

Lafayette School Corporation 2026 SAT Results

- Indiana uses the **SAT** as the required statewide accountability assessment for grade 11 students

Diploma + Student Success Indicators	80%
Graduation Rate	10%
Mandatory Statewide Assessment — SAT/I AM	10%
TOTAL	100%

- All students in the junior cohort participate in **SAT School Day**, generally administered in March
- The SAT measures **Evidence-Based Reading & Writing (EBRW) and Mathematics**
- Taking the SAT is required; earning a particular SAT score is not required for every student to graduate**
- The SAT is taken **ONE (1) time** by students
- SAT is **one option** students may use to satisfy the Postsecondary-Ready Competency within Indiana's current Graduation Pathways

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %	2025 Difference at Benchmark
LSC	208	50	208	466	44.6%	-1.4%
Kokomo	180	32	138	350	39.4%	
Goshen	210	34	164	408	40.2%	
La Porte	168	38	193	399	48.4%	
Richmond	172	34	111	317	35.0%	
Merrillville	275	54	157	486	32.3%	
TSC	303	86	549	938	58.5%	
West Lafayette	16	8	163	187	87.2%	

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %	2025 Difference at Benchmark
LSC	303	83	80	466	17.2%	-1.2%
Kokomo	222	73	55	350	15.7%	
Goshen	245	86	77	408	18.9%	
La Porte	212	104	83	399	20.8%	
Richmond	237	45	35	317	11.0%	
Merrillville	343	89	54	486	11.1%	
TSC	430	202	306	938	32.6%	
West Lafayette	33	30	124	187	66.3%	

2026 SAT DISAGGREGATED RESULTS

BLACK

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %
LSC	63	7	20	90	22.2%
Kokomo	38	9	11	58	19.0%
Goshen	7	2	2	11	18.2%
La Porte	8	1	3	12	25.0%
Richmond	21	6	7	34	20.6%
Merrillville	206	40	101	347	29.1%
TSC	34	3	18	55	32.7%
West Lafayette	***	***	***	8	***

HISPANIC

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %
LSC	79	18	68	165	41.2%
Kokomo	27	0	11	38	28.9%
Goshen	145	23	90	258	34.9%
La Porte	26	6	34	66	51.5%
Richmond	38	6	13	57	22.8%
Merrillville	47	9	31	87	35.6%
TSC	75	20	63	158	39.9%
West Lafayette	2	2	9	13	69.2%

MULTIRACIAL

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %
LSC	14	3	17	34	50.0%
Kokomo	27	3	15	45	33.3%
Goshen	5	1	5	11	45.5%
La Porte	19	3	5	27	18.5%
Richmond	29	2	8	39	20.5%
Merrillville	9	4	5	18	27.8%
TSC	11	3	18	32	56.3%
West Lafayette	0	0	11	11	100%

WHITE

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %
LSC	52	22	99	173	57.2%
Kokomo	80	18	92	190	48.4%
Goshen	52	7	63	122	51.6%
La Porte	115	28	150	293	51.2%
Richmond	83	19	79	181	43.6%
Merrillville	11	0	19	30	63.3%
TSC	177	58	431	666	64.7%
West Lafayette	7	4	98	109	89.9%

FREE/REDUCED

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %
LSC	131	30	86	247	34.8%
Kokomo	97	14	55	166	33.1%
Goshen	145	23	85	253	33.6%
La Porte	72	21	42	135	31.1%
Richmond	100	15	53	168	31.5%
Merrillville	140	21	54	215	25.1%
TSC	138	28	101	267	37.8%
West Lafayette	6	2	23	31	74.2%

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %
LSC	55	6	11	72	15.3%
Kokomo	31	2	7	40	17.5%
Goshen	36	0	6	42	14.3%
La Porte	45	4	9	58	15.5%
Richmond	62	4	7	73	9.6%
Merrillville	61	3	9	73	12.3%
TSC	99	8	35	142	24.6%
West Lafayette	***	***	***	8	***

ML

Corporation Name	EBRW Below Benchmark	EBRW Approaching Benchmark	EBRW At Benchmark	EBRW Total Tested	EBRW Benchmark %
LSC	55	6	10	71	14.1%
Kokomo	22	1	7	30	23.3%
Goshen	89	9	9	107	8.4%
La Porte	14	2	3	19	15.8%
Richmond	25	3	3	31	9.7%
Merrillville	11	2	1	14	7.1%
TSC	46	8	9	63	14.3%
West Lafayette	***	***	***	7	***

