

*"Problems cannot be solved at the same level of awareness that created them." Einstein*

---

**"THE INDIAN PROBLEM"**

**INDIAN EDUCATION REFORM FOR THE PUBLIC AND RESERVATION SCHOOLS**

*Retrieving the footsteps of school officials to find the place in time  
where they left behind our children and their families  
So that we – the Urban/Reservation Indian Communities –  
May move forward!*

---

**PRESENTED BY**

**NATIONAL INDIAN YOUTH COUNCIL, Inc.**

***Who are we?***

We are members of the five hundred or more federally recognized tribes in the United States. We moved to cities in New Mexico such as Albuquerque, Farmington and Gallup from across the prairies, the mountains, the rivers and the desert – so that we can go to school, to study and learn to work, to live in comfortable homes, to earn income and to engage in civic affairs – just like all other Americans. Because we live in the cities, the federal government labeled us "urban Indians." No matter how long we have lived in the city, we're still Native American Indians/Alaskan Natives (NAI/AN).

***History of Public Schools for NAI/AN***

Since the early nineteen hundreds NAI/AN students have been attending public and Indian Boarding Schools while state governments continue to receive federal funds for the education of our NAI/AN students. The history of NAI/AN Indian education revealed there are little, if any, involvement of NAI/AN in the educational policy formulation and the development of culturally relevant curriculum and instruction for our NAI/AN students. Even today, there is little, if any, effort to address the concerns and needs of NAI/AN parents and families of our urban NAI/AN students. In spite of these overwhelming odds, today there are NAI/AN students who succeeded in attaining their educational goals! Hence, we have in our urban NAI/AN communities, NAI/AN professionals who have the necessary knowledge and skills to step into leadership position by undertaking the responsibility to implement innovative programs such as "***The Moccasin Project***" Indian Education Reform for the Public Schools.

Therefore, so that our children and their families will no longer be left behind in the public school systems, we, the members of the urban NAI/AN communities, have and will continue, to study the history of our educational experiences; the implications of educational policies and regulations; the results of relevant research studies; culturally relevant curriculum and instruction; and other matters of concern. Moreover, at this point in time, we understand from analyzing test results of our NAI/AN students that there is something not working in the education of our urban NAI/AN children locally and Nationally. Equally important there is little, if any, research studies on NAI/AN familial involvement in

education and NAI/AN representation on public school boards and policy-making entities at other levels of government. Yet, the national trend for the demographics of NAI/AN show more NAI/AN are moving to urban and off-reservation communities. Thus, it is imperative for NAI/AN, including representatives from urban NAI/AN organizations and tribal leaders to engage in meaningful dialogue so as to ensure all NAI/AN students living in urban NAI/AN communities or on-reservations enjoy the educational benefits outlined in Treaties signed with the Federal Government. Let us remember, historically, our ancestors were not confined to reservation boundaries – this is foreign concept imposed upon us – and we must not allow ourselves to create **divisiveness** and **disunity** amongst ourselves as members of the urban NAI/AN communities. NIYC is offering the program called **“The Moccasin Project”** Indian Education Reform for the Public Schools as a solution to the problems facing our “at risk NAI/AN children, youth and their families.”

### ***The Problem of Indian Administration (The 1928 Meriam Report)***

This was a report of a survey made on the **“Indian Problem”** at the request of Honorable Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and submitted to him, February 21, 1928.

This report and its findings and recommendations will help the current decade of NAI/AN that still live in these conditions, to realize that the efforts and recommendations of this report and subsequent reports, surveys and studies on the **“Indian Problem”** over the past nine (9) decades did not achieved success because of non action by the state and federal governments.

The **“now”** generation must seek a different venue with these states and the federal government to ensure that the NAI/AN well being and education is achieved at its highest level. The question is: What kind of venue(s) and how do we institute it (them)?

### ***Native American Indians/Alaskan Natives Left Behind and Excluded***

In 2004, NIYC representatives met with New Mexico State Secretary of Education, Veronica Garcia, during a visit to Albuquerque when we presented to her documents and statistics regarding the poor academic performance (lowest in the State) of our NAI/AN students attending the Albuquerque and state Public Schools. If you were to compare the data contained in those documents presented to Secretary Garcia, you will note there are little, if any, significant improvements in our children’s test scores, attendance rates, dropout rates, and so forth in 2011. These results causes us to question the **raison d’être** of the individuals who came up with the altruistic notion of **“No Child Left Behind”** in the amendment of the U.S. Education Act. These individuals may have had noble intentions, nevertheless our 36,000 Native American Indian children in the New Mexico Public School systems are continuously left behind and excluded – along with their parents and family. In the mean time responsible urban NAI/AN leaders are denied a place at the table where dialogue and decision making occurs.

## ***Leadership and Policy Regarding Native American Indian/Alaskan Native Education in the Public Schools and the Post-Secondary Education Institutions***

It is imperative for NAI/AN – regardless of location of residency – to discuss the reality of leadership that will advocate for the welfare of the 3 million urban NAI/AN living off reservation (ref Kaiser Foundation, Report 2001) in the areas of education, health, housing and employment. This NAI/AN leadership must necessarily deal effectively with education matters affecting the majority (about 95%) of NAI/AN students (K-12) attending public schools as well as those NAI/AN students attending post-secondary education institutions located off-reservation. This leadership must be representative of urban NAI/AN organizations; parents and family members of NAI/AN students attending public schools; and committed NAI/AN who hold track records of advocating for quality education for all NAI/AN Indian children in the public schools and higher education institutions. We emphasize the leadership qualities because experience tell us we have in our midst NAI/AN appointed to governing entities whose self-interest is their main priority; who are either elected or appointed by friends to serve on education committees (state and national); who do not always advocate for our NAI/AN children in the public schools; and who do not inform us of their decisions and positions on educational matters. We are members of off-reservation communities – we live in their constituencies – and as taxpayers we are stakeholders! We have a voice to express our opinions on matters! The truth of the matter is, they hold public service position and they must be held accountable just like any other public servant. Furthermore, NAI/AN leaders must get beyond the ***colonial mentality*** by shifting their perspective to a more encompassing view of the needs of all NAI/AN regardless of the location of residence. It is a necessary challenge that must be undertaken! Almost all urban NAI/AN left our homelands because of education, economic and health needs – and we are still NAI/AN! Both state and national legislations regarding NAI/AN must reflect our reality that we, as urban NAI/AN, are members of their constituencies and they must consult with us.

