

# Annual Education Report

2009-2010

## Linden Grove Middle School

4241 Arboretum Parkway St.  
Kalamazoo, MI 49006  
269.337.1740 . fax 269. 337.1614  
mccanecm@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us



### The Mission Statement:

The staff of Linden Grove Middle School is committed to nurturing socially and academically responsible citizens.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Mr. Craig McCane

### 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 Linden Grove Middle 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 Mr. Craig McCane 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, Linden Grove 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. Linden Grove did not receive an Education Yes grade because it is a new school.

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,

Craig McCane  
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	
	Score	Grade
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Reading	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	N/A	N/A
Indicators of School Performance	100	N/A
Preliminary	N/A	N/A
AYP Status	Met AYP: N/A	
Composite Grade	N/A	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	N/A	

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

- Linden Grove Middle School Established 2009
- Enrollment 700
- Grades: 6-8
- State of the Art Building
- Middle School Concept
- RTI: Response to Intervention
- PBS: Positive Behavior Support
- Integrated Classroom Technology
- Teams—Common Planning Time
- Full Inclusion Model
- Green Design Features
- Course Offerings: Art, Advanced Art, Algebra, Advanced English, Technology, Life Skills, Choir, Band, Orchestra, Spanish and more.
- Extra-Curricular Activities: Cross-Country, Volleyball, Football, Basketball, Tennis, Track Wrestling.
- Clubs: Destination Imagination, 21st. Century, Green Club, Student Leadership, National Junior Honor Society, Yearbook & Honor Guard.

## 2009–2010 Highlights (cont.)

- State Honors Choir Director: Mrs. Williams-Johnson
- Two Choir Students receive State Honors
- Girls Basketball team wins league championship
- Students on Destination Imagination team finish 16th in the nation
- Six students accepted to KAMSE
- College-Going Culture: Students attended Martin Luther King Celebration at Western Michigan University
- Students attended Bronco Buds college awareness activities at Western Michigan University
- Students attended Commencement Speech by President Barack Obama

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	#	%	#	%
Linden Grove	391	55	267	39

## Parent Involvement

### 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.*

#### **Linden Grove'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

<b>Reading</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	All Students will be proficient in Reading by 2014.
<b>Data to support goal selection:</b>	Based on review of data sources (Scantron, Performance & MEAP), approximately 75% of students are scoring proficient as compared to the goal of 100% proficient by 2014. However, the gap between subgroup(s) ranges from 30% (Ethnicity) to 40% (English Language Learners).
<b>Planned Strategies and Interventions:</b>	1. Teachers in all subject areas, and librarian will provide instruction in reading for understanding in all content areas. 2. Read 180 will be utilized as an intervention for MEAP 3 & 4 students. 3. Increase core instructional minutes of master schedule from 48 to 60. 4. Evaluate all data from current and prior testing scores and interventions to identify areas of concern, track growth, and establish areas for improvement throughout the school year. 5. Continue to use curriculum maps. 6. Provide extended day activities i.e. tutoring, 21st. Century. 7. Professional development for staff in literacy strategies i.e. silent sustained reading, word walls, building vocabulary, read alouds, comprehension etc.
<b>Accomplishments:</b>	Met AYP. Literacy Night, Building Reads & Community Reads. Read 180 program with two staff members for support. RTI within the master schedule allowed students to have extra instructional minutes in Reading
<b>Implications for next year:</b>	Continue our strive to make the necessary gains in academic achievement. Increase master schedule minutes from 47 to 60 in core classes.

<b>Writing</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	All students will be proficient in Writing (ELA) by 2014.
<b>Data to support goal selection:</b>	Based on review of data sources (Scantron, Performance & MEAP 2009), approximately 60% of students are scoring proficient as compared to the goal of 100% proficient by 2014. This is a composite of district data average.
<b>Planned Strategies and Interventions:</b>	LGMS staff will: 1. John Collins Writing Program - Increase writing opportunities by writing systematically across the curriculum in all core classes. The exception being ELA. 2. Lucy Caulkins Writing Program for ELA students. 3. Increase master schedule for core classes from 47 to 60 minutes.
<b>Accomplishments:</b>	Met AYP. Lucy Caulkins Writing Program.
<b>Implications for next year:</b>	Continue our strive to make the necessary gains in academic achievement. Increase master schedule minutes from 47 to 60 in core classes.

