With all the way we are able to frame the data, the conclusions we can draw become increasingly clearer and easier to justify how we reached them. I think the two glaring conclusions we make can be fund towards the end of our file when we categorized each school. The first conclusion we can draw is that large schools do significantly worse in math than medium or small schools. Both small and medium schools scored a 93% passing rate while the large school only had 69.96%. There is further research to be done that may also help accentuate the conclusion. Can teachers not adequately teach math to large numbers? Does having more students in each class cause distractions that lead to a lower success rate? Another conclusion that seemed the opposite of what was expected was the relationship between budget on students and passing grades. With a higher budget per each student, you’d expect that would result in higher grades. However, when we broke our schools into groups based on the spending per each student, the lower spending schools did notably better than those who spent more. Those schools in the <585 had an overall passing rate of 95.035% which not only was the highest of the 4 groups within this category but also, the highest spending per student scored the lowest at a woefully low 73.69%. It would be rational to think that the more you spend on each student, the better they would do but in fact the statistics are showing the exact opposite.