### ***Educational Research and Evaluation***

Several years ago, the U.S. Secretary of Education office funded a national meeting in Albuquerque to develop a NAI/AN education research agenda. Since then, and it is unfortunate, we have not received any feedback regarding the outcome of this work. Along these lines of research methodology, we are concerned about the current research approach that does not include schools with 10 or less NAI/AN students in the annual quality performance report, program evaluation reports, and any other type of documentation on evaluation and research studies that is required by state and federal governments. This practice is not fair to NAI/AN. Generally speaking, our ethnicity constitutes the lowest number of student populations in the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels in comparison to other ethnicities. It is not the intent of the ***No Child Left Behind Act*** to exclude schools with 10 or less NAI/AN – it means not one child shall be left behind! We want public schools to be held accountable for every NAI/AN child even if it means one child. Additionally, it is our understanding that there are few NAI/AN who are actually involved in conducting these research studies. Consequently, because the majority of our children are attending public schools, it is imperative for public school systems to be charged with the responsibility of ensuring meaningful participation of NAI/AN educators in research activities that pertain to NAI/AN education – even if it means that they provide professional development for NAI/AN educator to upgrade their research skills.

## **Teacher Training Programs**

The NAI/AN Education Reform for the Public Schools must include educational policy, governance and leadership, institutional relationship with the NAI/AN communities and public schools systems, unity of cultural diversity, NAI/AN family and children reading development, health care for NAI/AN children, dual language instruction, NAI/AN English, NAI/AN family involvement at the school site, and teacher-NAI/AN family relationships.

## **Reform of NAI/AN Education in Public Schools**

The need for reform of NAI/AN in the public schools is long overdue (reference the 1928 Meriam Report)! It is a challenge that requires the participation of every concerned adult, both at the school sites and in the communities. There is a tremendous need for greater participation of the surrounding tribal leaders as the majority of our NAI/AN children attending the New Mexico public school system are Navajos and Pueblos. Equally important is the reform of Public School Boards to ensure the participation and involvement of NAI/AN in policy-making of the public school boards. This reform demands no less than the provision and the protection for NAI/AN communities to determine their leadership – and not the school systems and boards of education. These power and control matters are challenges that we, in the NAI/AN community, are facing and dealing with on a daily basis. As the Leader in the NAI/AN community, we are collaborating with numerous organizations including the National Coalition for Urban Indians, Network of Indian Organizations, Albuquerque Metro Native American Coalition, and the Bernalillo County Off-Reservation Indian Health Commission.

We will close with a quote from an editorial by Mr. Tim Giagos, dated December 10, 1999.

*“When a people have been subjected to genocide, forced acculturation and assimilation and the attempted destruction of their spirituality, it will take more than an economic turn-around to right the social, educational, physical well-being and spiritual recovery of their people. A conquering nation cannot subject an indigenous population to the institutionalized rape of its children without creating the breeding grounds for the very ills it had hoped to prevent. An institution, whether bureaucratic or religious, should have never been allowed to attempt to beat the language, culture and the spirituality out of innocent children with a leather strap or worse yet, by taking them away from their teachers, their parents and grandparents, and the other elders of their tribe. When American attempted to sever the tie between the Indian children and their traditional mentors, it created a terrible vacuum in their lives they are trying to fill even to this day. In attempting to “kill the Indian to save the child,” American nearly killed the child as well.”*

## ***Food for Thought:***

- 1) Why is BIE Education funding only for Native American Indian children that live on the reservations? Doesn't the CDIB's of the 96% of Native American Indian children attending public school systems mean anything? Are they still not Native American Indians?
- 2) Why does the Native American Indian college student who chooses to attend BIE operated Institutions of Higher Learning being penalized by not being made eligible for state lottery funds?
- 3) Why do the Native American Indian students have to pay for any education expenses, didn't our people give up our resources (550 Million acres) and lives for the guarantee by contract (370 treaties) that the United States would provide for our well being and education?
- 4) Why do the tribes still fight education battles as an individual entity and not join together as one voice to demand that the United States government to live up to its end of the 370 ratified treaties?
- 5) If the battles for equality and adherence of the Native American Indian treaties in the 1950's through today have not created the results we intended, what do we do now? World Court?
- 6) Do the Native American Indian Nations really have Sovereignty?
- 7) How does having Sovereignty or not having Sovereignty affect education?
- 8) Why is there such high dropout rates among Native American Students in both Secondary and in Higher Education?
- 9) What can this "now" generation do about the Native American Indian Students who have low proficiencies, grades, high truancy, homeless and racial bias in this country's educational institutions?
- 10) Could the Native American Indians ***panacea*** be a ***Native American Indian OPEC*** made up of all the tribes controlling our resources and not the United States Government . Native American controlling their own resources. Thus, forcing the United States Government to honor the 370 ratified treaties that they have broken.

