

Annual Education Report

2009-2010

Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts

922 W. Maple St.

Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Phone Number 269.337.0730 . Fax Number 269.337.1633

mccanecm@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us



Mission Statement: Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts, dedicated to the success of all our diverse students as they prepare for high school and their future, will provide an innovative program ensuring high academic achievement, social skills and moral values through integrating the arts across the curriculum, enhanced by dynamic technologies; through a caring and knowledgeable staff developing the unique talents and abilities of each student; through involving families and the community in our school; and through teaching life-long skills for success in the 21st Century.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Mr. Kevin Doerfler

2009-10 Board of Education

President: Ms. Mollie Peterson

Vice-President: Ms. Carol McGlenn

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 Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts. 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. Kevin Doerfler 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, Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) because we did not meet the 90% attendance rate goal. Because our school has not made AYP for three years, we are identified for restructuring.

Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts is committed to the academic achievement of every student. As a staff we are developing formative assessments in all disciplines to assist student learning and to improve the instructional process. Additionally, we will be employing differentiated instructional models to meet the varied needs of students on the learning continuum. We will also be employing note taking strategies, content literacy strategies, and cooperative group strategies to improve student achievement and performance.

Likewise, regular attendance is an important factor in student achievement and is preparation for the work world. Therefore, Maple Street will provide mentoring opportunities for students who need additional support, and incentives to enhance/encourage regular daily attendance. There are many ways in which you can also assist us in increasing the percent of students that are attending school on a daily basis such as:

- Engaging your student in frequent conversations about what they are learning.
- Participate in all school activities (conferences, open houses, and celebrations)
- Create enthusiasm and support for your student becoming engaged in a college-going culture.
- Monitor grades and attendance through the Parent Internet Viewer (PIV)
- Ensure that you and your student are aware of the KPS Attendance Procedures.
- Contact your student's counselor or teacher when you notice a drop in grades or attendance.

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,

Kevin Doerfler

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	79.3	C	76.9	C
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	58.8	F
Reading	64.4	D	N/A	N/A
Science	63.8	D	62.5	D
Social Studies	59.7	D	58.9	F
Achievement Subtotal	66.8	D	64.3	D
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	78	C	76	C
AYP Status	Met AYP: N		Met AYP: N	
Composite Grade	C		C	
Michigan Accreditation	Accredited		Accredited	

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

Specialized School

Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts integrates arts across the curriculum. The instruction is built around four strands: performing arts, literary arts, visual arts, and technology.

2009–2010 Highlights

- Mr. Doerfler assumed the role of building Principal, and Craig LeSuer took over the position of Assistant Principal.
- Sixth grade students were added to the middle school, making an extremely successful transition.
- Continued positive academic growth improving MEAP scores for second consecutive year.
- Maple Street student art is prominently displayed throughout the community.
- Partnership with the Aesthetic Arts program through KRESA provided visiting artists, off campus enrichment activities, and after school programming.
- Student written, produced and performed play *The Lorax 2010*, an adaptation of Dr. Suess', *The Lorax*. All proceeds went to Haitian earthquake relief funding.
- Both the Band/Orchestra and Choir competed at Solo and Ensemble and Festival, winning "excellent" marks in both competitions.
- Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts had a venue during the December Art Hop.
- Falcon Cards: Building-wide implementation of a recognition system as part of our Positive Behavior Supports program. During its first year, over 2,300 Falcon Cards were issued to students for doing the right thing.
- Seven eighth grade students were admitted to the Kalamazoo Area Math and Science Center for the 2010-2011 school year.

2009–2010 Highlights (cont.)

- Began a Check-in/Check-out program for at-risk students as part of the PBS program.
- Two sixth grade students placed third overall in the Michigan History Contest in the Exhibition Category, and placed first in use of Primary Source Documents.
- Continued partnerships with Kalamazoo College Amigos program.
- Awarded the 21st Century after school program grant through Kalamazoo Communities in Schools.
- Established new partnerships with Western Michigan University through the Special Education Department to have Pre-Intern teachers working with Special Needs staff and students.
- Also, Pre-Interns through the English department worked with students in English Language Arts classes two days per week. This group also organized and provided a second literacy night for Maple Street.
- Partnerships with the YMCA, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Gryphon Place, the Douglas Community Center, Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety Leadership Academy.
- Partnership with Phoenix High School where at-risk students met with Phoenix students to discuss the positive power of goal setting, hard work, staying focused, and positive choices.

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	#	%	#	%
Maple St. Magnet	384	55	299	41

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.

