

Annual Education Report

2009–2010

Edison Environmental Science Academy

924 Russell St.

Kalamazoo, MI 49001

◇ Phone Number: 269.337.0550 Fax Number: 269.337.1621
tanseyc@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us



The mission of Edison Environmental Science Academy is to ensure that each student demonstrates high academic achievement and becomes an ecologically responsible, contributing citizen through a nurturing and dedicated staff with a technologically advanced, integrated curriculum in cooperation with family and community.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Mr. Chuck Tansey

2009–10 Board of Education

President: Ms. Mollie Peterson

Vice-President: Ms. Carol McGlinn

Secretary: Ms. Marcy L. Peake

Treasurer: Mr. Ervin Armstrong

Trustee: Ms. Patti Sholler-Barber

Trustee: Mr. Eric Breisach

Trustee: Ms. Liz Henderson



Kalamazoo Public Schools

Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Annual Education Report (AER) Cover Letter

August, 2010

Dear Parents and Community Members:

We are pleased to present you with the Annual Education Report (AER) which provides key information on the 2009-2010 educational progress for the Edison Environmental Science Academy. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and state laws. The school's report contains information about student assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact Mr. Chuck Tansey for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site <http://www.kalamazoopublicschools.com/2009-2010-kalamazoo-public-schools-building-annual-reports> or you may review a copy from the office at your child's school.

For 2009-2010, Edison Environmental Science Academy made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. While we are pleased to have reached this important goal, we are continuously working to improve. We appreciate the continued support of parents, staff and our community in this effort.

State law requires that we also report additional information.

1. PROCESS FOR ASSIGNING PUPILS TO THE SCHOOL
2. THE STATUS OF THE 3-5 YEAR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
3. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EACH SPECIALIZED SCHOOL
4. IDENTIFY HOW TO ACCESS A COPY OF THE CORE CURRICULUM, A DESCRIPTION OF ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND AN EXPLANATION OF THE VARIANCES FROM THE STATE'S MODEL
5. THE AGGREGATE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS FOR ANY LOCAL COMPETENCY TESTS OR NATIONALLY NORMED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
6. IDENTIFY THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS REPRESENTED BY PARENTS AT PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES

Sincerely,

Chuck Tansey

Principal

Overview of School

Accreditation Status & Education YES! Grades

The chart below identifies our buildings accreditation status and grades as determined by Education YES!

| Education Yes! Report Card | 2009/2010 | | 2008 – 2009 | |
|----------------------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| | Score | Grade | Score | Grade |
| Mathematics | 68.8 | D | 73.7 | C |
| English Language Arts | N/A | N/A | 53.1 | F |
| Reading | 67.2 | D | N/A | N/A |
| Science | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Social Studies | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Achievement Subtotal | 68 | D | 63.4 | D |
| Indicators of School | 100 | A | 100 | A |
| Preliminary | 79 | C | 76 | C |
| AYP Status | Met AYP: Y | | Met AYP: Y | |
| Composite Grade | C | | C | |
| Michigan Accreditation | Accredited | | Accredited | |

* Schools continue to be accredited unless they receive a D Alert grade, at which point they become designated as unaccredited for the state of Michigan

Specialized School

Edison Environmental Science Academy uses a thematic curriculum centered around environmental science. Teachers function in grade level teams. Every classroom must have an environmental science center reflecting the four quarterly themes.

2009–2010 Highlights

Edison Environmental Science Academy features classrooms that develop real-world skills. Our technology, hands-on earth education, and learning labs provide children with a strong educational platform on which to form their futures.

Our facilities include:

Technology-based Classrooms, Greenhouse, Courtyard, and Garden Beds, Water Sequestering System, Science, Economics, and Literacy Lab

- Edison students have an opportunity to participate in the Summer Garden Camp: Students become better readers, writers, and communicators at Edison Environmental Science Academy's Summer Garden Camp. In summer 2008, our students designed, wrote, published, and distributed a book about Summer Garden Camp.
- Edison has created a thematic curriculum that aligns with Michigan's Grade-Level Content Expectations. This thematic focus revolves around the concept of Environmental Economics and encourages students to become active members within their community.
- Community Nights: Edison Environmental Science Academy celebrates students' learning and success during our Quarterly Community Nights. During these evening activities, children display what they've learned about our theme, Environmental Economics.

2009–2010 Highlights (cont.)

Edison Environmental Science Academy has hundreds of volunteers annually from all over the community., partnerships include:

- ◊ Kalamazoo Communities in Schools- The focus of this group is to help students with their physical, emotional, and academic needs, helping them to succeed in school and in life.
- ◊ First Presbyterian Church of Kalamazoo- has donated over a decade of volunteerism: Everything from tutoring to birthday cupcakes.
- ◊ Edison School-based Health Center- provides primary and acute medical care, health education, and mental health counseling to students, their siblings, and members of our Boys and Girls Club. The health center staffs a certified pediatric nurse practitioner, a pediatrician, and a mental health counselor.
- ◊ The Boys and Girls Club of America- supports our students with after-school programs. These programs offer education, mentoring, arts, and recreational activities. The Boys and Girls Club proudly provides just what children need: "A sense of competence, usefulness, belonging and influence."

Parent Involvement

| Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates | | | | |
|--|-----------|----|-------------|----|
| School | Fall 2009 | | Spring 2010 | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| EDISON | 324 | 93 | 282 | 81 |

Parent Involvement Policy

District Policy

The District will consistently work, in a variety of ways, to strengthen meaningful family participation in the education of their children.

Edison's Parent Involvement

Parents are encouraged to participate in the Parents Association, the school improvement team and other school enrichment activities. Parent involvement is assessed through the yearly parent survey.

School Assignment Process

Students are assigned to schools within the district based on geographic boundaries that are published on the district website- <http://www.kalamazoopublicschools.com/district-attendance-areas> Students who wish to attend one of our specialized magnet schools must submit an application to enter the magnet lottery.

