



2006-2007

School Building Report Cards



Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools · 625 Minnesota Avenue · Kansas City, KS 66101 · (913) 551-3200 · Fax (913) 551-3217

F. L. Schlagle High School

2214 N. 59th Street
Kansas City, KS 66104
(913) 627-7500

Douglas Bolden [dabolde@kckps.org], Principal

KSDE Building Report Card [\[link\]](#)

KSDE Summary .pdf

F. L. Schlagle High School Website [\[link\]](#)

School Highlights

Teaching and Learning

- Teachers increased the rigor in their classroom by incorporating Bloom's Taxonomy's higher level questioning skills into daily classroom curriculum.
- Active Engagement activities including Kagan and cooperative learning were incorporated into daily lessons to allow student to becoming engaged in their learning.
- We focused on planning lesson plans that incorporated the standards or other curriculum.
- Teachers created and implemented benchmarks in classes to allow for students' accountability in their learning.
- Teachers were available after school and on Saturdays to tutor students in Math, Science, English and Social Studies. Computer Labs were available for students use.
- Students achieved AYP status in reading for the 3rd consecutive year.
- Recognized a 250% gain in our state math assessment scores.
- Advanced placement classes for college credit are offered to our students in the areas of Math, English, Social Studies and Science.
- Sustained Silent Reading was utilized in TAC classes to encourage students to student to read books or articles of their choice.

Technology

- Teachers utilized technology through the use of daily emails to enhance written communication skills and help student become more acclimated to the world of technology. In addition to skills, the activity fostered closer a student/teacher relationship.
- Teachers and students utilized technology through the use of PowerPoint Presentation, Spreadsheet, Word Processing, and Publisher. Teachers and students were also exposed to Webpage design and other technology.
- Teachers used video equipment (cameras, etc.) to help students present their information and synthesize

concepts.

Activities

- Several first year debaters placed in the top ten of speakers at several of the tournaments through out the year.
- Thirty students attended Barack Obama's Presidential Rally on Saturday, May 12, and were exposed to a great deal of good information.
- Students participated in the Stock Market Game. In our region F.L. Schlagle's first place team ranked 19 out of 244 teams and our second place team ranked 21.
- Saturday Academy was provided to offer ACT Prep and other aid to students. Meals were provided and there was a great turnout. Many teachers came and tutored students in Math and Reading.
- Scholars Bowl competed at Regional event for the first time.
- Physics and Materials teachers implemented of our first Robotics team. The Mass Bots team built their first robot and competed at the regional competition.
- Honor student with high math scores by providing membership in Mu Alpha Theta National Mathematics Honor Society.
- Many music students competed at regional and state level.
- Ten forensics students to state competition brought home 1 ratings and two full-ride scholarships.
- Eight band students received full-ride scholarships.
- November 2006 Los Angeles performance national band competitions
- Students were given opportunities to attend many field trips concerning college readiness and career Exploration.

Relationships

- An All Male Advocacy group were targeted by their academy teachers as being "at risk." They ranged in class from freshmen to seniors and all boys were of African American descent. Instruction was delivered through group discussion as well as guest speakers from our community, videos, poetry reading and writing, reading articles and field trips.
- Family Advocacy – We met with our students four times a week. We made frequent phone contact with the parents of our students and met with them twice yearly.
- Each teacher had a peer partner with whom they observed and shared ideas.
- Letters were sent to parents at the semester and end of the year to encourage achievement.
- Provided experiences in working with others through yearbook and newspaper classes
- Met as an academy twice weekly; 1st weekly meeting dealt with student behavior using numerous interventions, 2nd weekly meeting to improve our teaching ability by learning the latest techniques and protocols in our profession.
- We used the Transition curriculum with our freshman T.A.C. students. This curriculum has many activities that focus on relationships with their self, family, school, and community.
- We worked to build relationships with the new teachers in our academy. We had two teacher retreats to support and build the relationships with first year teachers.
- We had peer-coaching partner. This was another teacher that viewed our class and shared ideas and strategies to improve instruction and relationships.
- We had a quarterly honor roll assembly. We recognized students for academic, citizenship, and attendance achievements.
- We selected one student for each grade for students of the month. These students were selected for their citizenship skills, academic skills, and their level of responsibility.
- We explored our relationship with our students with the Cris Tovali training. We watched the four videos and had deep dialogue about the relationships that we have with our students.
- Our new teachers participated in the New Teacher Retreats to strengthen their relationship with F.L. Schlagle High School.