Maple St. Magnet's Parent Involvement

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

School Assignment Process

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

School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	All Students will be proficient on the Reading/ELA MEAP by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Student performance over the past year has improved 4% in reading.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Professional Development in secondary content literacy strategies, focus put on content rich vocabulary. Teachers will instruct students in the proper use of inference, predication, and other reading strategies for various genres. Reading supports to be provided by KCIS and other partnerships.
Accomplishments:	Student levels of reading are improving, and those students who were/are part of our strategic reading program are making continuous improvement.
Implications for next year:	Teaching staff will need to have professional development in content literacy strategies, use of Literacy Walk Through forms. Reading supports to be provided by KCIS and other partners.

Writing	
Goal:	All Students will be proficient on the writing MEAP by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Student performance over the past year has improved 13% in writing.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Implementation of Collin's Writing Program, Lucy Caulkins Writing Program, and Professional Development in secondary content literacy strategies, focus put on content rich vocabulary.
Accomplishments:	Reading and Writing scores are maintaining a positive growth trajectory. Staff is motivated to integrate writing and content literacy strategies into every classroom.
Implications for next year:	Teaching staff will need to have professional development in content literacy strategies, Collin's Writing, and use of Literacy Walk Through forms.

Math	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in mathematics by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	All students will be proficient in mathematics by 2014. 6 th grade is performing 10% higher than the district, and 22% above the state. 7 th grade is performing 5% above the district, and 21% above the state average. 8 th grade is 8% above the district average and 6% above the state.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Math teachers will use a variety of techniques to reinforce the concepts of computation, problem-solving skills, evaluation, analysis of ration/real numbers, and algebraic skills. The teachers will regularly teach and use content rich vocabulary development along with rigorous practice. Math interventions will be suggested for students based on the finds of the MEAP, Performance Series test, grades, and teacher recommendations.
Accomplishments:	We have demonstrated continuous growth over the past two years and will be embarking on a district-wide implementation of a new middle school math curriculum. We also placed seven students at the Kalamazoo Area Math and Science Center for the 2010-2011 school year.
Implications for next year:	The mathematics teaching staff will need to have ongoing professional development for proper and effective implementation of new curriculum, while maintaining positive growth.

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in the MEAP science test by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	8 th grade is 8% above the district average and 9% above the state.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will use a variety of teaching techniques and methodologies to reinforce the scientific method, inquiry-based learning, experimentation, high quality lab work, and "Kalamazoo related" science. Use and development of content rich vocabulary combined with rigorous practice will create foundational understanding of content. Science interventions will be suggested for students based on results of the MEAP, Performance Series test, grades, and teacher recommendations.
Accomplishments:	The Science curriculum has been aligned and the teaching staff is in the process of creating common formative assessment pieces to enhance instruction and student performance. Seven students were admitted to the Kalamazoo Area Math and Science Center for the 2010-2011 school year.
Implications for next year:	Students will increase proficiency on MEAP to 70% proficient.

Social Studies	
Goal:	All students will be proficient on the MEAP social studies test by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	The 6 th grade students performed 8% above the district average, as well as above the state average.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Staff will work together to ensure that there is alignment with the written, taught, and tested social studies curricula. They will also make sure that the social studies curriculum is fully aligned with the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. They will also look at instructional best practices for content delivery.
Accomplishments:	We introduced a new geography curriculum to both 6 th and 7 th grades, as well as had two 6 th grade students place third in the Michigan History Day in the Exhibit category, while taking first place in the use of Primary Source Documents.
Implications for next year:	The Social Studies staff will continue their work on alignment of curriculum standards between the state and district, while improving writing across the curriculum.



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.

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts

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%	80%	21%	59%	15.1%	4.9%
Female	2009-10	100%	90%	76.6%	79.8%	21.1%	58.8%	14%	6.1%
Male	2009-10	100%	85.4%	75.5%	80.2%	20.9%	59.3%	16.5%	3.3%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	75.8%	67.1%	69.6%	11.6%	58%	20.3%	10.1%
American	2009-10	<10	84.7%	88.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
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%	73.5%	5.9%	67.6%	17.6%	8.8%
White	2009-10	100%	91.1%	87.5%	89.4%	33%	56.4%	10.6%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	70%	68.4%	67.9%	0%	67.9%	21.4%	10.7%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	59.9%	43.9%	63.6%	9.1%	54.5%	27.3%	9.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	81.1%	69.8%	73.9%	10.9%	63%	19.6%	6.5%
Grade: 07									
All Students	2008-09	99.7%	79.6%	61.5%	67.9%	22%	45.9%	17.7%	14.4%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	70.2%	74.2%	32.8%	41.4%	15.1%	10.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	82.8%	65.8%	69.5%	25.7%	43.7%	16.8%	13.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	84.5%	70.7%	74.3%	37.6%	36.6%	15.8%	9.9%
Male	2008-09	99.4%	76.5%	57.5%	66.3%	18.1%	48.1%	18.8%	15%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.6%	69.7%	74.1%	27.1%	47.1%	14.1%	11.8%