BLACK

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %
LSC	75	11	4	90	4.4%
Kokomo	44	13	1	58	1.7%
Goshen	8	1	2	11	18.2%
La Porte	8	3	1	12	8.3%
Richmond	28	4	2	34	5.9%
Merrillville	250	66	31	347	8.9%
TSC	42	8	5	55	9.1%
West Lafayette	***	***	***	8	***

HISPANIC

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %
LSC	111	30	24	165	14.5%
Kokomo	26	10	2	38	5.3%
Goshen	164	62	32	258	12.4%
La Porte	34	18	14	66	21.2%
Richmond	53	2	2	57	3.5%
Merrillville	60	15	12	87	13.8%
TSC	101	28	29	158	18.4%
West Lafayette	3	4	6	13	46.2%

MULTIRACIAL

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %
LSC	22	7	5	34	14.7%
Kokomo	31	5	9	45	20.0%
Goshen	6	3	2	11	18.2%
La Porte	19	6	2	27	7.4%
Richmond	35	2	2	39	5.1%
Merrillville	15	2	1	18	5.6%
TSC	17	7	8	32	25.0%
West Lafayette	1	4	6	11	54.5%

WHITE

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %
LSC	93	34	46	173	26.6%
Kokomo	115	41	34	190	17.9%
Goshen	66	20	36	122	29.5%
La Porte	151	76	66	293	22.5%
Richmond	119	36	26	181	14.4%
Merrillville	16	4	10	30	33.3%
TSC	266	155	245	666	36.8%
West Lafayette	20	18	71	109	65.1%

FREE/REDUCED

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %
LSC	183	38	26	247	10.5%
Kokomo	115	34	17	166	10.2%
Goshen	167	58	28	253	11.1%
La Porte	98	25	12	135	8.9%
Richmond	130	24	14	168	8.3%
Merrillville	168	29	18	215	8.4%
TSC	183	46	38	267	14.2%
West Lafayette	13	5	13	31	41.9%

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %
LSC	64	4	4	72	5.6%
Kokomo	31	8	1	40	2.5%
Goshen	38	1	3	42	7.1%
La Porte	56	2	0	58	0.0%
Richmond	68	3	2	73	2.7%
Merrillville	66	4	3	73	4.1%
TSC	117	16	9	142	6.3%
West Lafayette	***	***	***	8	***

ML

Corporation Name	Math Below Benchmark	Math Approaching Benchmark	Math At Benchmark	Math Total Tested	Math Benchmark %
LSC	64	4	3	71	4.2%
Kokomo	17	3	10	30	4.8%
Goshen	91	12	4	107	3.7%
La Porte	16	2	1	19	5.3%
Richmond	30	0	1	31	3.2%
Merrillville	11	3	0	14	0.0%
TSC	50	10	3	63	4.8%
West Lafayette	***	***	***	7	***

		2024	
		Average Score	Percentage Passing
Total Score	JHS	<u>917</u>	<u>18</u>
	State	936	23
	US	948	25
Reading and Writing	JHS	<u>469</u>	<u>46</u>
	State	478	50
	US	484	52
Math	JHS	<u>448</u>	<u>18</u>
	State	458	24
	US	464	27

		2025	
		Average Score	Percentage Passing
		<u>906</u>	<u>15</u>
		939	23
		965	28
		<u>469</u>	<u>46</u>
		483	53
		494	57
		<u>437</u>	<u>16</u>
		456	24
		470	29

		2026	
		Average Score	Percentage Passing
		<u>898</u>	<u>16</u>
		935	23
		964	28
		<u>464</u>	<u>45</u>
		479	51
		493	55
		<u>435</u>	<u>17</u>
		455	25
		471	30

		Average Score	Percentage Passing
Total Score	JHS	917	18
	State	936	23
	US	948	25
Reading and Writing	JHS	469	46
	State	478	50
	US	484	52
Math	JHS	448	18
	State	458	24
	US	464	27

Difference over 2024	Difference over 2024
-11	-3
3	0
17	3
0	0
5	3
10	5
-11	-2
-2	0
6	2

Difference Over 2025	Difference over 2025
-8	1
-4	0
-1	0
-5	-1
-4	-2
-1	-2
-2	1
-1	1
1	1

Summary of Data

- **Math is the greatest academic concern**

The 17.2% benchmark rate is concerning, but the bigger issue is that **65% of students are below benchmark**

- **EBRW is a relative strength, but performance has slipped slightly**

LSC compares favorably with several peer corporations, but its benchmark percentage decreased 1.4 points from 2025 and its average score fell five points