School Improvement Plan

| Reading | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Goal: | All students will be proficient readers. |
| Data to support goal selection: | 3rd-5th grade MEAP test, 2nd-5th grade Performance Series Assessment, 1st-4th grade ITBS. |
| Planned Strategies and Interventions: | Both during and beyond the core reading blocks, students will be placed in flexible groups to receive reading interventions at their instructional level. |
| Accomplishments: | 80% of 3rd grade students scored at or above the proficient level on the MEAP test. That is an increase of 13% compare to the 2008-09 school year. |
| Implications for next year: | Continue the literacy intervention program that is supported by 3 Reading Recovery Teachers, 2 Literacy Interventionist and a District Literacy Coach. |

| Writing | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Goal: | All students will be proficient writers by 2014. |
| Data to support goal selection: | Fall08 4th grade Writing MEAP |
| Planned Strategies and Interventions: | Staff will implement the district's writing program in all K-5 classrooms during the mandated 30-60 minute writing block daily. |
| Accomplishments: | During the 2009-10 school year, classroom teachers have consistently posted samples of high quality student writing indicating fidelity to planned strategies. |
| Implications for next year: | Classroom teachers need to continue implementation of strategies to ensure long-term growth. The building principal must continue walkthroughs to monitor implementation of strategies. |

School Improvement Plan

| Math | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Goal: | All students will be proficient in mathematics. |
| Data to support goal selection: | 3rd-5th grade MEAP, 1st-4th grade ITBS, 2nd-5th grade Performance Series Assessment |
| Planned Strategies and Interventions: | Staff will align new classroom materials with GLCE's. Staff will develop formative assessments to be used for developing small group instruction. Staff will implement best practices for use in instruction for all students in mathematics. Training for staff, materials purchase and monitoring results of students performance will be conducted by all classroom teachers. |
| Accomplishments: | 89% of 3rd grade students scored proficient on the Math MEAP. That is an increase of 26% above the 2008 MEAP. |
| Implications for next year: | Time needs to be devoted for classroom teachers to collaborate and plan for instruction based on available student data. |



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Improvement Plan

| Science | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Goal: | All students will be proficient in science. |
| Data to support goal selection: | 5th grade Science MEAP |
| Planned Strategies and Interventions: | Staff will implement the assessment program developed by the Battle Creek program and the Magnet Program Assessments at all grade levels. The data gathered will be tracked and monitored to identify misconceptions, curriculum and instructional improvement. |
| Accomplishments: | Over the past three years, there has been a steady increase of 5th graders scoring proficient on the MEAP assessment. The staff has developed a thematic curriculum that integrates inquiry-based science within the other core content areas. |
| Implications for next year: | Teachers need to be given time to collaborate and monitor assessment data. |

| Social Studies | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Goal: | All Edison students will be proficient in the areas of social studies as specified in the Grade Level Content Expectations (Grades K-5) as demonstrated on the 6th grade MEAP by 2014. |
| Data to support goal selection: | 6th grade Social Studies MEAP |
| Planned Strategies and Interventions: | Staff will design lessons that will reflect research-based best practices including: academic vocabulary, the gradual release of responsibly, productive student collaboration, time on task, literacy strategies, problem-solving, culturally responsive teaching. |
| Accomplishments: | The staff has developed a thematic curriculum that integrates social studies within the other core content areas. |
| Implications for next year: | Teachers need to be given time to collaborate and monitor assessment data. |



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

At Edison Elementary School we administer a variety of assessments to help determine student needs and progress. Students in grades 1 through 4 take the Iowa Test of Basic Skills to determine how students are progressing compared to a national peer group. Students in grades 3-9 also take Performance Series. Performance Series is a computer based assessment that gives teachers instant feedback on how well students are performing compared to their national peers and on the Michigan GLCE's.

Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Performance Series

| ITBS | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|
| Sub-group | Reading GLE | | Math GLE | |
| | 08-09 | 09-10 | 08-09 | 09-10 |
| First Grade | | | | |
| All | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| African American | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| Hispanic | 1.4 | N/A | 1.3 | N/A |
| White | 1.4 | 2.0 | 1.1 | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| Special Education | N/A | N/A | 1.3 | N/A |
| Second Grade | | | | |
| All | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| African American | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 |
| Hispanic | 1.7 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| White | 3.0 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.3 |
| Special Education | N/A | N/A | 2.1 | N/A |
| Third Grade | | | | |
| All | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.2 |
| African American | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 3.1 |
| Hispanic | 2.3 | N/A | 2.5 | N/A |
| White | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.2 |
| Special Education | 1.6 | N/A | 2.7 | N/A |
| Fourth Grade | | | | |
| All | 3.7 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| African American | 3.7 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 3.9 |
| Hispanic | 3.3 | N/A | 3.6 | N/A |
| White | 3.9 | N/A | 3.9 | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 3.7 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 3.9 |
| Special Education | 2.6 | N/A | 3.3 | N/A |

| Performance Series | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|
| Sub-group | Reading GLE | | Math GLE | |
| | 08-09 | 09-10 | 08-09 | 09-10 |
| Fifth Grade | | | | |
| All | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.4 |
| African American | 4.4 | 5.1 | 4 | 5.0 |
| Hispanic | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White | 5.1 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.6 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 4.4 | 5 | 4.3 | 4.8 |



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

Core Curriculum

The purpose of the Kalamazoo Public Schools curriculum is to ensure that all students learn the same essential content based on the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) standards and expectations. The curriculum ensures that students will be able to access, evaluate, and use information in a technology-dependent world. The curriculum provides optimal learning opportunities for all students and is designed to ensure post-secondary success in institutions of higher education and the workplace.

The Process of Curriculum Development and Alignment

As of 2007-2008, curriculum leaders, in conjunction with teachers, have integrated three major approaches to curriculum work in the development model. This model recognizes that creating curriculum guides alone does not enhance student achievement; it is merely the first step. Curriculum work must funnel down to classroom instruction, assessment, and instructional improvement based on data in order to maximize student achievement. As such, the model is focused on the work of Ainsworth, Marzano, Wiggins, and Tomlinson specifically as related to using standards for curriculum development, unit design, lesson design, instruction, differentiated instruction, and assessment (formative and summative). Our current process is indicated below:

- Unpack and prioritize Michigan Department of Education's grade level content standards (i.e., GLCEs and HSCEs).
- Unpack expectations using Ainsworth model of identifying verbs, nouns, concepts, skills, big ideas, essential questions, identify level of Bloom's Taxonomy for each expectation, create assessment items aligned to each prioritized standard
- Prioritize expectations
- Group expectations to create measurement topics
- Create end of course assessments
- Create assessment map
- Chunk
- Create course map and common formative assessments*
- Train team in data analysis
- Create units of instruction using the Understanding by Design (UbD) model
- Implement, assess, reflect, modify for improvement

*Common formative assessments are defined as periodic or interim assessments, collaboratively designed by grade-level or course teams of teachers and administered to all students in a grade level or course several times during the quarter, semester, trimester, or entire school year (Ainsworth, 2006).

The process of revising curriculum guides in the district involves teachers and curriculum leaders collaboratively conducting gap analyses using the following approach, in part, outlined by MDE:

- Standards and expectations published by MDE are identified and prioritized.
- Teams review existing documents to 1) determine whether GLCEs or HSCEs are taught in the curriculum and 2) identify the level of proficiency outcomes should be met.
- Pacing guides are reviewed to determine alignment along with corresponding resources.

Guides requiring revisions adhere to the cycle noted under *Process for Curriculum Development*.