## School Improvement Plan

Math	
Goal:	All Students will be proficient in Mathematics by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Based on review of data sources (Scantron, Performance & MEAP), approximately 70% of students are scoring proficient as compared to the goal of 100% proficient by 2014. However, the gap between subgroup(s) ranges from 30% (Ethnicity) to 40% (English Language Learners).
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Harder to Smarter - Emphasis on Time on Task - LGMS Staff will: 1. Increase instructional minutes of the master schedule from 48 to 60. 2. Continue to use curriculum maps. 3. Utilize data sources throughout school year to monitor student subgroups. A combination of the Ed Performance, MEAP teacher made assessments will be utilized. This information will be used to target remediation and to monitor improvement plan. 4. Evaluate all data from current and prior testing scores to identify areas of concern, track growth, and establish areas for improvement throughout the school year. 5. Utilize small group instruction for remediation, intervention, enrichment services and extended day opportunities. 6. Monitor the performance of students who receive intervention services. 7. Number Sense
Accomplishments:	RTI within the master schedule allowed students to have extra instructional minutes in mathematics.
Implications for next year:	Continue our strive to make the necessary gains in academic achievement. Increase master schedule minutes from 47 to 60 in core classes.

## School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All Students will be proficient in Science by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Based on review of data sources (Scantron, Performance & MEAP), approximately 60% of students are scoring proficient as compared to the goal of 100% proficient by 2014.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	1. Increase instructional minutes of the master schedule from 48 to 60. 2. Develop curriculum maps & pacing guides. 3. Evaluate all data from current and prior testing scores to identify areas of concern, track growth, and establish areas for improvement throughout the school year. 4. Utilize small group instruction for remediation, intervention, and enrichment services. 5. Monitor the performance of students who receive intervention services.
Accomplishments:	Science kits allowed for many hands-on activities in our new labs.
Implications for next year:	Continue our strive to make the necessary gains in academic achievement. Increase master schedule minutes from 47 to 60 in core classes.

Social Studies	
Goal:	All Students will be proficient in Social Studies by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Based on review of data sources (Scantron, Performance & MEAP), approximately 45% of students are scoring proficient as compared to the goal of 100% proficient by 2014.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	1. Increase instructional minutes of the master schedule from 48 to 60. 2. Develop curriculum maps & pacing guides. 3. Evaluate all data from current and prior testing scores to identify areas of concern, track growth, and establish areas for improvement throughout the school year. 4. Utilize small group instruction for remediation, intervention, and enrichment services. 5. Monitor the performance of students who receive intervention services.
Accomplishments:	Activities allowed for experiences in: mock elections, community awareness, volunteerism, fund raising, college-going culture etc.
Implications for next year:	Continue our strive to make the necessary gains in academic achievement. Increase master schedule minutes from 47 to 60 in core classes.



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.9

## Full Annual Education Report

# School-Level Student Assessment Data for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Linden Grove Middle 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: 06									
All Students	2009-10	100%	87.7%	76%	76.3%	20.7%	55.6%	21.2%	2.5%
Female	2009-10	100%	90%	76.6%	77.8%	20.6%	57.1%	19.8%	2.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	85.4%	75.5%	74.8%	20.9%	53.9%	22.6%	2.6%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	75.8%	67.1%	71.3%	13.3%	58%	24.7%	4%
American	2009-10	<10	84.7%	88.9%	<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>
Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.8%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	82.3%	71.8%	54.5%	9.1%	45.5%	45.5%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	91.1%	87.5%	87.3%	35.2%	52.1%	12.7%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	70%	68.4%	53.8%	7.7%	46.2%	46.2%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	59.9%	43.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	81.1%	69.8%	69%	13.2%	55.7%	28.2%	2.9%
Migrant	2009-10	<10	77.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 07									
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	70.2%	76%	31.2%	44.9%	13.3%	10.6%
Female	2009-10	100%	84.5%	70.7%	78%	33.3%	44.7%	13.6%	8.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.6%	69.7%	74%	29%	45%	13%	13%
Black or African	2009-10	100%	64.4%	56.7%	64.3%	12.7%	51.6%	19%	16.7%

<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>
American									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	79.2%	57.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	89.9%	91.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	71.7%	66.7%	70%	15%	55%	25%	5%
White	2009-10	100%	87.3%	86.1%	90.1%	56.4%	33.7%	5.9%	4%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	54.3%	55.1%	61.1%	11.1%	50%	27.8%	11.1%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	48%	22.5%	10%	0%	10%	40%	50%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.4%	61%	68.4%	18.6%	49.7%	18.6%	13%
Grade: 08									
All Students	2009-10	100%	83.4%	67.6%	67.5%	21%	46.5%	24.2%	8.3%
Female	2009-10	100%	87.5%	74.9%	71.6%	24.3%	47.3%	23%	5.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	60.4%	63.9%	18.1%	45.8%	25.3%	10.8%
Black or	2009-10	100%	70.9%	57.8%	59.8%	11%	48.8%	29.3%	11%