- **There are substantial achievement gaps**

Black, ML, Special Education, and Free/Reduced students are substantially less likely to meet benchmark, with the differences noticeable in Math

- **LSC has some subgroup strengths worth studying**

Hispanic and Free/Reduced EBRW performance compares relatively well with many of the peer corporations. Rather than looking only at deficits, we should investigate what is contributing to those strengths

- **This is not something that should be treated simply as an "11th-grade SAT problem"**

The size of the below-benchmark population—particularly in Math—suggests the need to examine earlier skill development and course performance, not just increase SAT preparation in junior year

Where Do We Go from Here? (Jefferson HS and Oakland Academy)

Jefferson High School and Oakland Academy will use SAT and PSAT data to identify areas of strength, target students who are approaching proficiency, and provide additional support to students who are not yet demonstrating the skills necessary for success.

Mathematics

Jefferson High School and Oakland Academy will focus on both SAT preparation and strengthening foundational mathematics skills.

- **Increase SAT preparation in Algebra II and higher-level courses.** Teachers will explore opportunities to incorporate regular SAT-style practice through resources such as Khan Academy, IXL, and targeted practice problems.

- **Strengthen foundational skills through MTSS.** Students in Algebra I and courses below Algebra II will receive increased attention to foundational skills, credit attainment, and daily intervention strategies. The goal is to support both academic growth and successful progress toward graduation.
- **Use PSAT data to identify students needing intervention.** Staff will examine students whose PSAT performance declines from year to year, including reviewing course sequencing and working with teachers to determine where additional support may be needed.
- **Expand supports for struggling students.** Math teachers will continue to utilize the math tutoring room (Jeff), after-school tutoring (Jeff), SST, and Advisory while exploring greater consistency in practices such as test corrections and reassessment opportunities.
- **Continue targeted support for students with disabilities.** Special education teachers will continue meeting with students prior to the SAT to encourage preparation, effort, and confidence—a strategy that showed positive results last year.

Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW)

EBRW performance was stronger overall than mathematics, providing areas of success to build upon while still identifying opportunities for continued growth.

- **Continue grade-level PLC analysis of PSAT/SAT skills.** English PLCs will regularly review student performance on SAT/PSAT-aligned activities, monitor mastery, and adjust instruction based on identified needs.
- **Target students approaching proficiency.** Particular attention will be given to students near the proficiency cut score (“bubble” students), where focused instruction may result in meaningful gains.
- **Focus on Standard English Conventions.** While all four EBRW content areas will remain instructional priorities, the Fall 2025 PSAT data indicate an opportunity for additional growth in Standard English Conventions, particularly because of the number of students in the 420–480 performance band.
- **Continue frequent SAT/PSAT practice.** English teachers will incorporate short SAT/PSAT-aligned activities into regular instruction and review results approximately monthly through PLCs.
- **Provide targeted support for multilingual learners.** Jefferson has expanded sheltered English sections (English class designed for ML students where students are taught grade-level English curriculum but the teacher provides additional language supports so students can access the content while continuing to develop their English proficiency) for students at specific WIDA proficiency levels and added a Level 4 English 10 section. The school will monitor the impact of these supports on PSAT/SAT performance and consider expansion to additional grade levels if results demonstrate success.

- **Continue effective instructional resources.** Teachers will utilize tools such as NoRedInk for grammar and writing, Actively Learn for reading comprehension, and teacher-developed PSAT/SAT practice activities aligned to College Board content areas.

TECUMSEH JUNIOR HIGH and our other schools (Math)

- For grades 3-8, schools must use data to determine whether a student is at risk of not achieving grade-level proficiency in math.
- Once identified at risk, the student must receive math intervention through the MTSS framework.
 - Tier II/Tier III support – intervention must progress from less intensive to more intensive support based on the individual student's needs.
 - Intervention must use evidence-based instructional strategies that promote conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and real-world problem solving.
 - Students receiving intervention must continue to have opportunities to interact with and demonstrate understanding of rigorous grade-level content
 - Schools must continually assess students and conduct an in-depth analysis of student data to determine whether students should move into, out of, or between Tier II and Tier III
 - The school must notify the parent/guardian within 15 days after determining that a student is at risk of not achieving grade-level proficiency in math and provide plan

Overall Focus

Moving forward, Jefferson High School and Oakland Academy will emphasize **intentional use of PSAT data, targeted intervention, consistent SAT-aligned practice, PLC-driven instructional decisions, and focused support for students approaching proficiency**. The schools will also continue examining subgroup performance and identifying successful practices that can be replicated across courses and student groups.