

# Annual Education Report

2009-2010

## Indian Prairie Elementary School

3546 Grand Prairie Rd.

Kalamazoo, MI 49006

Phone Number 269.337.0590 Fax Number 269.337.1623

[MathewsdangerfieldGS@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us](mailto:MathewsdangerfieldGS@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us)



The mission of Indian Prairie Elementary is to create an environment that nurtures young children to be responsible, productive, life-long learners, as characterized by high academic achievement, family participation, community involvement and exemplary staff who encourage the unique abilities of each person.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Mrs. Gwenn Mathews Dangerfield

### 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 Indian Prairie Elementary School. 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 Mrs. Gwenn Mathews-Dangerfield 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, Indian Prairie 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,

Gwenn Mathews-Dangerfield  
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	100	A	100	A
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	89.1	B
Reading	96	A	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	98	A	94.6	A
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	99	A	96	A
AYP Status	Met AYP? Y		Met AYP? Y	
Composite Grade	Accredited		A	
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

## 2009–2010 Highlights

- 100% proficient 3<sup>rd</sup> grade scores on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) scores in reading and math.
- 100% of all 3<sup>rd</sup> grade subgroups scored proficient (100%) in the areas of reading & math on the MEAP.
- Strong parental involvement (i.e. PTO, School Improvement Team, Volunteering)
- New Student/Community Visitation Day
- School Crisis & safety training with Kalamazoo Township Police Department
- Strong academically talented and Title I programs
- Restructured classroom math, reading, & writing instruction (rotations and guided groups)
- Achieved Adequate Yearly (AYP) Progress status
- Innovative Grant awarded to Indian Prairie for an extended day (before & after-school-program)
- Maintenance of enrollment throughout the school year
- 93% of all 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students reading at or above grade level at the end of the year.
- (Kindergarten) Wrap Around extended day Program
- 98% Parent Teacher attendance
- Before & afterschool (reading) interventions for targeted students.
- Recipient of one (1) Education for the Arts (EFA) grant
- Kalamazoo Symphony Orchestra/Gilmore Foundation partner school

## 2009–2010 Highlights (cont.)

- Continued (educational) partnerships with:
  1. Kalamazoo Township Police Department
  2. Kappa Alpha Psi (Kalamazoo Alumni Chapter)
  3. Western Michigan University
  4. Kalamazoo Valley Community College
  5. Northside Ministerial Alliance
  6. Western Michigan University
  7. Bronson Methodist Hospital
  8. Family Independence Agency
  9. Kalamazoo Community Mental Health
  10. Kalamazoo College
- School-home support opportunities
- Parent-Teacher Conferences
- Implementation of a variety of activities & school programs to encourage community & family participation.
- Collaborative efforts with the Parent-Teacher Organization.
- Implementation of more parent enrichment opportunities
- Involvement opportunities (i.e. day/evening programs, home projects, weekend opportunities, classroom/building volunteering).
- School website
- School/parent/student contract

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	#	%	#	%
Indian Prairie	240	97	243	98

## 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.*

### **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.

### Highly Qualified Staff

- 100% of the staff is teaching in their credential area of experience.
- No teachers with emergency or provision credentials are teaching in either the high or low poverty schools.
- No teachers are teaching in the classroom in either the high or low poverty schools that are not highly qualified.
- 1 Administrator with a Masters+30
- 14 teachers; 3 with a Bachelors Degree; 10 with a Masters Degree; and 1 with a Masters+30
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

## School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	All students will continue to exceed state achievement reading target through 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Based on 2009-2010 MEAP reading scores, 40% of the African American students scored in Level 1, as opposed to 74% of the White students scoring in level 1. This represents a 34% gap in achievement.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will expand upon the implementation of instructional strategies and enrichment opportunities that include the differentiation of instruction. Instructional strategies and support will also include various interventions and extended day support. •
Accomplishments:	100% of 3rd graders scored in the proficient range of the MEAP.
Implications for next year:	To move more African American students from Level 2 to Level 1 and to maintain proficient percentage for overall 3rd grade population.