All curriculum guides in the district are based on state standards and expectations. Serving as *living documents*, curriculum guides are reviewed annually to ensure alignment to state expectations and to incorporate needed revisions based on student data, research on best practices, and feedback from all stakeholders. In an effort to increase student achievement and effectively implement the curriculum, teachers across content areas engage in ongoing professional development. The sessions are designed to assist teachers in developing their capacity to a) further study and develop strategies to implement the GLCEs and HSCEs, b) use data to drive instruction, and c) identify areas of interest to strengthen classroom instruction. The district offers a variety of professional growth opportunities: differentiated professional development that allows teachers to develop in areas of interest; grade level/department sessions; school and district-wide sessions based on curriculum, data, and school improvement plans; training for group facilitators and content leaders representing their respective buildings; and voluntary after school sessions to further support instruction.

Several data warehousing systems are accessed to plan and evaluate professional development (building and district level), evaluate the impact of curriculum and instruction on student achievement, and support the development of school improvement plans. At the building level, staff members further align classroom instruction based on results from item analyses, disaggregated data based on subgroups, and noted trends over a period of time. At the district level, both aggregate and disaggregated data are used to establish academic goals, identify programming needs, and plan meaningful and relevant professional development.

The Foundation of Core Courses

All core courses (English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) are based on GLCEs or HSCEs. Students have access to courses across levels with opportunities for differentiated instruction. Resources are aligned to curriculum guides based on state expectations and offer activities to meet diverse learning styles and needs. Classes plan for small and whole group differentiated instruction to ensure that all students have equal and equitable access to appropriate core outcomes. Student data (formative and context-bound) is also used to guide decision making and select appropriate resources. Special education teachers receive core curriculum guides and participate in training to interpret expectations for areas under study. Special education teachers also have the opportunity to work with building teams in identifying best practices for reaching struggling learners. Professional development opportunities with corresponding resources are offered to all teachers in the district

Teaching to Expectations (Units of Study)

Curriculum documents are designed to teach the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs) to all students. The units of study are divided into three stages based on the genres to be explicitly taught at each grade level. **Stage 1** of each unit identifies the desired results for all students in a specific grade level. Stage 1 specifies what each student should know, understand, and be able to do at the end of the unit. The "desired results" designates the content worthy of understanding, what enduring understandings are desired, and what essential questions will be explored. Stage 1 calls for clarity about the priorities of the unit. **Stage 2** of each unit determines the acceptable evidence from the desired understandings and content of the unit of study. Stage 2 provides diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment to allow educators to know when students have achieved the desired results of the unit. This stage describes the acceptable evidence of a student's understanding and proficiency. The assessment evidence reflects the desired results of Stage 1. **Stage 3** of each unit is the instructional plan. Stage 3 suggests the activities, sequence, and resources which are best suited to accomplish the goals established in Stage 1. This stage focuses on the knowledge and skills students need to perform effectively to achieve the desired results. The goal is to make teaching engaging and effective for learners, while always keeping the end in mind.

English Language Arts

The kindergarten through third grade curriculum writing teams drafted reading guides winter 2009. All elementary teachers received draft guides and professional development fall 2009 and 2010. Full implementation of guides in classrooms is scheduled fall 2010.

In the area of writing at the elementary level, teams will assemble during the 2009-2010 school year to review resources. The outcome of the review will drive development of K-5 writing curriculum guides during 2010-2011 with full implementation and professional development in 2011-2012. Serving as living documents, writing teams will review guides yearly to a) incorporate diagnostic assessments, b) adjust expectations for learning experiences based on data, c) include scaffolding and reference materials, and d) strengthen units of study. At the secondary level, teams assembled fall 2009 to review resources and write guides for targeted courses. English curriculum guides drafted in 2007-2008 were scheduled for full implementation during 2009-2010 or 2010-2011. Professional development activities occurred fall 2009 and will in fall 2010. Plans to conduct resources audits for specific elective English courses will occur during 2011-2012 with possible adoption recommendations and curriculum development work in 2012-2013.

Math

A representative group of elementary teachers assembled in fall 2008 to explore options for new resources aligned with state expectations and based on best practices for grades K-5. Following the scheduled resource pilot in January 2009, mathematics leadership team members will identify and recommended a new series in March 2009. Professional development activities were scheduled for late summer and fall 2009 that provided assistance to classroom teachers with using guides and new textbook series to teach grade-level content expectations. During 2008-2010, the curriculum writing team, along with classroom teachers, convened periodically to report on the quality of guides and offered recommendations for improvement. The implementation began in fall 2009 and will be provided with ongoing opportunities for improving guide components and professional development.

With respect to middle school mathematics, the leadership team will review resources during 2009-2010 to investigate quality, relevance in meeting state expectations, and unification of format and content with the K-5 program. Based on findings, the adoption and curriculum development process may occur in 2010-2011 with scheduled professional development in fall 2011. In the meantime, to focus instruction on grade-level content expectations and support instructional practices, mathematics writing teams will assemble in winter 2009 to strengthen currently used guides. In winter 2009, high school curriculum writing teams collaborated with teachers to complete guides drafted during 2007-2008. In fall 2009, teachers received drafts guides and are expected to fully implement the program during 2009-2010. Plans to conduct resource audits for specific elective courses will occur 2010-2011. Revisions in state course expectations will direct future curriculum writing efforts during 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

Science

During the 2007-2008, the district adopted a K-6 science program developed by Battle Creek Area Mathematics and Science Center (BCAMSC) in Battle Creek, Michigan. BCAMSC curriculum guides contain instructional units aligned with grade level content expectations for life, earth, and physical science strands. On a yearly basis, BCAMSC provides teachers with updated unit activities and curriculum guides (components), includes resources to address realignment needs indicated by MDE, and offers professional development. Over the past two years, the district has phased in units by specific grade levels. In accordance with the final phase of implementation plan, 3rd through 6th grade teacher received the newly realigned science units with curriculum guides and training in fall 2009. consistent with the elementary direction and based on the results of an resource audit conducted in 2007, the science leadership teams will consider piloting BCAMSC units along with other resource options for 7th and 8th grades in spring 2010. Upon approval, the leadership team will deliver professional development sessions during 2010-2011. In the meantime, the 7th grade curriculum writing team assembled in winter 2009 to draft pacing guides and identify supplementary materials for use in fall 2009. Similarly, the 8th grade curriculum writing team assembled in winter 2009 to continue writing pacing guides previously drafted in 2007-2008. Seventh and eighth grade teachers received draft pacing guides in fall 2009 with supporting professional development. Full implementation of the 7th and 8th grade science curriculum guides will occur 2010-2011.

