

Proposal A

Part 1

Do we want our students to take the minimum number of classes to get through high school or to explore the possibilities? Our current grade scale would reflect that we want our students to take the minimum number of classes due to the calculations.

For example, let's pretend student "A" takes two AP courses and four regular courses. For the sake of ease, we'll say student "A" earned the grade of an A in all courses. That student would then have a GPA of:

$$\frac{(2 \times 5.0) + (4 \times 4.0)}{6} = 4.33$$

If student "B" takes the same two AP courses and five regular courses and earned an A in all courses, then their equation would look like this:

$$\frac{(2 \times 5.0) + (5 \times 4.0)}{7} = 4.29$$

Student "B" actually took a more rigorous course load, but student "A" was rewarded simply because of the ratio of extended scale courses to regular courses. This type of calculation has penalized students at North Boone for a number of years. A more equitable grading scale has recently been brought to my attention that would encourage students to take the courses they want and would even the playing field for students who take a varying number of courses.

$$\frac{(weighted\ courses \times grade\ earned) + (non-weighted\ courses \times grade\ earned) \left(\frac{Minimum\ credits - weighted\ credits}{actual\ non-weighted\ credits} \right)}{Minimum\ credits}$$

Given the last scenario, the calculations for student A would look like this:

$$\frac{(2 \times 5.0) + (4 \times 4.0) \left(\frac{6 - 2}{4} \right)}{6} = 4.33$$

The calculations for student B would look like this:

$$\frac{(2 \times 5.0) + (4 \times 5.0) \left(\frac{6 - 2}{5} \right)}{6} = 4.33$$

If you increase the course numbers over time, you will still get equitable results. Using an arbitrary example of Student "C" taking 7 weighted courses and 17 non-weighted courses overall and student "D" taking 7 weighted courses and 21 non-weighted courses over a four year period, we can do the comparison with our students needing a minimum of 24 courses to graduate. For the purpose of the example, we'll say each student earned an A in all courses.

Student A

$$\frac{(7 \times 5.0) + (17 \times 4.0) \left(\frac{24 - 7}{17} \right)}{24} = 4.29$$

Student B

$$\frac{(7 \times 5.0) + (21 \times 4.0) \left(\frac{24 - 7}{21} \right)}{24} = 4.29$$

This grading scale would not penalize a student for taking engineering through CEANCI and only being able to take six courses, nor would the scale penalize a student for taking more electives than another student.

Part 2

The other problem is that a number of students are now enrolling in the running start program at RVC, but some students just don't want to lose the opportunity to be involved in extracurricular activities. Currently all college course are on the extended scale. This penalize students who decide to stay at North Boone and be involved in the extracurricular activities, since North Boone does not offer enough college credits to keep students attending North Boone competitive with those who are taking running start courses. I would like the board to consider only offer extended scale course credits for the number of extended scale course credits we offer at North Boone. For example, if during the junior year, a student at North Boone would only be able to take five courses on the extended scale, then students taking college courses would only be able to earn five courses on the extended scale. There is still the incentive to earn college course credits or earning an associate's degree for those who are attending programs like running start, but it will allow for competitiveness between all students whether they are at North Boone or enrolled in a program offering college credit.

Proposal B

Below is a proposal that a number of schools across the United States have begun to go to due to the competitiveness of class rank and calculations of GPA. The descriptions below are pulled from the Rockwood School District in Eureka, Missouri.

In Rockwood, we prepare our graduates for college, career and citizenship. All four high schools use the laude system to recognize graduates for their success in rigorous programs. These designations use weighted grades: cum laude (3.5), magna cum laude (3.75) and summa cum laude (4.0). The Board of Education approved the new academic recognition and eliminated the class ranking system beginning with the Class of 2013 for the following reasons:

High Achievement: Students are more focused on the educational value of their class selection. They choose to take a broader range of course work to balance and improve their educational experience - rather than selecting a course for the potential weighted grade to increase their "top 10" class ranking.

Top Performing Schools: Schools around the state and nation can be vastly different. Students from different high schools may have selected vastly different courses and may have earned different grades - but have the same class rank to report to colleges as Rockwood students in their top performing schools. It is important to note that Rockwood schools collectively make up one of the highest achieving districts in the state and nation.

Increase Post-Secondary Opportunities: Research shows that colleges may consider applicants more individually when class rank is not a factor. Factors such as academics, test scores, course rigor and extracurricular activities may become the focus. Most importantly, it means that our graduates applying for college will be competing with all applicants, not just the students within their own high school.