Writing	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in English Language Arts/writing as indicated by the State achievement targets by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Based on the review of the assessment data (Writing, MEAP 2008), a significant gap exists between the White and African American student body when scoring at or above the proficient level, with White students scoring 74% and African American students scoring 45% proficient. This peaks to a 29% gap in academic achievement.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase Tier III support/interventions (i.e. Before &amp; After school program) to address targeted areas.</li> <li>• Continue use of technology to explicitly teach &amp; reinforce targeted strategies</li> <li>• Continue training &amp; support of the differentiation of instruction</li> <li>• Increase targeted interventions for intensive students during classroom rotations</li> <li>• Increase in Tier II (outside of the block) interventions</li> </ul> <p>Instructional staff will also utilize grade level meetings and Professional Learning Communities to better address units of study for teaching specific genres of writing.</p>
Accomplishments:	Economically-disadvantaged student scores have consistently increased over the past 4 years.
Implications for next year:	To increase overall students scoring in the proficient range from 67% to 70%.

## School Improvement Plan

<b>Math</b>	
Goal:	All students will continue to exceed State achievement math targets through 2014
Data to support goal selection:	Based on 2009 MEAP math scores, 93% of 3rd grade white students scored at level 1, as opposed to 47% of African American students scoring at Level 1. This represents a 46% gap in achievement.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will expand upon the implementation of instructional strategies and enrichment opportunities that include the differentiation of instruction, extended day support and classroom supports (programs, tutors) and interventions. Implement the use a new math curriculum to enhance and support direct instruction. Increase targeted interventions for intensive students during classroom rotations. Continue implementation & support of the differentiation of instruction for math
Accomplishments:	Overall students scoring in the proficient range on the MEAP increased from 98% to 100%. African-American students scoring proficient on the MEAP increased from 91% to 100% on the MEAP.
Implications for next year:	To move more African American students from Level 2 to Level 1, and to maintain proficient percentage for overall 3rd grade population.

## School Assessment Data

### Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

At Indian Prairie Elementary School we administer a variety of assessments to help determine student needs and progress. Students in grades 1 through 3 take the Iowa Test of Basic Skills to determine how students are progressing compared to a national peer group. Students in grade 3 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)**

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	08-09	09-10	08-09	09-10
<b>First Grade</b>				
All	2.7	2.4	2.2	2.1
African American	2.2	2.1	1.7	1.8
Hispanic	3.1	N/A	1.9	N/A
White	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.4
Economically Disadvantaged	2.5	1.9	1.9	1.7
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Second Grade</b>				
All	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.2
African American	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.4
Hispanic	4.1	N/A	2.4	N/A
White	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.5
Economically Disadvantaged	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.5
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Third Grade</b>				
All	4.3	4.8	4.4	4.6
African American	3.3	4.0	3.5	3.6
Hispanic	4.8	N/A	3.9	N/A
White	4.6	5.2	4.6	5.0
Economically Disadvantaged	3.9	4.6	4.0	4.2
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A



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.

**Indian Prairie Elementary**

***Student – Parent- Teacher Compact***

It is among the beliefs of the Kalamazoo Public School district that all students can learn when provided with appropriate instruction and an environment, which is safe and orderly.

To have such a setting, it requires the cooperative efforts of the students, parents/guardians, school staff, as well as the community. As we are all committed to your child's education, we are going to do our best to promote his/her academic as well as social-emotional achievement.

This agreement is a promise to work together. We believe that this agreement can be fulfilled by our team effort. Together we can work to improve the teaching and learning environment at Indian Prairie Elementary.

As a student, I agree to:

- Attend school everyday, unless I am sick
- Do my personal best on my school assignments and with my behavior
- Make good decisions, and to take responsibility if I choose not to do so
- Treat others as I would like to be treated

Respect others to get respect from others

---

Student Signature

As a parent I agree to:

- Talk to my child about his/her school activities everyday
- Assist my child with his/her homework assignments
- Read to my child often
- Attend all conferences
- Encourage my child to continue to behave in a manner that is acceptable and in accordance with the Student Code of Conduct
- To continue to be a positive role model for my child

To support the school in it's efforts to assist my child in achieving their very best, academically, socially, and emotionally

---

Parent/Guardian signature

As a teacher, I agree to:

- Provide motivating and interesting learning experiences in my classroom
- Maintain high behavioral and academic expectations for all children
- To explore what instructional techniques work best for all students involved
- Encourage parental involvement in their child's education
- Provide feedback to the student and parent about his/her academic and social progress

Be a positive role model for all children

---

Teacher's signature

## Full Annual Education Report

# School-Level Student Assessment Data for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Indian Prairie Elementary School