11) Why do the Native American Indian Tribes as a whole not include the “Urban “ tribal members in funding assistance for their education? Do their tribal members lose their tribal blood by leaving their reservations for jobs, health and education? Does this mean that the Native American Indian Nations have assimilated to the standards of the white man’s ways?

## New Mexico Native American Report Card

### Math & Reading Proficiency Percentage Average on

#### Native American Students Located on Public Schools on Indian Land, BIE/Grant Schools and APS Schools

School Type and Area	Number of Schools	2009 Math Proficiency Percentage Average	2009 Reading Proficiency Percentage Average
<b>Public Schools on Indian Land</b>	* 35	23.4	38.5
<b>BIE/Grant Schools</b>	38	14.6	27.7
<b>APS Schools with ten or more NA Students</b>	** 84	27.7	44.5

\*Public Schools on Indian Land: Two (2) schools in the Zuni Public School that did not report any data in 2009 as indicated by NMPED SBA reports.

\*\*APS Schools with ten or more NA Students:

- (1) APS had 48 schools with ten or more students that showed no statistical data in the math area on the NMPED 2009 reports.
- (2) APS had 40 schools with ten or more students that showed no statistical data in the Reading area on the NMPED 2009 reports.

Note: The Native American community will check with NMPED to see if they averaged the APS Math Statistics by 36 schools and the reading statistics by 44 schools.

### 2008-2009 Native American Student Population by School Type and Area

School Type and Area	NA Population
BIE/Grant Schools K-12	4,735
Native American Students Attending K-12 Public Schools	36,449
Total NA Students attending K-12 in the State of New Mexico	41,184

Source: NMPED Standards Base Assessment Statistics and School District Report Card for SY 2008-2009 and the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Ed programs 2008-2009 Bureau-Wide Annual Report

### New Mexico Public Schools and Federal BIE/Grant School Summaries for

**School Years 2005-2008**

**New Mexico/Albuquerque Public School Summaries**

***Proficiency Testing for Reading and Math by Race and Category Indicating***

***The Achievement Gap between Highest and lowest Proficiencies***

<u>School Year</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Read Prof.</u>	<u>Math Prof.</u>	<u>State Rating</u>
2004-05	Asian	67	57	1st
	American Indian (AI)	<u>33</u>	<u>17</u>	Last
	Achievement Gap	34	40	
2005-06	Asian	68	58	1st
	AI	<u>33</u>	<u>17</u>	Last
	Achievement Gap	35	41	
2006-07	Asian	68	61	1st
	AI	<u>33</u>	<u>20</u>	Last
	Achievement Gap	35	41	
2007-08	Asian	70	62	1st
	AI	<u>39</u>	<u>22</u>	Last
	Achievement Gap	31	40	
2008-09	Asian	71	66	1 <sup>st</sup>
	AI	<u>39</u>	<u>26</u>	Last
	Gap	32	40	

Note: American Indian student reading proficiency averages have never been higher than 39% and these students also have never had a math proficiency higher than 26 % over the last 5 years. The achievement gap has virtually stayed the same since 2003-04 School years. As of this date the American Indian community has seen no specific reading or math programs instituted by the New Mexico Public Education Department just for the American Indian students.

Source: NMPED District School Report Card 2004-2009

**1999-2000 APS Minority Student Performance (Terra Nova) American Indian (Poverty) vs Asian (Non-Poverty) by grade.**

<u>Grade</u>	<u>AI Score</u>	<u>Asian Score</u>	<u>Achievement Gap</u>
3 <sup>rd</sup>	33.88	68.34	34.36
4 <sup>th</sup>	44.21	71.59	27.08
5 <sup>th</sup>	42.28	71.48	29.20
6 <sup>th</sup>	37.76	65.20	27.44
7 <sup>th</sup>	40.29	65.26	19.06
8 <sup>th</sup>	47.22	66.28	19.06
9 <sup>th</sup>	38.05	65.18	27.13

Note: Free Lunch program percentage for APS Native American students taking test: 81.40 %. As you can see by the statistical data presented in the previous chart that the Achievement Gap for the American Indian Students has not changed since 2000.

Source: APS Minority Student Performance Report on 1999-2000 Achievement Tests

**2000-2004 Graduating Students from APS and Navajo Pine who required college remedial classes attending the following University and Colleges:**

**UNM**

Percentage of Albuquerque Public High school graduates by ethnicity taking remedial college courses:

American Indian Students: 66%

Hispanics Students: 58%

Anglo Students: 36%

State highest percentage requiring remedial courses: Navajo Pine High School 83 %

Source: New Mexico Office of Education Accountability, Higher Education and Public Education departments.

**2006-2007 American Indian students requiring remedial classes:**

**San Juan College**

Math	96.9 %
English	72.9 %
Reading	42.3 %

**Dine College**

Math	68%
English	65%
Reading	69%

Source: San Juan College 2006-07 Native American Students Characteristics Report.

**2007-08 American Indian students requiring remedial classes:**

**Dine College**

Math	84 %
English	70 %
Reading	66 %

Source: Report to the New Mexico Indian Education Department dated 7/18/2008

***APS Homeless students 5/15/2009***

Anglo	619
African American	405
Asian	20
Hispanic	3,286
<b>American Indian</b>	<b>544</b>
Other	52
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,926</b>

Source: APS Homeless Student Report dated 5/15/2009

***NM 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rates class of 2008:***

<u>Race</u>	<u>Graduation Percentage</u>
Caucasian	71.3
American Indian	<u>49.8</u>
Graduation Gap	21.5

Source: NMPED SBA 2008 Reports

***NM Public Schools Dropout Percentages by Ethnicity:***

<u>School Year</u>	<u>State Avg.</u>	<u>AI/AN</u>
2007-08	3.6 %	6.6 %
2006-07	4.4 %	6.1 %

Note: American Indian/Alaskan Natives (AI/AN) dropouts have increased by **521 since 2005**. All ethnicities had a decrease in their dropout rates with the exception of AI/AN in 2008.