Community Connections

Groups at Schlagle worked with:

- Beidental Foundation
- DST Systems, INC
- Alvin Alley
- Alvin Brooks
- American Red Cross
- Charles Etta
- Edward Jones Investment Firm
- Health Department
- Healthbridge
- Ignite
- Kansas City, KS Police Department
- Kansas City, MO Police Department
- Kansas City Royals
- Kansas State University
- Kansas University
- Kaplan
- KCK Community College
- KC Black Chamber of Commerce
- K-State Extension
- Legends
- Parents as Teachers
- Ranch Bowl
- St. Benedict's
- Strawberry Hill Museum
- The Bread Company
- The Haven Center
- United Way
- Wal-Mart
- YMCA
- Youth Friends

Mission Statement

Our mission at F.L. Schlagle High School is to provide students equitable opportunities to become responsible life long learners in a changing society.

Our (VISION) Statement is our (MISSION):

We believe that the most promising strategy for achieving the mission of F.L. Schlagle High School is to develop our capacity to function as a professional learning community. We envision a school in which staff:

- Respect and honor the diversity of individual students;
- Dedicate their profession and skills to the intellectual, emotional and social development of students by monitoring each students' progress;
- Unite to achieve a common purpose and clear goals through the development of four unique academies that focus on various live/career skills;
- Support and encourage our students to be actively engaged in the learning process by working collaboratively in "Teams";
- Assist in raising academic standards by implementing cooperative learning strategies on a continual basis; and
- Increase school pride and extracurricular activities through their daily relationships and involvement with students.

This building report card is a brief summary of how your school and students are performing and the impact of your local school improvement plan. However, it should not be used as a single source to judge students or school accomplishments. No single report can tell the whole story of a district's or school's education program. This report card does not provide information about curriculum, teaching methods, special programs, the "climate" of your school or the performance of individual teachers or administrators.

In addition, this report card is not a way of "rating" or "ranking" schools. Because of the distinct community and student characteristics, direct comparison between schools or districts are invalid. Rank-ordering school districts or schools is a clear misuse of the information. Rather, the information should be used to assess local strengths and weaknesses based on past performance and to plan program improvements.

Report Card 2006-2007

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is a method for determining if schools, districts and the state have made adequate progress in improving student achievement. AYP is based on participation and performance on state assessments, as well as attendance rates for elementary and middle schools, and, for high schools, graduation rates. For the 2006-2007 school year, this school did not make AYP. More information on this school's performance on the AYP measures is provided below.

Student Group	Reading		Math		Additional Academic Indicators	
	% Prof. & Above Goal: 65%	% Tested Goal: 95%	% Prof. & Above Goal: 55.7%	% Tested Goal: 95%	Grad Rt. High Sch. Goal: 75% or Improve.	Attend Rt. Goal: 90%
All Students	29.8%	98.2%	20.6%	99.1%	90.0%	N/A
Free & Reduced Lunch	25.7%	97.9%	22.0%	99.3%	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
African-Americans	29.1%	98.2%	18.4%	100.0%	N/A	N/A
Hispanics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Whites	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian / Pacific Islanders	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indians	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-ethnic & Undeclared	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

DEMOGRAPHICS

Race/Ethnicity	Bldg.	Dist.	State
African Americans	74.6	44.4	7.9
Hispanics	7.4	34.9	11.9
Whites	12.6	17.1	73.2
Other	5.5	3.7	7.1