In 2010-2011, curriculum writing teams will implement secondary science guides drafted during 2008-2009. Curriculum teams worked during the summer in writing these guides to provide teachers with drafts and professional development in the fall 2009. Teachers will fully implement revised guides in 2011 with opportunities for improving guide components and professional development. Curriculum writing teams will assemble during 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 to investigate alignment between high school content expectations and currently used textbooks in honors and elective courses. Based on findings, recommendations for adoptions and the subsequent revision of curriculum guides will occur in winter 2010 with professional development during 2010-2011.

Social Studies

To address MDE revisions at the elementary level curriculum writing teams conducted K-5 resource audits to ensure alignment to the grade level content expectations. Teachers will receive draft guides in fall 2010 with supporting professional development. Full implementation of guides is expected fall 2011. At the middle school level, 6th grade recently underwent a textbook adoption and as a result, curriculum writing teams assembled draft curriculum guides that provide direction in implementing the newly adopted series in the fall of 2009. Teachers engaged in professional development in fall 2009 and will continue the work during the year. Full implementation of the revised guide is scheduled fall 2010.

During 2009-10, the middle school social studies curriculum writing team will review grade level content expectations and resources to determine cohesiveness of the 6th and 7th grade courses. Recommendations to shift or redistribute partial content in 7th grade to 6th may occur based on breadth of current MDE social studies topics. This decision will assist with ensuring vertical articulation between courses. Based on resource needs, the curriculum writing team may recommend an adoption during 2009-2010. The 7th grade curriculum writing team will continue drafting curriculum pacing guides during 2009-2010 with full implementation in 2011. In 8th grade, a textbook adoption committee convened in 2007-2008 to conduct a resource audit and pilot selected resources. As a result of the pilot, committee members recommended a new textbook series for adoption in winter 2010. In the meantime, the curriculum writing team will complete 8th grade previously drafted in 2008-2009. Teachers received draft guides in fall 2009 with scheduled professional development. Full implementation of the 8th grade guides with new resources is scheduled 2011.

High school social studies curriculum guides drafted in 2007-2008 are scheduled for full implementation in 2010-2011. To meet timelines, curriculum teams have assembled this year to continue writing guides. Several of these guides will undergo major revisions due to new MDE high school content expectations. Teachers received draft guides in fall 2009 along with professional development. With respect to elective courses, curriculum writing teams will conduct resource audits during 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Curriculum writing teams may offer recommendations for adoptions based on findings. Writing teams will complete related work with developing curriculum guides between 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Variations

All schools use Kalamazoo Public School's curriculum guides that are aligned to MDE expectations and standards. Magnet schools and schools with special themes integrate their specialized areas into the KPS curriculum.



**Edison Environmental Science Academy
Parent – Teacher – Student Compact**

It is our purpose to educate all students to high levels of academic performance, while fostering positive growth in social/emotional behaviors and attitudes. The entire staff, in collaboration with parents and community, commits to a comprehensive system of support to ensure these outcomes. Parents, students, and staff agree to following:

Parent/Guardian Commitment:

I want my child to achieve. Therefore, I will encourage him/her by doing the following:

- Attend parent-teacher conferences, workshops and school performances.
- Have a quiet space to read and do school work at home.
- Get and use a family library card.
- Read with my child and let my child see me read.
- Set routines for meals, provide a regular bedtime and see that my child is punctual and attends school regularly.
- Stay aware of what my child is learning by asking the three best things that happened that day.
- Support the school in its efforts to do his/her best by teaching your child appropriate ways to interact and respond to authority.
- Encourage positive attitudes and encourage my child to do his/her best.

Parent Signature _____

Student Commitment:

It is important that I work to the best of my ability. Therefore, I shall strive to do the following:

- Come to school every day ready to learn and work hard.
- Bring necessary materials, completed assignments and homework.
- Know and follow the school standards and expectations.
- Communicate regularly with my parents and teachers about school experiences so that they can help me to be successful in school.
- Set aside a regular time and place each night to complete homework
- Do my best and keep trying even when the work is difficult.

Student Signature _____

Teacher/Administration Commitment:

It is important that students achieve. Therefore, I shall strive to do the following:

- Believe that ALL children can learn and assist all students in meeting or exceeding grade level expectations.
- Instruct, model, and reinforce daily procedures, routines, and socially accepted manners.
- Communicate effectively with students, parents, colleagues, and the community by creating a community of learners and collaborating with others.
- Base instructional and behavioral decisions on data.
- Affirm and encourage parental involvement at conferences and school events. Communicate with parents/guardians on a regular basis (i.e. parent letters, newsletters, written notes, website, telephone calls, and emails making sure to be responsive to the individual needs of students and parents).
- Build a culture of teamwork and collaboration in the classroom and school.

Teacher/ Administrator Signatures _____

“Together we can make a world of difference”

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Edison Environmental Science Academy