Source: NMPED SBA 2007-08 Reports

***New Mexico Education Statistics for Public Schools on Tribal lands***

Only 3 schools out of 35 met Proficiency in either Math or Reading.

30 schools out of 35 scored 39 % or less in Math.

17 schools out of 35 scored 39 % or less in Reading.

Source: NMPED SBA District Report Card

***Federal BIE/Grant Schools 2008 Education Statistics***

23 of 38 reporting schools had a decline in either Math or Reading.

A three year Math average of the 38 schools: 14.5

A three year Reading average of the 38 schools: 26.0

Note: Using the 2008 New Mexico Public School NCLB goal AMO shows that in comparison to the Native American students in the public school system only 2 BIE/Grant schools met Math Proficiency and only one (1) school met Reading proficiency.

Source: BIE Report Card 2004-2008

**NEW MEXICO PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON TRIBAL LANDS  
2009 REPORT CARD SUMMARY  
(35 REPORTING SCHOOLS)**

**OVERALL PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGE ON THE 35 PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON TRIBAL LAND**

Proficiency % Scale	Total Schools Math Proficiency	Total Schools Reading Proficiency
40 +	6	12
20 - 39	11	19
19 - <1.0	15	2
No Count Reported	3	2

**NM PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON TRIBAL LAND WHO HAD 40+ PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES**

Proficiency % Scale	Total Schools Math Proficiency	Total Schools Reading Proficiency
80 +	-	-
70 – 79	-	-
60 – 69	1	2
50 – 59	1	5
40 – 49	4	5

**PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON TRIBAL LANDS WHO HAD 0 – 39 PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES**

Proficiency % Scale	Total Schools Math Proficiency	Total Schools Reading Proficiency
30 - 39	2	13
20 – 29	9	6
10 – 19	12	2
1 – 9	3	-
< 1.0	-	-

**BEST PRACTICES PUBLIC SCHOOL ON TRIBAL LANDS (HIGHEST 2009 PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES)**

School	Math Proficiency	School	Reading Proficiency
Tohatchi ES	64	Tohatchi ES	62
Dowa Yalanne ES	53	Natanni Nez ES	61
Cochiti ES	51	San Juan ES	56

**2009 TOP THREE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON TRIBAL LAND WHO WAS MOST IMPROVED IN EITHER MATH OR READING**

School	2009 Math % Improve	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Improve	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
Natanni Nez ES	+35	12	47	Natanni Nez ES	+24	37	61
Cochiti MS	+14	14	28	Walatowa HS	+35	<2.0	36
Walatowa Charter HS	+13	<2.0	14	Zuni HS	+12	39	51

**2009 PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON TRIBAL LAND WITH THE LARGEST DECLINE IN EITHER MATH OR READING**

School	2009 Math % Decline	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Decline	2007 Read Prof %	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
San Diego Riverside	-13	21	8	Cochiti MS	-23	-	69	46
Santo Domingo ES	-13	32	19	Navajo Pine	-16	-	42	26
Newcomb ES	-12	61	49	San Diego Riverside	-15	-	37	22
Dulce HS	-11	26	15	Career Prep Alt	-15	29	-	14
A:Shiwies	-9	36	27	Newcomb ES	-14	-	53	39

Note: (1) Only Two (2) schools out of 35 met the 2009 No Child Left Behind Goal (AMO) in either math or reading.

(2) Most improved NM Public School on Tribal Land is Natanni Nez ES

(3) 2009 Math Proficiency Percentage Average = 23.4

(4) 2009 Reading Proficiency Percentage Average = 38.5

(3) Total Native American students tested = 3,763

(4) Total schools reviewed = 35

Source: NM PED Standards Based Assessment Statistics and Data Reports

**2009**

**NEW MEXICO BIE/GRANT SCHOOLS SUMMARY**

**(39 REPORTING SCHOOLS)**

**OVERALL PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGE ON THE 39 BIE/GRANT SCHOOLS**

Proficiency % Scale	Total Schools Math Proficiency	Total Schools Reading Proficiency
40 +	5	8
20 - 39	6	18
19 - <1.0	26	11
No Count Reported	2	2

**BIE/GRANT SCHOOLS WHO HAD 40+ PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES**

Proficiency % Scale	Total Schools Math Proficiency	Total Schools Reading Proficiency
80 +	-	-
70 – 79	-	1
60 – 69	-	1
50 – 59	2	4
40 – 49	3	2

**BIE/GRANT SCHOOLS WHO HAD 0 – 39 PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES**

Proficiency % Scale	Total Schools Math Proficiency	Total Schools Reading Proficiency
30 - 39	1	8
20 – 29	5	10
10 – 19	9	9
1 – 9	17	2
< 1.0	-	-

**BEST PRACTICES BIE/GRANT SCHOOLS (HIGHEST 2009 PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES)**

School	Math Proficiency	School	Reading Proficiency
Bread Springs Day Sch	57	Navajo Prep	74
Tse'ii'ahi	54	Beclabito Day Sch	64

**2009 TOP THREE BIE/GRANT SCHOOLS WHO WAS MOST IMPROVED IN EITHER MATH OR READING**

School	2009 Math % Improve	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Improve	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
--------	---------------------	------------------	------------------	--------	---------------------	------------------	------------------

