Grade					Black	92	71.7	19.6	6.5	2.2	8.7
All 8th Graders	24	N/A	N/A	N/A	American Indian/Alaskan						
Below Grade	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	Native	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
On Grade	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	Asian/Pacific Islander	28	0	39.3	28.6	32.1	60.7
Above Grade	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Hispanic	71	76.1	22.5	1.4	0	1.4
Special Education	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	Multi-race	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	Free/Reduced Lunch						
White	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	Recipient	196	63.8	23.5	7.7	5.1	12.8
Black	8	N/A	N/A	N/A							
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	* The sample of students includ	ded in this ana	lysis are thos	e who were p	resent for bo	oth the fall a	and spring
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	administrations of the MAP ex	kam and spent	t at least 6 mi	nutes on the a	administratio	on of both e	exams and
Hispanic	n	N/A	N/A	N/A	who were present for at least	70% OF the St	.11001 Year in ti	ne i iU progra	III).	t looct 70°/	of the cohe-
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	vear in the TTO nrogram and	who had a Sta	are thos ate Test Score	e who were p	nezent tot g	i iedst 70%	o u une school
Free/Reduced Lunch Recinient	23	N/A	N/A	N/A	******* / A is used where a subgro			all to draw a c	onclusion fr		

 Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient
 2.3
 N/A
 N/A
 N/A
 ***N/A is used where a subgroup sample size was too small to draw a conclusion from.

	Teach To One I.S. 381 Brooklyn, NY				PrincipalMary HarringtoInitial Program Year2012-1Grades TTO Operated In6-2			Total # of Students in TTO376Total # of Teachers in TTO6				
M/ by	AP RIT Scores / Grade and Subgroup*			2012-13				G				
6t	h Grade	Total Students	Fall	Spring	Gain							

by Grade and Subgroup*	2012-13				
6th Grade	Total Students	Fall	Spring	Gain	
All 6th Graders	113	215.9	222.7	6.8	
Below Grade	37	201.8	211	9.2	
On Grade	56	219.3	225	5.7	
Above Grade	20	N/A***	N/A	N/A	
Special Education	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	
White	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Black	72	215.9	222	6.1	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	109	216.1	223	6.9	
7th Grade					
All 7th Graders	101	225.4	231.2	5.8	
Below Grade	24	N/A	N/A	N/A	
On Grade	53	225.9	231.1	5.2	
Above Grade	24	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Special Education	n	N/A	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	
White	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Black	58	223.3	230.1	6.8	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	25	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	101	225.4	231.2	5.8	
8th Grade					
All 8th Graders	103	227.5	233.6	6.1	
Below Grade	35	212.8	221	8.2	
On Grade	47	230.3	237.2	6.9	
Above Grade	21	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Special Education	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	
White	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Black	67	224.6	230.7	6.1	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	17	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	103	227.5	233.6	6.1	



New York State Math Exam**		2012-13				
Overall (by grade)	Total Students	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3	% Level 4	% Proficient
All I.S.381 Students	350	35.4	48.6	11.7	4.3	16
All 6th Graders	124	61.2	36.9	1.9	0	1.9
All 7th Graders	108	43	41.1	10.3	5.6	15.9
All 8th Graders	119	32.8	51.3	13.4	2.5	15.9
Below Grade	103	57.5	40	2.5	0	2.5
On Grade	168	30.4	59.5	8.9	1.2	10.1
Above Grade	65	4.6	40	36.9	18.5	55.4
Special Education	11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	31	22.6	45.2	25.8	6.5	32.3
Black	217	39.2	50.2	7.8	2.8	10.6
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	30	13.3	53.3	20	13.3	33.3
Hispanic	72	38.9	43.1	13.9	4.2	18.1
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	350	35.4	48.6	11.7	4.3	16

* The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for both the fall and spring administrations of the MAP exam and spent at least 6 minutes on the administration of both exams and who were present for at least 70% of the School Year in the TTO program.