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| English Language Arts / Reading | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade: 03 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 86.4% | 78.4% | 66.7% | 7% | 59.6% | 28.1% | 5.3% |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 89.8% | 86.5% | 80.4% | 8.7% | 71.7% | 15.2% | 4.3% |
| Female | 2008-09 | 100% | 88.3% | 79.4% | 67.9% | 7.1% | 60.7% | 28.6% | 3.6% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 91.9% | 88.4% | 80% | 10% | 70% | 20% | 0% |
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 84.6% | 77.5% | 65.5% | 6.9% | 58.6% | 27.6% | 6.9% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 87.9% | 84.7% | 80.8% | 7.7% | 73.1% | 11.5% | 7.7% |
| Black or | 2008-09 | 100% | 75.1% | 72.6% | 64.9% | 5.4% | 59.5% | 27% | 8.1% |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| African American | | | | | | | | | |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 80.6% | 81.9% | 77.4% | 6.5% | 71% | 16.1% | 6.5% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2008-09 | <10 | 84.6% | 81.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2008-09 | <10 | 93.1% | 91.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 79% | 70.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 84.6% | 80.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | <10 | 90% | 87.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2009-10 | 100% | 92.7% | 92.4% | 100% | 20% | 80% | 0% | 0% |
| Multiracial | 2009-10 | <10 | 88.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 74.9% | 67.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 82.2% | 82.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students | 2008-09 | <10 | 63.4% | 51% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| with Disabilities | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 2009-10 | <10 | 71% | 69.1% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 79.1% | 71.8% | 66.7% | 7.4% | 59.3% | 27.8% | 5.6% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 84.5% | 82.1% | 80.4% | 8.7% | 71.7% | 15.2% | 4.3% |
| Grade: 04 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 98.1% | 82.8% | 66.8% | 56.9% | 2% | 54.9% | 39.2% | 3.9% |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 84.1% | 70.6% | 49.1% | 3.6% | 45.5% | 45.5% | 5.5% |
| Female | 2008-09 | 100% | 84.7% | 70.1% | 55.9% | 2.9% | 52.9% | 38.2% | 5.9% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 86.1% | 72.4% | 40.7% | 3.7% | 37% | 55.6% | 3.7% |
| Male | 2008-09 | 94.4% | 80.9% | 63.5% | 58.8% | 0% | 58.8% | 41.2% | 0% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 82.1% | 68.7% | 57.1% | 3.6% | 53.6% | 35.7% | 7.1% |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | 97% | 65.6% | 53.6% | 53.1% | 3.1% | 50% | 43.8% | 3.1% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 68.6% | 58.5% | 42.1% | 2.6% | 39.5% | 50% | 7.9% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2009-10 | <10 | 83.5% | 81.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2008-09 | <10 | 91.6% | 100% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2009-10 | <10 | 90.5% | 95% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 72.6% | 58.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 74.3% | 61.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | 100% | 88% | 84.7% | 61.5% | 0% | 61.5% | 38.5% | 0% |
| White | 2009-10 | <10 | 88.9% | 86.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 61.2% | 60% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 64.3% | 60% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 54.7% | 30.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2009-10 | <10 | 58% | 47.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 98% | 72.9% | 56.4% | 58% | 2% | 56% | 38% | 4% |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Disadvantaged | | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 75.7% | 62.5% | 47.1% | 2% | 45.1% | 47.1% | 5.9% |
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 81.5% | 64.1% | 43.9% | 10.5% | 33.3% | 29.8% | 26.3% |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 85.2% | 72.4% | 67.4% | 8.7% | 58.7% | 21.7% | 10.9% |
| Female | 2008-09 | 100% | 83.4% | 66.4% | 45.5% | 18.2% | 27.3% | 24.2% | 30.3% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 86.8% | 76.8% | 64.3% | 14.3% | 50% | 17.9% | 17.9% |
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 79.8% | 61.7% | 41.7% | 0% | 41.7% | 37.5% | 20.8% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 83.5% | 67.8% | 72.2% | 0% | 72.2% | 27.8% | 0% |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | 100% | 63.5% | 52.9% | 44.4% | 8.3% | 36.1% | 27.8% | 27.8% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 70.4% | 61.8% | 70% | 6.7% | 63.3% | 20% | 10% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2008-09 | <10 | 80.9% | 80% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2009-10 | <10 | 90.6% | 100% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or | 2008-09 | <10 | 71.2% | 67.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Latino | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 74.6% | 64% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | 100% | 86.9% | 76.5% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 25% | 37.5% | 25% |
| White | 2009-10 | 100% | 89.8% | 86.3% | 60% | 0% | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 56.2% | 63.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 61.8% | 62.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 49.2% | 34.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2009-10 | <10 | 57.6% | 46.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 70.5% | 55.6% | 40.7% | 5.6% | 35.2% | 31.5% | 27.8% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 76.6% | 63.1% | 66.7% | 6.7% | 60% | 22.2% | 11.1% |
| Grade: 06 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 80.5% | 70% | 56% | 20% | 36% | 20% | 24% |
| Female | 2008-09 | <10 | 82.9% | 71.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 78.2% | 68.1% | 52.9% | 23.5% | 29.4% | 23.5% | 23.5% |
| Black or | 2008-09 | 100% | 63.5% | 57% | 52.9% | 17.6% | 35.3% | 17.6% | 29.4% |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| African American | | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2008-09 | <10 | 78.2% | 60% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 68.7% | 70.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | <10 | 85.7% | 84.5% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 51.2% | 63.5% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 44.7% | 26.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 69.2% | 61.4% | 56% | 20% | 36% | 20% | 24% |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade: 03 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 91.3% | 81.2% | 63.3% | 10.2% | 53.1% | 34.7% | 2% |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 94.8% | 92.4% | 89.1% | 26.1% | 63% | 10.9% | 0% |
| Female | 2008-09 | 100% | 90.9% | 78.6% | 44% | 8% | 36% | 56% | 0% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 94.8% | 92.2% | 95% | 20% | 75% | 5% | 0% |
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 91.6% | 83.7% | 83.3% | 12.5% | 70.8% | 12.5% | 4.2% |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 94.8% | 92.6% | 84.6% | 30.8% | 53.8% | 15.4% | 0% |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | 100% | 78.9% | 73.7% | 60.6% | 6.1% | 54.5% | 36.4% | 3% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 87.7% | 89.2% | 90.3% | 22.6% | 67.7% | 9.7% | 0% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2008-09 | <10 | 92.4% | 81.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2008-09 | <10 | 96% | 90.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 86.9% | 74.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 92.3% | 90.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | <10 | 94.9% | 92.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2009-10 | 100% | 96.9% | 96.1% | 100% | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% |
| Multiracial | 2009-10 | <10 | 94.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 85.1% | 71.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English | 2009-10 | <10 | 92.1% | 90.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Proficient | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 79.7% | 71.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2009-10 | <10 | 87.8% | 82.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 85.7% | 76.1% | 63% | 10.9% | 52.2% | 34.8% | 2.2% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 91.9% | 90.2% | 89.1% | 26.1% | 63% | 10.9% | 0% |
| Grade: 04 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 87.9% | 69% | 58.5% | 3.8% | 54.7% | 30.2% | 11.3% |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 92.3% | 83.1% | 69.1% | 14.5% | 54.5% | 29.1% | 1.8% |
| Female | 2008-09 | 100% | 87.9% | 67.9% | 54.3% | 5.7% | 48.6% | 31.4% | 14.3% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 92.9% | 83.5% | 66.7% | 11.1% | 55.6% | 33.3% | 0% |
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 87.8% | 70.2% | 66.7% | 0% | 66.7% | 27.8% | 5.6% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 91.6% | 82.6% | 71.4% | 17.9% | 53.6% | 25% | 3.6% |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | 100% | 73.8% | 56.9% | 57.6% | 0% | 57.6% | 30.3% | 12.1% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 82.3% | 74.9% | 68.4% | 10.5% | 57.9% | 31.6% | 0% |
| American Indian or | 2009-10 | <10 | 89.5% | 72.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Alaska Native | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2008-09 | <10 | 95.1% | 100% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2009-10 | <10 | 96.9% | 95% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 81% | 67% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 89.3% | 80.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | 100% | 92% | 83.9% | 57.1% | 7.1% | 50% | 28.6% | 14.3% |
| White | 2009-10 | <10 | 95.1% | 93.5% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 75.7% | 64% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 86.6% | 81% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 68.1% | 46.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with | 2009-10 | <10 | 80% | 70% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Disabilities | | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 80.4% | 59.4% | 59.6% | 3.8% | 55.8% | 30.8% | 9.6% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 87.8% | 78.4% | 68.6% | 11.8% | 56.9% | 29.4% | 2% |
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 76.8% | 54.3% | 32.1% | 7.1% | 25% | 41.1% | 26.8% |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 79.5% | 61.4% | 58.7% | 19.6% | 39.1% | 32.6% | 8.7% |
| Female | 2008-09 | 100% | 75.8% | 51.4% | 37.5% | 3.1% | 34.4% | 28.1% | 34.4% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 79.6% | 63.6% | 57.1% | 21.4% | 35.7% | 32.1% | 10.7% |
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 77.8% | 57.2% | 25% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 58.3% | 16.7% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 79.4% | 59.2% | 61.1% | 16.7% | 44.4% | 33.3% | 5.6% |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | 100% | 55.2% | 41.1% | 28.6% | 2.9% | 25.7% | 37.1% | 34.3% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 62.5% | 50.1% | 63.3% | 16.7% | 46.7% | 26.7% | 10% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2008-09 | <10 | 72.3% | 46.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific | 2009-10 | <10 | 93% | 95.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Islander | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 66.1% | 40.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 71% | 53.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | 100% | 83% | 74.7% | 43.8% | 18.8% | 25% | 43.8% | 12.5% |
| White | 2009-10 | 100% | 84.3% | 76.9% | 40% | 20% | 20% | 50% | 10% |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 60.7% | 41.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 67.6% | 48.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 46.9% | 29.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2009-10 | <10 | 52.8% | 50% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 64.4% | 44.9% | 28.3% | 7.5% | 20.8% | 43.4% | 28.3% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 69.8% | 51.6% | 57.8% | 17.8% | 40% | 33.3% | 8.9% |
| Grade: 06 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 79.9% | 68% | 56% | 24% | 32% | 36% | 8% |
| Female | 2008-09 | <10 | 80.9% | 69.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 78.9% | 66.7% | 58.8% | 29.4% | 29.4% | 29.4% | 11.8% |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | 100% | 61.2% | 52.8% | 52.9% | 23.5% | 29.4% | 41.2% | 5.9% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2008-09 | <10 | 76.6% | 80% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 71.3% | 73.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | <10 | 85.2% | 82.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 62.3% | 71.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 45.5% | 31.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 69% | 58.6% | 56% | 24% | 32% | 36% | 8% |
| Science | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | 100% | 83.1% | 57.8% | 42.1% | 1.8% | 40.4% | 22.8% | 35.1% |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 81% | 59% | 47.2% | 5.7% | 41.5% | 41.5% | 11.3% |
| Female | 2008-09 | 100% | 83.3% | 56.2% | 51.5% | 3% | 48.5% | 21.2% | 27.3% |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 81.1% | 60.2% | 40.6% | 6.3% | 34.4% | 43.8% | 15.6% |
| Male | 2008-09 | 100% | 82.9% | 59.4% | 29.2% | 0% | 29.2% | 25% | 45.8% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 80.8% | 57.7% | 57.1% | 4.8% | 52.4% | 38.1% | 4.8% |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | 100% | 61.8% | 42.4% | 36.1% | 0% | 36.1% | 19.4% | 44.4% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 59.6% | 42.7% | 50% | 5.9% | 44.1% | 38.2% | 11.8% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2008-09 | <10 | 83.9% | 66.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | 2009-10 | <10 | 88.8% | 81% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 72.9% | 52.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 68.8% | 58.1% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2008-09 | 100% | 89.4% | 78.5% | 56.3% | 6.3% | 50% | 31.3% | 12.5% |
| White | 2009-10 | 100% | 87.5% | 78.9% | 33.3% | 0% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 0% |
| Limited English Proficient | 2008-09 | <10 | 59% | 48.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited | 2009-10 | <10 | 56.7% | 52.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| English Proficient | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 2008-09 | <10 | 63.6% | 47.1% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2009-10 | <10 | 60.7% | 36.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2008-09 | 100% | 72.3% | 47.8% | 38.9% | 1.9% | 37% | 24.1% | 37% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 70.6% | 48.6% | 46.2% | 3.8% | 42.3% | 42.3% | 11.5% |