Bread Springs Day Sch	+43	14	57	Beclabito Day School	+44	20	64
Beclabito Day Sch	+21	18	39	Okhay Owingeh	+19	13	32
Jemez Day Sch	+20	24	44	Laguna ES	+11	26	37
Santa Clara Day Sch	+14	28	42	Tse'ii'ahi	+9	49	58

**2009 BIE/ GRANT SCHOOLS WITH THE LARGEST DECLINE IN EITHER MATH OR READING**

School	2009 Math % Decline	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Decline	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
Tse'ii'ahi	-13	67	54	Sky City Comm Sch	-12	43	31
Tohaali	-13	18	5	San Idefonso Day Sch	-8	41	33
San Idefonso	-12	18	6	Santa Fe Indian Sch	-6	41	33
Navajo Prep	-11	51	40	Dzilth-Na-D-Dith-Hle	-6	23	17
Crystal Boarding Sch	-4	8	4	Navajo Prep	-5	79	74

- Note:**
- (1) 23 of the 38 reporting school in 2009 had an Increase in either math or reading proficiency.
  - (2) Most improved NM BIE/Grant school is Beclabito Day School.
  - (3) 2008-2009 stats indicates the 38 BIE/Grant Schools had an average Math Prof % of 14.6 %
  - (4) 2008-2009 stats indicates the 38 BIE/Grant Schools had an average Reading Prof % of 27.7
  - (5) 2007-2008 Math Proficiency Percentage Average = 13.17
  - (6) 2007-2008 Reading Proficiency Percentage Average = 26.7
  - (8) BIE students tested in 2009 = 4,735
  - (9) 17 Schools had a 2009 Math proficiency of less than 10.0
  - (10) 21 Schools had a 2009 Reading proficiency of less than 30.0
  - (11) 2 Schools Sanostee Day and Te Su Geh Oweenge had no data reported in 2008-09 Annual Report Card

Source: U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs, 2008 – 2009 Bureau-Wide Annual Report Card

**2009**

**APS NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITY REPORT CARD  
(REPORTING SCHOOLS WHO HAD 10 OR MORE NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

**OVERALL PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGE ON THE APS SCHOOLS  
(NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

<b>Proficiency % Scale</b>	<b>Total Schools Math Proficiency</b>	<b>Total Schools Reading Proficiency</b>
40 +	2	15
20 - 39	18	17
19 - <1.0	21	9
No Count Reported	1	1

**APS SCHOOLS WHO HAD 40+ PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES  
(NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

<b>Proficiency % Scale</b>	<b>Total Schools Math Proficiency</b>	<b>Total Schools Reading Proficiency</b>
80 +	-	1
70 – 79	1	-
60 – 69	-	1
50 – 59	-	5
40 – 49	1	8

**APS SCHOOLS WHO HAD 0 – 39 PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES  
(NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

<b>Proficiency % Scale</b>	<b>Total Schools Math Proficiency</b>	<b>Total Schools Reading Proficiency</b>
20 - 39	18	17
11 – 19	12	9
2 – 10	8	-
< 2.0	1	1

**2009 BEST PRACTICES APS SCHOOLS FOR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS  
(HIGHEST 2009 PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES WHO HAD 10 OR MORE NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

	<b>Math</b>		<b>Reading</b>
--	-------------	--	----------------

School	Proficiency	School	Proficiency
Sandia HS	75	Sandia HS	83
Jefferson MS	42	McKinley MS	63

**2009 APS HIGH SCHOOLS WHO WAS THE MOST IMPROVED IN EITHER MATH OR READING  
(NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

School	2009 Math % Improve	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Improve	2007 Read Prof %	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
Sandia HS	+20	55	75	Sandia HS	+19		64	83
-				Eldorado HS	+13	46	-	59
-				Albuquerque HS	+10	44	-	54
-				Del Norte HS	+7		38	45

**2009 APS MIDDLE SCHOOLS WHO WAS THE MOST IMPROVED IN EITHER MATH OR READING  
(NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

School	2009 Math % Improve	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Improve	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
John Adams MS	+4	11	15	McKinley MS	+31	32	63
Jefferson MS	+3	39	42	Jackson MS	+12	27	39
Van Buren MS	+3	7	10	Kennedy MS	+8	31	39
-	-	-	-	James Monroe	+4	47	51

**2009 APS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WHO WAS THE MOST IMPROVED IN EITHER MATH OR READING  
(NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS)**

School	2009 Math % Improve	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Improve	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
E.G. Ross ES	+15	19	34	E.G. Ross ES	+22	38	60
Lowell ES	+13	<2.0	13	Painted Sky ES	+18	32	50
Bel Air ES	+7	7	14	Gov. Bent	+7	33	40
Painted Sky	+6	26	32	Bel Air	+2	27	29

**2009 APS SCHOOLS WITH THE LARGEST DECLINE IN EITHER MATH OR READING  
FOR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS**

School	2009 Math % Decline	2007 Math Prof %	2008 Math Prof %	2009 Math Prof %	School	2009 Read % Decline	2007 Read Prof %	2008 Read Prof %	2009 Read Prof %
Seven Bar ES	-27	-	39	12	Tomasita ES	-50	-	69	19
Highland HS	-24	-	29	5	Eisenhower MS	-48	73	-	25
Albuquerque HS	-24	39	-	15	Seven Bar ES	-40	-	61	21
Valley HS	-23	-	31	8	Whitter ES	-35	-	50	15
Emerson ES	-22	-	30	8	Comanche ES	-31	47	-	16
Comanche ES	-21	33	-	12	Cibola HS	-26	-	69	43
Whitter ES	-21	-	33	12	LBJ MS	-24	-	66	42

**2009 APS SCHOOLS WHO MET AYP BUT THEIR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS DID NOT MEET PROFICIENCY IN EITHER MATH OR READING OR BOTH.**