Economically Disadvantaged Students	Bldg.	Dist.	State
Economically Disadvantaged	61.9	76.5	38.7
Non-Economic. Disadvantaged	38.1	23.5	61.3

Migrant Students	Bldg.	Dist.	State
Migrant Students	0.0	0.5	0.6
Non-Migrant Students	0.0	99.5	99.4

TOTAL ENROLLMENT

Building: 842 District: 16,101 State: 461,640

DEMOGRAPHICS

English language Learners	Bldg.	Dist.	State
LEP Students	2.0	29.3	7.4
Non-LEP Students	98.0	70.7	92.6

Gender	Bldg.	Dist.	State
Male	51.9	51.3	51.6
Female	48.1	48.7	48.4

Attendance	Bldg.	Dist.	State
2006	92.1	93.1	95.2
2007	86.1	91.9	95.2

Students with Disabilities	Bldg.	Dist.	State
Students with Disabilities	14.8	13.0	13.4
Students without Disabilities	85.2	87.0	86.6

Graduation Rate	Bldg.	Dist.	State
2005	88.7	82.1	90.2
2006	90.0	80.1	89.7

TEACHER QUALITY

Qualification	
	School
Fully Licensed	66.66%
Not Fully Licensed	33.33%

% Not Fully Licensed Teachers	
	School
Not Licensed	6.06%
Not Qualified	1.51%
Provisional	19.69%
Waiver	2.00%

Core Content Classes	
	School
Not Taught by Highly Qualified	42.41%
Taught by Highly Qualified	57.59%

% of Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers			
	School	District	State
Mathematics	20.83%	64.37%	91.42%
Foreign Language	0.00%	64.96%	90.21%
Science	35.55%	65.32%	89.20%
ESL/Bilingual	N/A	75.47%	82.45%
Elementary	N/A	95.07%	98.53%
History and Government	80.48%	85.21%	94.24%
English Language Arts	89.28%	77.36%	92.56%
Fine Arts	64.70%	79.57%	95.03%
Special Education	60.00%	69.39%	83.73%

For more information about Teacher Quality, go to http://online.ksde.org/rcard/bldg_tchrs.aspx?org_no=D0500&bldg_no=8329

GRADE 11 READING

All Students

	Exemplary		Exceeds Std.		Meets Std.		Approaches Std.		Acad. Warning		Not Tested
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	
Building	1.5%	2.7%	10.0%	6.7%	28.9%	20.4%	24.2%	36.0%	25.2%	31.6%	2.7%
District	7.4%	5.9%	16.0%	13.2%	27.6%	23.8%	21.3%	26.6%	23.4%	25.2%	5.3%
State	23.9%	22.4%	28.0%	29.1%	25.2%	25.5%	11.3%	13.2%	8.1%	7.2%	2.6%

Economically Disadvantaged

Building	0.8%	2.1%	8.9%	3.5%	26.7%	20.1%	25.8%	34.0%	25.8%	37.5%	2.8%
District	4.9%	4.5%	13.7%	11.5%	27.1%	24.0%	24.3%	28.1%	26.7%	28.3%	3.6%
State	12.1%	10.8%	20.8%	21.2%	28.7%	28.5%	17.1%	20.7%	15.8%	15.6%	3.2%

Special Ed.

Building	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	2.8%	19.0%	8.3%	14.2%	16.7%	47.6%	61.1%	5.6%
District	9.1%	10.2%	10.0%	4.7%	14.6%	13.3%	18.3%	14.1%	40.3%	52.3%	5.5%
State	8.3%	8.4%	13.5%	12.6%	27.9%	27.5%	19.3%	23.6%	24.6%	24.2%	3.7%

ELL

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	12.7%	1.4%	17.0%	27.1%	63.8%	65.7%	5.7%
State	2.1%	3.2%	7.9%	6.7%	19.7%	17.6%	20.1%	26.0%	40.5%	41.1%	5.4%

African Am.