### 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%	100%	63%	37%	0%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	86.5%	100%	61.7%	38.3%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	79.4%	100%	72.2%	27.8%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	88.4%	100%	68%	32%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	77.5%	100%	57.1%	42.9%	0%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	84.7%	100%	57.1%	42.9%	0%	0%
Black or	2008-09	100%	75.1%	72.6%	100%	36.4%	63.6%	0%	0%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
African American									
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	80.6%	81.9%	100%	40%	60%	0%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	93.1%	91.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	95.1%	100%	<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	100%	90%	87.4%	100%	71%	29%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	92.4%	100%	73.8%	26.2%	0%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	82.2%	82.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.4%	51%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with	2009-10	<10	71%	69.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Disabilities									
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	79.1%	71.8%	100%	46.7%	53.3%	0%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	82.1%	100%	52.6%	47.4%	0%	0%
Mathematics									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	81.2%	97.8%	78.3%	19.6%	2.2%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.4%	100%	81.7%	18.3%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	78.6%	100%	77.8%	22.2%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.2%	100%	80%	20%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	83.7%	96.4%	78.6%	17.9%	3.6%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.6%	100%	82.9%	17.1%	0%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	78.9%	73.7%	90.9%	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	87.7%	89.2%	100%	46.7%	53.3%	0%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	96%	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	98%	100%	<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	100%	94.9%	92.2%	100%	87.1%	12.9%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	96.1%	100%	92.9%	7.1%	0%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	92.1%	90.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
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%	93.3%	66.7%	26.7%	6.7%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	91.9%	90.2%	100%	63.2%	36.8%	0%	0%

## 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)
No records to display.								

### Supported Independence

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

## Participation

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

## MEAP-Access

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Level 1</b>	<b>% Level 2</b>	<b>% Level 3</b>
No records to display.								

# 2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting

# for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Indian Prairie Elementary School

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	101.7%	100%
Mathematics	101.7%	100%
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	85.2%
Mathematics	99.5%	85.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
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%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
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%
Mathematics	99.8%	89.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
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	100%	100%
Mathematics	100%	100%
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
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
Students with Disabilities		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
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%
Mathematics	99.5%	87.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

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

58.52%

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

65%

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

District

<10

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

84.47%

District

71.01%

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

District

<5%

White

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

State

81.85%

District

72.89%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

District

47.06%

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

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

33.33%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

55.83%

**Attendance Rate**  
**(Goal 90%)**

All Students

State

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
	94.7%
District	
	92.1%
School	
	95.8%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	90.3%
School	
	92.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
	93.7%
District	
	91%
School	
	94.3%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	96.5%
District	
	95.4%
School	
	96.4%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
	94.1%
District	
	93.2%
School	
	98.9%
White	
State	
	95.7%
District	
	93.9%
School	
	96.9%
Multiracial	
State	

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
	94.8%
Limited English Proficient	
State	
	94.6%
District	
	93.3%
School	
	98.3%
Students with Disabilities	
State	
	93.5%
District	
	89.1%
School	

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
94.8%	
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
94.8%	
District	
91.9%	
School	
95.6%	

\* 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](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%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
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%
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%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

## 2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Indian Prairie Elementary School

### 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	A	N/A	0

## December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Indian Prairie Elementary School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All	0	5	13	0

	<b>Other</b>	<b>B.A.</b>	<b>M.A.</b>	<b>Ph.D</b>
Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School				

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%
	<b>School Aggregate</b>
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

<b>Reporting Group</b>	<b>Percent of Students</b>	<b>Percent below Basic</b>	<b>Percent Basic</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>
All Students	100	22	43	30	5
Male	50	22	41	30	7
Female	50	22	45	29	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	36	47	16	1
Not Eligible	56	11	40	40	9
Info not available	†	†	†	†	†
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	14	43	37	6

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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 Program Eligibility					
Eligible	38	50	37	12	1
Not Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	23	40	29	8

<b>Reporting Group</b>	<b>Percent of Students</b>	<b>Percent below Basic</b>	<b>Percent Basic</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>
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**

<b>Reporting Group</b>	<b>Percent of Students</b>	<b>Percent below Basic</b>	<b>Percent Basic</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>
All Students	100	36	34	23	6
Male	50	39	35	21	5
Female	50	32	34	26	8
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	52	33	13	2
Not Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Info not available	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	28	36	28	8

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	37	44	41	14	1
Not Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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