**2009 No Child Left Behind AYP GOALS:**

**(Grades K-5 Schools) Math = 50, Reading = 63**

**(Grades 6-8 Schools) Math =41, Reading = 57**

**(Grades 9-12 Schools) Math = 46, Reading = 60**

School	2008 Math Prof %	2008 Reading Prof %
Bel Air ES	<b>14</b>	<b>29</b>
La Mesa ES	<b>&lt;1.0</b>	<b>8</b>

Note:

Source: NMPED School District Report Card 2006-2009

**2009  
APS SCHOOLS WITH THE LARGEST DECLINE IN  
MATH PROFICIENCY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS**

				<b>2009</b>
--	--	--	--	-------------

School	2009 Math Prof. %	2008 Math Prof. %	2007 Math Prof. %	Math Prof % Decline
Albuquerque HS	15	ndr	39	-24
Cibola HS	24	44	-	-20
Comanche ES	12	ndr	33	-21
Emerson ES	8	30	-	-22
Highland HS	5	29	-	-24
Kennedy MS	3	19	-	-16
La Mesa ES	<1.0	<2.0	-	-1
Manzano HS	23	40	-	-17
Seven Bar ES	12	39	-	-27
Taylor MS	16	28	-	-12
Valley HS	8	31	-	-23
Whitter ES	12	33	-	-21

Source: NMPED 2009 District School Report Card

ndr = No Data Reported in the 2008 NMPED District School Report Card

**2009**  
**APS SCHOOLS WITH THE LARGEST DECLINE IN**  
**READING PROFICIENCY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS**

				<b>2009</b>
--	--	--	--	-------------

School	2009 Reading Prof. %	2008 Reading Prof. %	2007 Reading Prof. %	Math Reading % Decline
Chelwood ES	15	30	-	-15
Cibola HS	43	69	-	-26
Cleveland MS	32	50	-	-18
Comanche ES	16	ndr	47	-31
Eisenhower MS	25	ndr	73	-48
Emerson ES	13	30	-	-17
Grant MS	44	59	-	-15
Highland HS	28	50	-	-22
John Adams MS	27	44	-	-17
LBJ MS	42	66	-	-24
Lowell ES	19	30	-	-11
NACA (charter)	30	41	-	-11
Seven Bar ES	21	61	-	-40
Taylor MS	24	44	-	-20
Tomasita ES	19	69	-	-50
West Mesa HS	38	50	-	-12
Whitter ES	15	50	-	-35
Wilson MS	19	41	-	-22
Zia ES	29	44	-	-15

Source: NMPED 2009 District School Report Card

ndr = No Data Reported in the 2008 NMPED District School Report Card

**2009 Native American 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, Class of 2009**

	2009 NA District	2009 Grad	2007-2008	Reading Ranking Among The 18	2007-2008	Math Ranking Among the 18

School Districts	Grad Pop	Rate %	11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Read Prof.	Reporting Districts	11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math Prof.	Reporting Districts
Albuquerque PS	421	52.5	46.8	2	28.7	5
Aztec PS	81	63.4	42.4	6	21.2	9
Bernalillo PS	136	60.1	30.2	17	10.5	16
Bloomfield PS	97	65.2	45.6	4	42.1	2
Central Cons. PS	655	59.3	35.8	12	16.0	12
Cuba PS	82	51.8	12.7	18	3.6	18
Dulce PS	67	50.1	36.0	11	23.0	7
Farmington PS	287	61.8	44.0	5	26.5	6
Gallup/McKinley CS	1214	53.8	34.3	15	15.6	14
Grants-Cibola CS	167	67.2	35.2	13	18.0	10
Jemez Valley PS	25	86.7	35.0	14	15.0	15
Los Lunas PS	60	86.5	32.7	16	21.8	8
Rio Rancho PS	65	76.2	45.7	3	45.7	1
Ruidosa MS	34	66.4	42.1	7	31.6	4
Santa Fe PS	45	45.4	41.7	8	16.7	11
Taos PS	30	67.8	52.6	1	42.1	3
Tularosa MS	21	80.2	36.9	10	15.9	13
Zuni PS	191	69.5	39.1	9	10.0	17

Note: Statistics reflect Student Population, Graduation Rates for 2009, Reading and Math Proficiency Percentages for these students in school years 2007-2008 (last year tested before graduation). The 18 School Districts listed had more than 10 Native American students in their graduating classes. No school district had at or above proficiency in reading in 2007-2008. Three (3) school districts had at or above proficiency in math. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reading goal for 2009 = 60 and NCLB math proficiency goal for 2009 = 46.

Source: NMPED SBA Report 2009

## New Mexico Public School Dropouts

### By Ethnicity

School Years 2005-2008

**School Year 2007-2008**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Population Grades 7-12</b>	<b>Total Dropouts</b>	<b>Ethnicity Dropout Rate</b>
Asian/Pacific	2,005	48	2.4
Black	4139	168	4.1
Caucasian/White	47238	1195	2.5
Hispanic	81489	2917	3.6
American Indian/Alaskan Native	19093	1262	6.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>153,964</b>	<b>5590</b>	<b>3.6</b>

**School Year 2006-2007**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Population Grades 7-12</b>	<b>Total Dropouts</b>	<b>Ethnicity Dropout Rate</b>
Asian/Pacific	1831	50	2.7
Black	3821	182	4.8
Caucasian/White	48232	1368	2.8
Hispanic	78371	3339	4.3
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	18592	1131	6.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>150847 (see note I)</b>	<b>6070</b>	<b>4.4</b>