<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									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	80.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	91%	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	76.5%	61.5%	58.3%	33.3%	25%	33.3%	8.3%
White	2009-10	100%	86.9%	81.8%	81%	32.8%	48.3%	13.8%	5.2%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	61%	55.2%	60%	10%	50%	30%	10%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	48.6%	30.6%	30%	0%	30%	20%	50%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75%	59%	53.5%	9.9%	43.6%	33.7%	12.9%
Mathematics									
Grade: 06									
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	66.2%	70.1%	35.3%	34.9%	24.1%	5.8%

<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>
Female	2009-10	100%	83%	67.5%	70.3%	34.4%	35.9%	21.9%	7.8%
Male	2009-10	100%	81.1%	64.8%	69.9%	36.3%	33.6%	26.5%	3.5%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	62.3%	53.6%	61.3%	24.7%	36.7%	29.3%	9.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	78.2%	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.8%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	75.6%	60.8%	58.3%	16.7%	41.7%	41.7%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	82.5%	90%	57.1%	32.9%	10%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	68.7%	53.2%	50%	14.3%	35.7%	50%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.3%	32.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.5%	59%	62.1%	23.6%	38.5%	31%	6.9%
Migrant	2009-10	<10	68.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 07									

<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>
All Students	2009-10	100%	82.2%	68.5%	69.2%	37.3%	31.9%	27.7%	3.1%
Female	2009-10	100%	82.6%	67.5%	68.7%	35.9%	32.8%	26%	5.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	81.7%	69.7%	69.8%	38.8%	31%	29.5%	0.8%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	62.6%	51.2%	52.8%	18.4%	34.4%	41.6%	5.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	78.5%	57.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.2%	91.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	75.3%	65.6%	73.7%	31.6%	42.1%	21.1%	5.3%
White	2009-10	100%	87.6%	88.5%	88%	58%	30%	12%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	66%	58.8%	58.8%	11.8%	47.1%	35.3%	5.9%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	51.2%	33.3%	30%	0%	30%	60%	10%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.4%	59.3%	59.8%	20.7%	39.1%	35.6%	4.6%
Grade: 08									

<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>
All Students	2009-10	100%	70.3%	51.3%	56.4%	35.9%	20.5%	32.1%	11.5%
Female	2009-10	100%	70.6%	51.2%	48.6%	31.1%	17.6%	40.5%	10.8%
Male	2009-10	100%	70%	51.4%	63.4%	40.2%	23.2%	24.4%	12.2%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	44.7%	33.7%	43.2%	22.2%	21%	39.5%	17.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	63%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	88.7%	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	59.1%	53.2%	50%	33.3%	16.7%	50%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	77.1%	73.5%	75.9%	55.2%	20.7%	17.2%	6.9%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	50.2%	44.8%	20%	10%	10%	70%	10%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	31.6%	15.9%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	56.3%	40.8%	41%	18%	23%	45%	14%
Science									

<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>
Grade: 08									
All Students	2009-10	100%	75.9%	54.6%	57.4%	15.4%	42%	29%	13.6%
Female	2009-10	100%	77%	54.7%	50.7%	10.7%	40%	30.7%	18.7%
Male	2009-10	100%	74.9%	54.5%	63.2%	19.5%	43.7%	27.6%	9.2%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	50%	37.3%	38.6%	7.2%	31.3%	39.8%	21.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	70.4%	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	86.9%	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	65%	42%	50%	8.3%	41.7%	41.7%	8.3%
White	2009-10	100%	83.1%	79.3%	83.6%	27.9%	55.7%	11.5%	4.9%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	48.3%	36.2%	30%	0%	30%	60%	10%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	42.3%	26.9%	33.3%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	63.1%	42.1%	39.8%	1.9%	37.9%	40.8%	19.4%

<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>
Disadvantaged									

### **Michigan Merit Examination (MME)**

<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>
No records to display.									