Building	1.3%	2.3%	8.8%	6.3%	30.6%	20.6%	25.1%	33.1%	25.8%	34.9%	2.9%
District	6.4%	4.6%	15.1%	11.9%	28.6%	22.7%	24.0%	28.4%	22.3%	27.7%	4.6%
State	8.7%	7.2%	19.4%	17.0%	28.5%	27.2%	19.3%	23.4%	17.5%	20.0%	5.2%

Hispanic

Building	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	23.0%	12.5%	30.7%	43.8%	38.4%	25.0%	6.3%
District	3.3%	4.0%	14.6%	9.1%	24.2%	25.0%	20.0%	26.2%	33.4%	28.6%	7.1%
State	8.6%	8.3%	17.4%	17.5%	27.4%	26.9%	18.5%	23.5%	20.9%	19.6%	4.2%

White

Building	0.0%	0.0%	29.4%	11.8%	23.5%	11.8%	5.8%	52.9%	17.6%	23.5%	0.0%
District	15.7%	13.7%	21.1%	22.6%	29.5%	23.7%	13.3%	21.6%	15.2%	14.7%	3.7%
State	27.3%	25.8%	30.2%	31.9%	24.8%	25.3%	9.5%	10.9%	5.5%	4.6%	1.5%

Asian

Building	8.3%	7.1%	8.3%	7.1%	16.6%	21.4%	33.3%	50.0%	16.6%	14.3%	0.0%
District	6.1%	2.2%	14.2%	15.2%	20.4%	28.3%	28.5%	28.3%	24.4%	21.7%	4.3%
State	22.2%	23.2%	23.0%	23.9%	20.8%	25.4%	14.1%	14.9%	14.0%	9.8%	2.9%

Am. Indian

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State	15.0%	12.4%	25.5%	25.3%	26.0%	31.0%	13.4%	18.6%	13.9%	7.9%	4.8%

Multi-Ethnic

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State	18.0%	13.6%	27.0%	22.4%	24.4%	22.9%	15.4%	15.2%	8.0%	7.1%	18.8%

Female

Building	0.0%	2.7%	5.5%	7.3%	34.4%	24.5%	22.2%	32.7%	30.0%	30.9%	1.8%
District	7.7%	5.0%	16.5%	13.9%	28.8%	24.3%	20.1%	27.5%	22.8%	23.6%	5.7%
State	25.3%	23.4%	28.4%	29.6%	25.7%	26.0%	10.9%	12.7%	6.4%	6.0%	2.4%

Male

Building	3.0%	2.6%	14.0%	6.1%	24.0%	16.5%	26.0%	39.1%	21.0%	32.2%	3.5%
District	7.2%	7.0%	15.5%	12.4%	26.4%	23.3%	22.6%	25.6%	24.1%	26.9%	4.8%
State	22.5%	21.5%	27.6%	28.6%	24.7%	25.1%	11.7%	13.6%	9.7%	8.5%	2.7%

Migrant

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	0.0%	---	6.2%	---	15.6%	---	15.6%	---	56.2%	---	---
State	3.1%	1.5%	10.6%	12.3%	25.1%	33.8%	14.4%	18.5%	40.8%	27.7%	6.2%

GRADE 11 MATH

All Students

	Exemplary		Exceeds Std.		Meets Std.		Approaches Std.		Acad. Warning		Not Tested
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2007
Building	1.4%	2.2%	3.2%	3.9%	7.9%	14.2%	18.7%	14.7%	62.2%	61.6%	3.4%
District	2.0%	2.6%	7.0%	8.6%	17.1%	26.7%	21.2%	16.3%	47.7%	40.9%	5.0%
State	14.5%	15.7%	18.6%	21.5%	25.3%	34.1%	18.4%	14.6%	19.7%	12.2%	2.0%

Economically Disadvantaged

Building	1.6%	2.0%	4.4%	5.4%	7.7%	14.1%	18.8%	13.4%	60.5%	63.1%	2.0%
District	2.1%	2.7%	6.1%	7.9%	16.0%	26.1%	20.5%	16.6%	49.8%	44.5%	2.2%
State	5.6%	6.9%	11.3%	14.8%	22.7%	33.9%	22.8%	19.8%	32.2%	22.3%	2.4%

Special Ed.