**School Year 2005-2006**

		<b>Ethnicity Dropout Rates by Grade/Gender</b>			
<b>Population</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Grade 9-12</b>	<b>Grade 7-8</b>	<b>Grade 9-12</b>	<b>Grade 7-8</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Grades 7-12</b>	<b>Dropouts</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Asian/Pacific</b>	Not available	54	1.1	0.3	2.8	0.4
<b>Black</b>	Not available	141	6.1	0.3	4.0	1.8
<b>Caucasian/White</b>	Not available	1293	4.0	0.8	3.1	0.8
<b>Hispanic</b>	Not available	3116	6.0	1.5	5.2	1.1
<b>American Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	Not available	889	6.4	2.1	5.6	1.9
<b>Total</b>	Not available	5463				
<b>State Dropout Rate: 3.6</b>						

**School Year 2004-2005**

			<b>Ethnicity Dropout Rates By Grade/Gender</b>			
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Population Grades 7-12</b>	<b>Total Dropout</b>	<b>Grade 9-12 Male</b>	<b>Grade 7-8 Male</b>	<b>Grade 9-12 Female</b>	<b>Grade 7-8 Female</b>
<b>Asian/Pacific</b>	Not available	42	4.1	0.7	2.3	0.0
<b>Black</b>	Not available	150	6.8	1.0	4.6	1.4
<b>Caucasian/White</b>	Not available	1238	3.7	0.6	3.1	0.5
<b>Hispanic</b>	Not available	3307	6.6	1.3	5.6	1.1
<b>American Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	Not available	741	5.8	1.7	4.5	1.5
<b>Unknown</b>	Not available	10	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	Not available	5488				
<b>State Dropout Rate: 3.7</b>						

Note 1: Total does not include Unknown ethnicities

American Indian/Alaskan Natives (AI/AN) dropouts have increased by 521 since 2005. All ethnicities had a decrease in their dropout rates with exception of AI/AN in 2008.

Source: NMPED SBA Dropout Reports 2004-2008

**2000-2004**

**College Remedial Classes Required**

**By**

## **APS & Navajo Pine High School Graduates**

Of the **10,542** students who graduated from a public high school in Albuquerque, **44.12** percent took a remedial class in either math or reading during the years of 2000-2004. While American Indian students only represented 7 percent of all the students within the study of “Ready for College” prepared by the state Department of Finance and Administration, they represented the highest remedial classes – **66 Percent**.

### **Percent of Albuquerque public high school graduates by ethnicity taking remedial college classes:**

American Indian Students **66%**

Hispanics Students **58%**

Anglo Students **36%**

### **State highest percentage of students who went on to take remedial class upon entering college:**

Navajo Pine High School **83%**

### **Percent of Albuquerque public high school graduates taking remedial college classes:**

<b>School</b>	<b>2000/04 Literacy And Communication</b>	<b>2000/04 Math Class</b>	<b>2009 Literacy and/or Math</b>	<b>2009 Literacy and/or Math</b>
Albuquerque HS	43.5	48.9	58.2	56.8
Cibola	27.4	38.5	45.7	39.5
Del Norte	33.7	39.1	46.8	50.6
Eldorado	18.7	26.9	32.7	37.4
Highland	33.5	41.2	49.0	62.1
La Cueva	14.8	21.2	25.4	22.7
Manzano	25.5	33.6	40.0	40.2
Rio Grande	50.8	58.6	67.2	71.9
Sandia	20.3	27.8	34.5	38.8
Valley	31.2	42.9	50.5	57.1
West Mesa	49.4	55.7	64.3	77.7

Source: New Mexico Office of Education Accountability,  
Higher Education and Public Education departments.

## ***Ready For College 2010 Remedial Studies Required in 2009***

***High Schools with large American Indian Population or Public schools on Tribal Land***

<u>School</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2000-2009 Avg.</u>
<i>Central Cons HS</i>	<i>61.8</i>	<i>69.5</i>
<i>Dulce HS</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>72.3</i>
<i>Farmington HS</i>	<i>55.6</i>	<i>59.8</i>
<i>Gallup HS</i>	<i>68.0</i>	<i>58.9</i>
<i>Grants HS</i>	<i>63.7</i>	<i>57.1</i>
<i>Jemez Valley HS</i>	<i>73.7</i>	<i>64.3</i>
<i>Laguna-Acoma HS</i>	<i>84.2</i>	<i>64.8</i>
<i>Navajo Pine HS</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>76.6</i>
<i>Newcomb HS</i>	<i>87.5</i>	<i>80.1</i>
<i>Ramah HS</i>	<i>55.0</i>	<i>53.6</i>
<i>Rio Rancho HS</i>	<i>40.8</i>	<i>40.7</i>
<i>Shiprock HS</i>	<i>70.0</i>	<i>76.5</i>
<i>Tohatchi HS</i>	<i>88.6</i>	<i>76.7</i>
<i>TSE YI GAI HS</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>55.6</i>
<i>Twin Butts HS</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>16.7</i>
<i>Walatowa HS</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>66.7</i>
<i>Zuni HS</i>	<i>84.6</i>	<i>69.0</i>

*Note: - signifies Less than 10 students graduated*

*Source: NMPED Higher Ed Report "Ready for College "2010".*

***Ready for College 2010***  
***High Nine Year (2000-2009) Averages for***  
***Students Taking Remedial Studies***

<u>School</u>	<u>2000-2009 Remedial % Average</u>
<i>Albuquerque Talent DEV (Charter)</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Broad Horizons Alt HS</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Charter School # 37</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>La Academia DE Esperanza (Charter)</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Los Puentes Charter School</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Newcomb HS</i>	<i>80.1</i>
<i>New Futures Alt HS</i>	<i>81.3</i>
<i>Santa Fe Voc-Tech Alt HS</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>University HS Alt</i>	<i>82.3</i>