**The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for at least 70% of the school year in the TTO program and who had a State Test Score.

103 227.5 233.6 6.1 *******N/A is used where a subgroup sample size was too small to draw a conclusion from.

Hart Middle School Washington, D.C.									
MAP RIT Scores by Grade and Subgroup*			2012-13						
Alle Cuesda	Total	E-II	Casina	Cain					
oth Grader	Students	Fall	Spring	Gain					
All Out Olduers	115	100.2	204.2	4					
On Grado	20	210.6	204.2	4.9					
Abovo Grado	12	210.0	226.6	-0.0					
ADUVE Oldue	15	L21 NI/A***	220.0	-4.4					
	1/	N/A	N/A	N/A					
	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Plack	U	N/A	N/A	N/A					
DIdLK	113	207.9	210.3	2.4					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	U	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Asian/Pacific Islander	U	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Hispanic	U	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	760	214.8	222	7.2					
7th Grade									
All 7th Graders	99	213.1	217.1	4					
Below Grade	60	203.2	210	6.8					
On Grade	30	224.8	226.2	1.4					
Above Grade	9	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Special Education	4	N/A	N/A	N/A					
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
White	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Black	98	212.9	217	4.1					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Hispanic	1	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	99	213.1	217.1	4					
8th Grade									
All 8th Graders	97	218.6	219	0.4					
Below Grade	59	208.95	210.45	1.5					
On Grade	31	231.32	230.62	-0.7					
Above Grade	7	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Special Education	12	N/A	N/A	N/A					
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
White	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Black	96	218.4	218.8	0.4					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Hispanic	1	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	97	218.6	219	0.4					

ncipal ial Program Year des TTO Operated in Billy Kearney 2012-13 6-8

Total # of Students in TTO Total # of Teachers in TTO

2012-13

487 7



District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)**

Overall (by grade)	Total Students	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Proficient or Advanced
All Hart Students	380	22.9	43.9	29.9	2.1	32
All 6th Graders	137	34.3	51.8	13.9	0	13.9
All 7th Graders	121	20.7	40.5	35.5	3.3	38.8
All 8th Graders	122	13.1	40.2	43.4	3.3	46.7
Overall (by subgroup)						
Below Grade	73	20.5	52.0	27.0	0.0	27
On Grade	33	0.0	21.0	73.0	0.1	73.1
Above Grade	7	0.0	0.0	71.0	0.3	71.3
Special Education	47	42.6	42.6	14.9	0.0	14.9
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	377	23.3	44.6	30.0	2.1	32.1
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	380	22.9	43.9	29.9	2.1	32

* The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for both the fall and spring administrations of the MAP exam and spent at least 6 minutes on the administration of both exams and who were present for at least 70% of the School Year in the TTO program.

**The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for at least 70% of the school year in the TTO program and who had a State Test Score.

97 218.6 219 0.4 ***N/A is used where a subgroup sample size was too small to draw a conclusion from.

Teach To One **Gray Elementary School** Chicago, IL

Principal Sandra Carlson **Initial Program Year** 2012-13 Grades TTO Operated in 6-8