### **MI-Access**

### **Functional 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>
English Language Arts								
Grade: 07								
All Students	2009-10	<10	88.2%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	86.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	84.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	90.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2009-10	<10	91.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	92.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	86.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 07								
All Students	2009-10	<10	70.9%	40%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	72.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or	2009-10	<10	61.9%	<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>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
African American								
White	2009-10	<10	74.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	74.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 08								
All Students	2009-10	<10	52.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	34.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

## 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>
English Language Arts								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	80.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	82%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	77.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	82%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	<10	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	89%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	87.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	84.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	90.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

## 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>
English Language Arts								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	<10	56.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	57.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	53.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	56.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	<10	47.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	48.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	43.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	47.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

## 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>
Reading								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	100%	48.3%	39%	53.3%	13.3%	40%	46.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	49.4%	26.7%	20%	0%	20%	80%
Male	2009-10	100%	47.8%	46.2%	70%	20%	50%	30%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	39.1%	31.3%	40%	0%	40%	60%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	68.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	52%	36.4%	55.6%	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	44.3%	38.9%	54.5%	9.1%	45.5%	45.5%
Grade: 07								
All Students	2009-10	100%	52.1%	41.7%	16.7%	0%	16.7%	83.3%
Female	2009-10	100%	56.2%	50%	33.3%	0%	33.3%	66.7%

<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>
Male	2009-10	100%	49.8%	38.9%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	41.1%	33.3%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	50.6%	66.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	55.7%	44.4%	50%	0%	50%	50%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	41.3%	66.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	48.7%	43.5%	16.7%	0%	16.7%	83.3%
Grade: 08								
All Students	2009-10	100%	58%	52.9%	50%	0%	50%	50%
Female	2009-10	100%	65.6%	71.4%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	54.2%	40%	25%	0%	25%	75%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	48.8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
White	2009-10	100%	61.4%	87.5%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	57.1%	58.3%	60%	0%	60%	40%
Mathematics								

<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>
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	100%	47.7%	37.5%	46.7%	6.7%	40%	53.3%
Female	2009-10	100%	46.4%	42.9%	60%	0%	60%	40%
Male	2009-10	100%	48.5%	34.6%	40%	10%	30%	60%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	46.4%	46.7%	60%	0%	60%	40%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	26.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	49%	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	48.1%	34.3%	36.4%	0%	36.4%	63.6%
Grade: 07								
All Students	2009-10	100%	47.2%	41.7%	33.3%	0%	33.3%	66.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	43.5%	66.7%	66.7%	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	49.6%	33.3%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	38.2%	25%	33.3%	0%	33.3%	66.7%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	45.8%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	50.6%	66.7%	50%	0%	50%	50%

<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>
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	49.1%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	46.1%	39.1%	33.3%	0%	33.3%	66.7%
Grade: 08								
All Students	2009-10	100%	37.4%	41.2%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	38.4%	28.6%	50%	0%	50%	50%
Male	2009-10	100%	36.8%	50%	25%	25%	0%	75%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	34%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
White	2009-10	100%	37.6%	62.5%	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	35.2%	33.3%	40%	20%	20%	60%

**2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting  
for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District,  
Linden Grove Middle 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	98.2%	0%
Mathematics	97.6%	0%
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	85.2%

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
Mathematics	99.5%	85.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	98.7%	0%
Mathematics	97.9%	0%
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
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	97.8%	0%
Mathematics	97.8%	0%

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	98%	0%
Mathematics	97.6%	0%
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	97.7%	0%
Mathematics	97.7%	0%
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	94.9%	0%
Mathematics	94.9%	0%
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	98.6%	0%
Mathematics	97.7%	0%

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%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	90.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	93.7%
District	
	91%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

State

96.5%

District

95.4%

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

District

93.2%

White

State

95.7%

District

93.9%

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

Multiracial

State

94.8%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

District

93.3%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

District

89.1%

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

\* 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%
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%



# 2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Linden Grove Middle 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
No				No Grade	N/A	0

# December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Linden Grove Middle School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	17	27	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	2.3%
	<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

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 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
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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
having a disability	12	42	39	17	2
SD	88	19	44	31	6
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	48	40	11	1
ELL	97	21	43	31	5
Not ELL					

‡ 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
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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
having a disability	10	75	22	2	1
SD	90	27	39	27	7
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	2	58	32	10	0
ELL	98	32	37	24	7
Not ELL					

‡ 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 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
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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
having a disability	10	66	24	8	3
SD	90	32	36	25	7
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	65	26	9	1
ELL	97	35	35	24	7
Not ELL					

# 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					
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	‡	‡	‡	‡

<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>
Student classified as having a disability	9	73	22	4	#
SD	91	23	43	30	3
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	2	60	33	8	#
ELL	98	27	42	28	3
Not ELL					

# 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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Participation Rate for IEP Students</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>
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