*Source: NMPED Higher Ed Report: Ready for College "2010"*

***Ready for College 2010  
Top 11 Schools with a high % of student taking remedial  
studies in 2009***

<u>School</u>	<u>2009 % of Students taking Remedial studies</u>
<i>Creative Ed Prep Net 1 (Charter)</i>	<i>85.7</i>
<i>Cuba HS</i>	<i>83.3</i>
<i>Gilbert L. Sena (Charter)</i>	<i>85.7</i>
<i>Laguna-Acoma HS</i>	<i>84.2</i>
<i>Newcomb HS</i>	<i>87.5</i>
<i>New Futures HS Alt</i>	<i>81.3</i>
<i>Robert J. Kennedy Charter School</i>	<i>81.8</i>
<i>School on Wheels Alt</i>	<i>80.0</i>
<i>The Learning Community Charter School</i>	<i>83.3</i>
<i>Tohatchi HS</i>	<i>88.6</i>
<i>Zuni HS</i>	<i>84.6</i>

San Juan College  
2006-2007  
Native American Student Characteristics

FALL ENROLLMENT

Year	Number of	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage
------	-----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

	Students	Native American Students	Hispanic	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Asian
<b>2005</b>	8,993	25%	12%	58%	1%	1%
<b>2006</b>	9,941	26%	13%	53%	1%	1%
<b>2007</b>	10,345	26%	13%	54%	15	1%
<b>Service Area % of Eligible</b>		26.9%	11.1%	61.3%	0.4%	0.3%

- The overall ethnic characteristics of SJC accurately reflect the service population.
- On the average, native students enroll in more credits per semester. For the past 3 fall Semester, Native Students have enrolled in 2.2 credits more per semester than non-Native Students.

#### PLACEMENT IN DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

Program	Native Students	Non-Native Students	Difference
<b>Math</b>	<b>96.9%</b>	<b>95.6%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>English</b>	<b>72.9%</b>	<b>45.6%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
<b>Reading</b>	<b>42.3%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>

- Native students place into developmental English and Reading at a much higher percentage than non-Native Students.

#### SUCCESS IN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Program Success 5-Year Average	Native Students	Non-Native Students	Difference
<b>Math</b>	<b>50.1%</b>	<b>54.3%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>
<b>English</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>
<b>Reading</b>	<b>64.2%</b>	<b>57.8%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>

- Over the past five years, Native students are only slightly less successful in Developmental Math and English than non-Native students.
- Over the past five years, Native students are more successful in Developmental Reading than non-Native students.

#### PERSISTENCE OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN

5-Year Average	Native Students	Non-Native Students	Difference
<b>Fall to Spring</b>	<b>74.3%</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>
<b>Fall to Fall</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>58.2%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>

- Fall to spring and fall to fall persistence rates are less for Native students than for non-Native students.

## GRADUATION

Year 2006-2007	Number of Students	Percent Native Students	Percent Hispanic Students	Percent White, non- Hispanic	Percent Black, Non- Hispanic	Percent Asian
All Awards	631	27.4%	14.3%	52.6%	0.5%	0.2%
Associate Degrees	414	28.0%	10.1%	56.6%	0.7%	0.0%
Certificates	217	26.3%	22.1%	45.2%	0.0%	0.5%

- SJC is forth in the nation for the number of Native Americans receiving Associates Degrees for the past five years.

Note: After nine (9) years, 75% of Native American students have received their degree.  
After seven (7) years, 75% of non-Native students have received their degree.

Source: San Juan College 2008 report to the NMPED and NMIEAC

## DINE' COLLEGE

REPORT TO NEW MEXICO INDIAN  
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
JULY 18, 2008

**PLACEMENT TESTING RESULTS  
ACADEMIC YEAR 0607 (231 STUDENTS)**

**Math**

<b>Courses</b>	<b>Total Students</b>
MTH 011 (Arithmetic)	127
MTH 051 (Beg. Alg.)	17
MTH 100 (Intermediate Alg.)	14
MTH 110 (College Algebra)	6

- 68% of the Native American Students tested into Dev. MTH overall

**English**

<b>Courses</b>	<b>Total Students</b>
FST 133 (Applied Com. I)	21
ENG 101A (Com. Workshop I)	47
ENG 100B (Com. Workshop II)	82
ENG 101 (Freshman Eng I)	39

- 65% of the Native American Students tested into Dev. Writing Overall

**Reading**

<b>Courses</b>	<b>Total Students</b>
FST 129(Found. Of Reading I)	20
FST 130(Found. Of Reading II)	37
FST 131 (Advanced Reading)	103
NRR (No Reading Required)	57

- 69% of the Native American Students tested into Dev. Reading Overall

**PLACEMENT TESTING RESULTS  
ACADEMIC YEAR 0708 (205 STUDENTS)**

**Math**

<b>Courses</b>	<b>Total Students</b>
MTH 011 (Arithmetic)	132
MTH 051 (Beg. Alg.)	28
MTH 100 (Intermediate Alg.)	13
MTH 110 (College Alg.)	3

- 84% tested into Developmental Math

### Reading

<b>Courses</b>	<b>Total Students</b>
FST 129 (Found. Of Reading I)	18
FST 130 (Found. Of Reading II)	24
FST 131 (Advanced Reading)	93
NRR (No Reading Required)	45

- 66% tested into Developmental Reading Overall

### English

<b>Courses</b>	<b>Total Students</b>
FST 133 (Applied Com. I)	18
ENG 100A (Com. Workshop I)	46
ENG 100B (Com. Workshop II)	79
ENG 101 (Freshman English I)	22

- 70% tested into Developmental Writing Overall