Building	4.6%	5.7%	13.9%	17.1%	4.6%	2.9%	0.0%	5.7%	69.7%	68.6%	0.0%
District	4.8%	7.4%	6.7%	8.8%	9.1%	11.8%	12.8%	13.2%	57.9%	55.9%	2.9%
State	3.7%	4.4%	8.0%	10.9%	19.0%	29.7%	22.9%	21.6%	41.0%	30.2%	3.2%

ELL

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	5.1%	12.8%	22.8%	21.1%	19.0%	57.7%	50.6%	2.5%
State	3.2%	4.0%	6.9%	9.7%	15.1%	26.0%	22.8%	21.6%	47.9%	35.5%	3.2%

African Am.

Building	0.9%	1.1%	2.2%	2.8%	7.7%	14.5%	16.4%	11.7%	65.7%	67.6%	2.2%
District	1.7%	2.2%	4.8%	6.0%	16.4%	24.4%	17.9%	13.9%	52.8%	48.7%	4.8%
State	2.9%	3.7%	8.0%	10.4%	19.7%	29.2%	22.4%	20.2%	39.6%	32.1%	4.4%

Hispanic

Building	5.8%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	5.9%	29.4%	29.4%	52.9%	47.1%	5.9%
District	1.0%	1.5%	6.0%	7.7%	14.5%	27.2%	25.6%	19.5%	48.6%	39.1%	5.0%
State	3.6%	4.4%	9.6%	12.9%	20.2%	32.9%	22.2%	21.3%	38.6%	25.4%	3.1%

White

Building	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	11.1%	11.5%	16.7%	23.0%	22.2%	53.8%	44.4%	5.6%
District	3.7%	4.9%	13.2%	16.1%	22.3%	31.7%	23.1%	18.5%	35.5%	24.4%	4.4%
State	17.1%	18.2%	20.9%	23.6%	26.7%	34.9%	17.5%	13.3%	15.1%	8.7%	1.3%

Asian

Building	7.6%	7.1%	15.3%	14.3%	7.6%	21.4%	15.3%	7.1%	46.1%	42.9%	7.1%
District	3.9%	4.2%	13.7%	14.6%	21.5%	35.4%	25.4%	14.6%	31.3%	27.1%	4.2%
State	22.5%	22.7%	22.0%	24.0%	23.5%	30.4%	15.2%	9.6%	13.8%	10.1%	3.3%

Am. Indian

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State	6.2%	7.1%	14.0%	17.0%	24.4%	36.6%	22.5%	19.4%	28.3%	17.5%	2.4%

Multi-Ethnic

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State	10.4%	10.3%	16.7%	17.8%	20.9%	27.4%	21.6%	15.8%	24.5%	16.3%	12.5%

Female

Building	1.4%	2.6%	0.7%	0.9%	8.6%	17.4%	26.0%	17.4%	61.5%	58.3%	3.5%
District	1.3%	1.9%	4.6%	5.7%	17.5%	28.5%	24.4%	17.9%	47.6%	40.3%	5.6%
State	13.1%	14.1%	18.9%	21.7%	26.0%	35.0%	19.8%	15.6%	19.2%	11.9%	1.8%

Male

Building	1.4%	1.7%	5.7%	6.8%	7.1%	11.1%	11.4%	12.0%	62.8%	65.0%	3.4%
District	2.7%	3.3%	9.6%	11.6%	16.8%	24.8%	17.7%	14.5%	47.7%	41.5%	4.4%
State	15.8%	17.2%	18.4%	21.2%	24.6%	33.2%	17.2%	13.6%	20.2%	12.5%	2.3%