Total # of Students in TTO 377 Total # of Teachers in TTO 5



by Grade and Subgroup*			2012-13				
6th Grade	Total Students	Fall	Spring	Gain			
All 6th Graders	103	216.3	226.4	101			
Below Grade	3/	100	2001	10.1			
On Grade	30	218.8	220 5	10.1			
Ahove Grade	39	232.6	2/12	0./			
Special Education	20	N/A***		N/A			
English Language Learners	15	N/A	N/A	N/A			
White	15	215 5	224.2	87			
Black	2	N/A	N/A	N/A			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Asian/Parifir Islander	3	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Hisnanic	87	215.8	2261	10.3			
Multi-race	0,	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	97	215.7	226	10.3			
7th Grade	77	213.7	LLO	10.5			
All 7th Graders	131	223	232.5	05			
Below Grade	43	2073	219	117			
On Grade	56	226.4	234.5	81			
Ahove Grade	32	238.2	2471	80			
Special Education	21	N/A	N/A	N/A			
English Language Learners	10	N/A	N/A	N/A			
White	15	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Black	1	N/A	N/A	N/A			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Hispanic	110	222.8	232.1	9.3			
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	115	222.5	232	9.5			
8th Grade							
All 8th Graders	126	228.2	240	11.8			
Below Grade	41	210.5	225.2	14.7			
On Grade	55	231.3	241.1	9.8			
Above Grade	30	246.7	254.2	7.5			
Special Education	14	222.3	236.5	14.2			
English Language Learners	14	209.9	227.2	17.3			
White	19	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Black	6	N/A	N/A	N/A			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Hispanic	93	229.8	240.6	10.8			
Multi-race	1	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	114	228.3	239.2	10.9			



Illinois Standard Achievement Test (ISAT)**				2012-13		
Overall (by grade)	Total Students	% Warning	% Below	% Meet	% Exceed	%Meet/ Exceed
All Gray Students	363	4.7	28.6	55.2	11.3	66.5
All 6th Graders	105	8.6	30.5	41.9	19	60.9
All 7th Graders	132	4.5	25	64.4	6.1	70.5
All 8th Graders	126	1.6	31	57.1	10.3	67.4
Overall (by subgroup)						
Below Grade	117	12.8	69.2	17.9	0	17.9
On Grade	150	0	14	84	2	86
Above Grade	92	0	0	58.7	41.3	100
Special Education	54	14.8	46.3	33.3	5.6	38.9
English Language Learners	41	24.4	56.1	19.5	0	19.5
White	45	4.4	28.9	55.6	11.1	66.7
Black	10	10	40	40	10	50
American Indian/Alaskan Native	3	0	66.7	33.3	0	33.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	11	0	36.4	27.3	36.4	63.7
Hispanic	293	4.8	27.6	57	10.6	67.6
Multi-race	1	0	0	1	0	1
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	330	4.8	30	54.8	10.3	65.1

* The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for both the fall and spring administrations of the MAP exam and spent at least 6 minutes on the administration of both exams and who were present for at least 70% of the School Year in the TTO program.

**The sample of students included in this analysis are those who were present for at least 70% of the school year in the TTO program and who had a State Test Score.

***N/A is used where a subgroup sample size was too small to draw a conclusion from.

Teach To One	
Spencer Technology Academy	
Chicago, IL	

MAP RIT Scores by		2012-13		
Grade and Subgroup*				
6th Grade	Total Students	Fall	Spring	Gain
All 6th Graders	66	204.2	210.1	5.9
Below Grade	46	197.4	203.8	6.4
On Grade	18	N/A***	N/A	N/A
Above Grade	2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Education	2	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	66	204.2	210.1	5.9
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	66	204.2	210.1	5.9
7th Grade				
All 7th Graders	65	212	218.2	6.2
Below Grade	44	205.4	213.5	8.1
On Grade	19	N/A	N/A	N/A
Above Grade	2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Education	3	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	65	212	218.2	6.2
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch Recipient	65	212	218.2	6.2
8th Grade				
All 8th Graders	57	222.5	227.7	5.2
Below Grade	29	210.4	217.5	7.1
On Grade	21	N/A	N/A	N/A
Above Grade	7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Education	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	57	222.5	227.7	5.2
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-race	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

Principal	Shawn Jackson
Initial Program Year	2012-13
Grades TTO Operated In	6-8

Total # of Students in TTO 244 Total # of Teachers in TTO 3



Illinois Standard Achievement Te	st
(ISAT)**	



Innovation Partners for Learning

New Classrooms Innovation Partners 1250 Broadway, 30th Floor New York, NY 10001 Phone: 212-920-6130 Fax: 718-313-0135

www.newclassrooms.org