Michigan Merit Examination (MME)

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Advanced (Level 1) | % Proficient (Level 2) | % Partially Proficient (Level 3) | % Not Proficient (Level 4) |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| No records to display. | | | | | | | | | |

MI-Access

Functional Independence

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Surpassed (Level 1) | % Attained (Level 2) | % Emerging (Level 3) |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| English Language Arts | | | | | | | | |
| Grade: 04 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | <10 | 83.5% | 72.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2008-09 | <10 | 83.1% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | <10 | 77.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | <10 | 83.1% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| All Students | 2009-10 | <10 | 81% | 64.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2008-09 | <10 | 83% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2009-10 | <10 | 80.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Black or African | 2009-10 | <10 | 76.5% | 60% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Surpassed (Level 1) | % Attained (Level 2) | % Emerging (Level 3) |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| American | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 82.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | |
| Grade: 04 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | <10 | 86.5% | 72.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2008-09 | <10 | 87.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Black or African American | 2008-09 | <10 | 81.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | <10 | 74.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| All Students | 2009-10 | <10 | 71.1% | 35.7% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2008-09 | <10 | 75.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2009-10 | <10 | 74.2% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | <10 | 65.3% | 50% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 73.9% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Science | | | | | | | | |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Surpassed (Level 1) | % Attained (Level 2) | % Emerging (Level 3) |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2008-09 | <10 | 59.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| All Students | 2009-10 | <10 | 58% | 21.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2008-09 | <10 | 60.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Male | 2009-10 | <10 | 61.6% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | <10 | 48.2% | 20% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2008-09 | <10 | 57.4% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

Supported Independence

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Surpassed (Level 1) | % Attained (Level 2) | % Emerging (Level 3) |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| No records to display. | | | | | | | | |

Participation

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Surpassed (Level 1) | % Attained (Level 2) | % Emerging (Level 3) |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| No records to display. | | | | | | | | |