Migrant

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	0.0%	---	9.3%	---	11.6%	---	11.6%	---	65.1%	---	---
State	2.7%	3.7%	7.2%	3.7%	16.2%	22.2%	20.2%	33.3%	49.0%	14.8%	22.2%

GRADE 11 WRITING

All Students

	Exemplary		Exceeds Std.		Meets Std.		Approaches Std.		Acad. Warning		Not Tested
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007	2007
Building	---	1.9%	---	13.0%	---	42.5%	---	37.7%	---	4.8%	0.0%
District	---	4.6%	---	14.2%	---	40.2%	---	28.9%	---	12.1%	0.0%
State	---	17.1%	---	26.0%	---	32.5%	---	17.1%	---	6.2%	1.0%

Economically Disadvantaged

Building	---	2.3%	---	12.2%	---	39.7%	---	40.5%	---	5.3%	0.0%
District	---	4.5%	---	12.9%	---	38.2%	---	31.0%	---	13.5%	0.0%
State	---	9.8%	---	18.9%	---	34.0%	---	24.3%	---	11.4%	1.7%

Special Ed.

Building	---	3.4%	---	3.4%	---	10.3%	---	58.6%	---	24.1%	0.0%
District	---	9.2%	---	7.1%	---	14.3%	---	35.7%	---	33.7%	0.0%
State	---	5.0%	---	12.4%	---	29.6%	---	29.4%	---	21.7%	1.9%

ELL

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	7.3%	---	14.5%	---	18.2%	---	29.1%	---	30.9%	0.0%
State	---	7.6%	---	13.5%	---	26.2%	---	25.5%	---	25.5%	1.8%

African Am.

Building	---	0.6%	---	13.0%	---	43.8%	---	38.9%	---	3.7%	0.0%
District	---	3.1%	---	14.4%	---	40.4%	---	30.5%	---	11.7%	0.0%
State	---	6.2%	---	15.5%	---	34.8%	---	28.2%	---	12.1%	3.1%

Hispanic

Building	---	7.7%	---	15.4%	---	38.5%	---	30.8%	---	7.7%	0.0%
District	---	3.2%	---	9.7%	---	36.6%	---	31.5%	---	19.0%	0.0%
State	---	9.0%	---	17.5%	---	33.2%	---	24.6%	---	14.4%	1.3%

White

Building	---	0.0%	---	12.5%	---	37.5%	---	43.8%	---	6.3%	0.0%
District	---	8.7%	---	20.2%	---	43.4%	---	22.0%	---	5.8%	0.0%
State	---	19.1%	---	28.1%	---	32.4%	---	15.1%	---	4.7%	0.6%

Asian

Building	---	15.4%	---	7.7%	---	30.8%	---	30.8%	---	15.4%	0.0%
District	---	13.0%	---	8.7%	---	43.5%	---	26.1%	---	8.7%	0.0%
State	---	21.3%	---	24.6%	---	28.0%	---	18.3%	---	5.9%	2.0%

Am. Indian

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State	---	10.3%	---	22.2%	---	31.7%	---	21.7%	---	11.9%	2.1%

Multi-Ethnic

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State	---	12.0%	---	20.9%	---	32.8%	---	21.6%	---	7.7%	4.9%

Female

Building	---	3.0%	---	18.8%	---	45.5%	---	27.7%	---	5.0%	0.0%
District	---	4.4%	---	16.9%	---	42.8%	---	24.7%	---	11.2%	0.0%
State	---	20.7%	---	28.7%	---	31.5%	---	14.0%	---	4.3%	0.8%

Male

Building	---	0.9%	---	7.5%	---	39.6%	---	47.2%	---	4.7%	0.0%
District	---	4.8%	---	11.3%	---	37.3%	---	33.4%	---	13.2%	0.0%
State	---	13.6%	---	23.5%	---	33.5%	---	20.1%	---	8.1%	1.1%

Migrant

Building	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
District	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
State	---	3.5%	---	12.3%	---	40.4%	---	17.5%	---	26.3%	0.0%