MEAP-Access

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Level 1 | % Level 2 | % Level 3 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Reading | | | | | | | | |
| Grade: 04 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 50.7% | 34.5% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 50.8% | 31.8% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | <10 | 43.8% | 33.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 46.3% | 0% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 44.6% | 0% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Level 1 | % Level 2 | % Level 3 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 49.8% | 28% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 50% | 31.1% | 28.6% | 0% | 28.6% | 71.4% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 53.8% | 23.8% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 48% | 37.5% | 66.7% | 0% | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 41.1% | 27.6% | 25% | 0% | 25% | 75% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 55.8% | 50% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2009-10 | 100% | 52.5% | 35.7% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 47.3% | 50% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 48% | 28.6% | 28.6% | 0% | 28.6% | 71.4% |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | |
| Grade: 04 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 73% | 64.5% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 74% | 66.7% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |

| Student Group | School Year | % Students Tested | State % Students Proficient | District % Students Proficient | School % Students Proficient | % Level 1 | % Level 2 | % Level 3 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | <10 | 67.4% | 68.8% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 68.1% | 0% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 75% | 33.3% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 72.5% | 59.3% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Grade: 05 | | | | | | | | |
| All Students | 2009-10 | 100% | 62.6% | 60.9% | 57.1% | 14.3% | 42.9% | 42.9% |
| Female | 2009-10 | 100% | 60.9% | 52.4% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Male | 2009-10 | 100% | 63.6% | 68% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 33.3% |
| Black or African American | 2009-10 | 100% | 55.2% | 53.3% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2009-10 | <10 | 62.1% | 50% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| White | 2009-10 | 100% | 65.9% | 78.6% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 50% |
| Limited English Proficient | 2009-10 | <10 | 62.5% | 50% | <10 | <10 | <10 | <10 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2009-10 | 100% | 60.3% | 60.5% | 57.1% | 14.3% | 42.9% | 42.9% |

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Edison Environmental Science Academy

| Subject | % Tested (Goal 95%) | % Proficient for AYP* |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| All Students | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.1% | 93.9% |
| Mathematics | 98.9% | 93.7% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.3% | 89.3% |
| Mathematics | 99.3% | 89.9% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 101.3% | 82.7% |
| Mathematics | 101.3% | 89.5% |
| Black or African American | | |
| State | | |

| Subject | % Tested (Goal 95%) | % Proficient for AYP* |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| English Language Arts / Reading | 97.7% | 88.4% |
| Mathematics | 97.4% | 88% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.6% | 85.2% |
| Mathematics | 99.5% | 85.4% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 102% | 81.8% |
| Mathematics | 102% | 89.2% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.2% | 93.2% |
| Mathematics | 99% | 92.4% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 91.5% | 92.6% |
| Mathematics | 91.5% | 97.1% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |

| Subject | % Tested (Goal 95%) | % Proficient for AYP* |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.5% | 96.8% |
| Mathematics | 99.6% | 97.5% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 94.2% | 98.1% |
| Mathematics | 94.2% | 97.1% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |
| Hispanic or Latino | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.3% | 91.3% |
| Mathematics | 98.9% | 92.4% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.3% | 87.9% |

| Subject | % Tested (Goal 95%) | % Proficient for AYP* |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Mathematics | 99.8% | 89.1% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |
| White | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.4% | 95.3% |
| Mathematics | 99.3% | 95.1% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.6% | 94.2% |
| Mathematics | 99.6% | 95% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |
| Multiracial | | |
| State | | |

| Subject | % Tested (Goal 95%) | % Proficient for AYP* |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| English Language Arts / Reading | 102.4% | 93.5% |
| Mathematics | 102.3% | 94.3% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |
| Limited English Proficient | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 123.6% | 86.9% |
| Mathematics | 126.3% | 92.3% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 98% | 85.5% |
| Mathematics | 99.1% | 85.7% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |

| Subject | % Tested (Goal 95%) | % Proficient for AYP* |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Students with Disabilities | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 102.6% | 73.1% |
| Mathematics | 102.2% | 76.5% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 100.5% | 63.2% |
| Mathematics | 100.6% | 71% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | <30 | <30 |
| Mathematics | <30 | <30 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | | |
| State | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 102.6% | 90.6% |
| Mathematics | 102.5% | 91.1% |
| District | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 99.4% | 85.8% |

| Subject | % Tested (Goal 95%) | % Proficient for AYP* |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Mathematics | 99.5% | 87.2% |
| School | | |
| English Language Arts / Reading | 102% | 82.1% |
| Mathematics | 102% | 89.2% |

Note: 467 Recently arrived LEP students took part in the State's ELPA instead of the MEAP/MME/MI-Access.

* [AYP Targets \(Annual Measurable Objectives\)](#)

| Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%) | |
|---|--------|
| All Students | |
| State | |
| | 75.39% |
| District | |
| | 63.74% |
| Black or African American | |
| State | |
| | 56.59% |
| District | |

| Graduation Rate (High Schools only) | |
|---|--------|
| (Goal 80%) | |
| | 58.52% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | |
| State | |
| | 65% |
| District | |
| | <10 |
| Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander | |
| State | |
| | 84.47% |
| District | |
| | 71.01% |
| Hispanic or Latino | |
| State | |
| | 59.94% |

Graduation Rate (High Schools only)
(Goal 80%)

District

<5%

White

State

81.85%

District

72.89%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

Graduation Rate (High Schools only)
(Goal 80%)

State

65.51%

District

47.06%

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

33.33%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

55.83%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

All Students

State

94.7%

District

92.1%

School

91.5%

Black or African American

State

91%

District

90.3%

School

91.4%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

93.7%

District

91%

School

92%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

96.5%

District

95.4%

School

84.4%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

District

93.2%

School

94.4%

White

State

95.7%

District

93.9%

School

90.6%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

Multiracial

State

94.8%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

District

93.3%

School

94.8%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

| Attendance Rate (Goal 90%) | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|
| District | |
| | 89.1% |
| School | |
| | 93.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | |
| State | |
| | 94.8% |
| District | |
| | 91.9% |
| School | |
| | 91.7% |

* All data based on students enrolled for a full academic year.

** More information regarding AYP can be found at the following link:

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_22875---,00.html

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

| School Year | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 11 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| 2001-02 | | 38% | | | 31% | | 42% |
| 2002-03 | | 38% | | | 31% | | 42% |
| 2003-04 | | 38% | | | 31% | | 42% |
| 2004-05 | | 48% | | | 43% | | 52% |
| 2005-06 | 50% | 48% | 46% | 45% | 43% | 41% | 52% |
| 2006-07 | 50% | 48% | 46% | 45% | 43% | 41% | 52% |
| 2007-08 | 60% | 59% | 57% | 56% | 54% | 53% | 61% |
| 2008-09 | 60% | 59% | 57% | 56% | 54% | 53% | 61% |
| 2009-10 | 70% | 69% | 68% | 67% | 66% | 65% | 71% |
| 2010-11 | 78% | 77% | 76% | 75% | 74% | 73% | 79% |
| 2011-12 | 86% | 85% | 84% | 83% | 82% | 82% | 86% |
| 2012-13 | 93% | 92% | 92% | 91% | 91% | 91% | 93% |
| 2013-14 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Mathematics

| School Year | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 11 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| 2001-02 | | 47% | | | | 31% | 33% |
| 2002-03 | | 47% | | | | 31% | 33% |
| 2003-04 | | 47% | | | | 31% | 33% |
| 2004-05 | | 56% | | | | 43% | 44% |
| 2005-06 | 59% | 56% | 53% | 50% | 46% | 43% | 44% |
| 2006-07 | 59% | 56% | 53% | 50% | 46% | 43% | 44% |
| 2007-08 | 67% | 65% | 62% | 60% | 57% | 54% | 55% |

| School Year | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 11 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| 2008-09 | 67% | 65% | 62% | 60% | 57% | 54% | 55% |
| 2009-10 | 67% | 65% | 62% | 60% | 57% | 54% | 55% |
| 2010-11 | 75% | 74% | 71% | 70% | 67% | 66% | 67% |
| 2011-12 | 83% | 82% | 81% | 80% | 78% | 77% | 78% |
| 2012-13 | 91% | 91% | 90% | 90% | 89% | 89% | 89% |
| 2013-14 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Edison Environmental Science Academy

School AYP Status

| Title 1 Status | AYP ELA/Reading Status | AYP Mathematics Status | AYP Overall Status | Education Yes Report Card Grade | School Improvement Status | Years in Improvement |
|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Yes | Met | Met | Met | C | N/A | 0 |

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Edison

Environmental Science Academy

| | Other | B.A. | M.A. | Ph.D |
|--|-------|------|------|------|
| Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School | 0 | 22 | 12 | 0 |

Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School with Emergency Certification | 0% |
| | School Aggregate |
| Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | 0% |

Michigan Report Card for the National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Results

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| All Students | 100 | 22 | 43 | 30 | 5 |
| Male | 50 | 22 | 41 | 30 | 7 |
| Female | 50 | 22 | 45 | 29 | 4 |
| National Lunch | | | | | |

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Program Eligibility | 43 | 36 | 47 | 16 | 1 |
| Eligible | 56 | 11 | 40 | 40 | 9 |
| Not Eligible | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Info not available | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Race Ethnicity | | | | | |
| White | 71 | 14 | 43 | 37 | 6 |
| Black | 20 | 52 | 39 | 9 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 5 | 29 | 51 | 19 | 1 |
| Asian Amer/Pacif Isl | 3 | 13 | 32 | 36 | 19 |
| American Indian | 1 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Unclassified | 1 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Student classified as having a disability | | | | | |
| SD | 12 | 42 | 39 | 17 | 2 |
| Not SD | 88 | 19 | 44 | 31 | 6 |
| Student is an English Language Learner | | | | | |
| ELL | 3 | 48 | 40 | 11 | 1 |
| Not ELL | 97 | 21 | 43 | 31 | 5 |

‡ Reporting Standards not met. Note: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment Program (NAEP) 2009 Mathematics Achievement.

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| All Students | 100 | 32 | 37 | 24 | 7 |
| Male | 51 | 31 | 37 | 24 | 8 |
| Female | 49 | 33 | 38 | 24 | 5 |
| National Lunch | | | | | |

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Program Eligibility | 38 | 50 | 37 | 12 | 1 |
| Eligible | 62 | 21 | 38 | 31 | 10 |
| Not Eligible | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Info not available | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Race Ethnicity | | | | | |
| White | 74 | 23 | 40 | 29 | 8 |
| Black | 18 | 68 | 27 | 4 | 1 |
| Hispanic | 4 | 38 | 45 | 15 | 2 |
| Asian Amer/Pacif Isl | 2 | 11 | 30 | 31 | 28 |
| American Indian | 1 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Unclassified | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Student classified as having a disability | | | | | |
| SD | 10 | 75 | 22 | 2 | 1 |
| Not SD | 90 | 27 | 39 | 27 | 7 |
| Student is an English Language Learner | | | | | |
| ELL | 2 | 58 | 32 | 10 | 0 |
| Not ELL | 98 | 32 | 37 | 24 | 7 |

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment Program (NAEP) 2009 Mathematics Achievement.

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| All Students | 100 | 36 | 34 | 23 | 6 |
| Male | 50 | 39 | 35 | 21 | 5 |
| Female | 50 | 32 | 34 | 26 | 8 |
| National Lunch | | | | | |

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Program Eligibility | 43 | 52 | 33 | 13 | 2 |
| Eligible | 57 | 24 | 36 | 31 | 10 |
| Not Eligible | # | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Info not available | | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Race Ethnicity | | | | | |
| White | 71 | 28 | 36 | 28 | 8 |
| Black | 19 | 65 | 26 | 7 | 1 |
| Hispanic | 5 | 49 | 34 | 15 | 2 |
| Asian Amer/Pacif Isl | 3 | 21 | 37 | 25 | 17 |
| American Indian | 1 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Unclassified | 1 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Student classified as having a disability | | | | | |
| SD | 10 | 66 | 24 | 8 | 3 |
| Not SD | 90 | 32 | 36 | 25 | 7 |
| Student is an English Language Learner | | | | | |
| ELL | 3 | 65 | 26 | 9 | 1 |
| Not ELL | 97 | 35 | 35 | 24 | 7 |

Rounds to zero

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| All Students | 100 | 28 | 41 | 28 | 3 |
| Male | 51 | 33 | 42 | 23 | 2 |
| Female | 49 | 23 | 41 | 32 | 4 |

| Reporting Group | Percent of Students | Percent below Basic | Percent Basic | Percent Proficient | Percent Advanced |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| National Lunch Program Eligibility | 37 | 44 | 41 | 14 | 1 |
| Eligible | 62 | 18 | 42 | 36 | 4 |
| Not Eligible | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Info not available | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Race Ethnicity | | | | | |
| White | 74 | 21 | 32 | 32 | 3 |
| Black | 18 | 54 | 37 | 9 | # |
| Hispanic | 4 | 40 | 34 | 24 | 2 |
| Asian Amer/Pacif Isl | 2 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| American Indian | 1 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Unclassified | 1 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Student classified as having a disability | | | | | |
| SD | 9 | 73 | 22 | 4 | # |
| Not SD | 91 | 23 | 43 | 30 | 3 |
| Student is an English Language Learner | | | | | |
| ELL | 2 | 60 | 33 | 8 | # |
| Not ELL | 98 | 27 | 42 | 28 | 3 |

Rounds to zero

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

| Grade | Subject | Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities | Standard Error | Participation Rate for IEP Students | Standard Error | Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students | Standard Error |
|--------------|----------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 4 | Math | 82.08 | 2.771 | 81.98 | 2.786 | 91.89 | 3.063 |
| | Reading | 72.05 | 2.592 | 72.01 | 2.63 | 81.16 | 3.53 |
| 8 | Math | 76.39 | 2.561 | 76.21 | 2.578 | 93.13 | 4.12 |
| | Reading | 70.72 | 3.239 | 70.46 | 3.298 | 85.15 | 4.505 |