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)
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	61.6%	47.2%	53.6%	10%	43.6%	25%	21.4%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	64.4%	56.7%	58.7%	19%	39.7%	27%	14.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	76.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	89.9%	88.9%	<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	2008-09	100%	69.9%	60.8%	59.6%	12.3%	47.4%	28.1%	12.3%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	71.7%	66.7%	61.5%	17.9%	43.6%	20.5%	17.9%
White	2008-09	99.2%	84.7%	79.7%	87.5%	39.2%	48.3%	5.8%	6.7%
White	2009-10	100%	87.3%	86.1%	91.3%	52.5%	38.8%	3.8%	5%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	52.3%	55.3%	56.9%	5.9%	51%	29.4%	13.7%

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)
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	54.3%	55.1%	53.6%	10.7%	42.9%	21.4%	25%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	42.7%	28.6%	35.7%	7.1%	28.6%	32.1%	32.1%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	48%	22.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	68.3%	51.1%	58.8%	11.5%	47.3%	22.1%	19%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.4%	61%	65.4%	20.5%	44.9%	19.7%	15%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	65.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08									
All Students	2008-09	99.3%	75.5%	58.6%	55.1%	17.2%	38%	29.6%	15.3%
All Students	2009-10	100%	83.4%	67.6%	73.7%	23.7%	50%	18.2%	8%
Female	2008-09	100%	78.6%	62.1%	54.4%	19%	35.4%	32%	13.6%
Female	2009-10	100%	87.5%	74.9%	79.7%	24.6%	55.1%	14.5%	5.8%
Male	2008-09	98.4%	72.6%	55.5%	55.9%	15%	40.9%	26.8%	17.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	60.4%	67.6%	22.8%	44.9%	22.1%	10.3%
Black or African American	2008-09	99.3%	56.5%	45.1%	42.4%	6.9%	35.4%	36.1%	21.5%
Black or African	2009-10	100%	70.9%	57.8%	62.7%	3.9%	58.8%	25.5%	11.8%

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)
American									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	72.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	80.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	86.1%	92.3%	<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	2008-09	100%	65.1%	49.4%	50%	7.1%	42.9%	35.7%	14.3%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	76.5%	61.5%	65.2%	15.2%	50%	28.3%	6.5%
White	2008-09	98.8%	80.9%	79.5%	78.3%	39.8%	38.6%	15.7%	6%
White	2009-10	100%	86.9%	81.6%	85.7%	42%	43.7%	9.2%	5%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	46.4%	50%	50%	2.3%	47.7%	34.1%	15.9%

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)
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	61%	55.2%	52.6%	2.6%	50%	36.8%	10.5%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	96.3%	35.1%	15%	11.5%	0%	11.5%	42.3%	46.2%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	48.6%	30.6%	27.8%	0%	27.8%	55.6%	16.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	99%	62.7%	45.2%	45.1%	6.3%	38.8%	35%	19.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75%	59%	65.9%	9.1%	56.8%	23.3%	10.8%
Mathematics									
Grade: 06									
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	66.2%	76.4%	41.3%	35.1%	20.7%	2.9%
Female	2009-10	100%	83%	67.5%	80.9%	39.1%	41.7%	18.3%	0.9%
Male	2009-10	100%	81.1%	64.8%	71%	44.1%	26.9%	23.7%	5.4%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	62.3%	53.6%	62.9%	17.1%	45.7%	31.4%	5.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	78.2%	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.8%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	75.6%	60.8%	62.9%	25.7%	37.1%	31.4%	5.7%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	82.5%	90.5%	62.1%	28.4%	9.5%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	68.7%	53.2%	55.2%	17.2%	37.9%	37.9%	6.9%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	52.3%	32.6%	61.5%	23.1%	38.5%	30.8%	7.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.5%	59%	70.2%	29.1%	41.1%	26.2%	3.5%
Grade: 07									
All Students	2008-09	99.7%	82.6%	65.2%	69.9%	34.7%	35.3%	25.5%	4.6%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82.2%	68.5%	74.3%	38.5%	35.8%	24.6%	1.1%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.2%	66.1%	68.1%	34.9%	33.1%	27.1%	4.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	82.6%	67.5%	74.3%	37.6%	36.6%	23.8%	2%
Male	2008-09	99.4%	81.1%	64.3%	71.9%	34.4%	37.5%	23.8%	4.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	81.7%	69.7%	74.4%	39.5%	34.9%	25.6%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	63.4%	54.5%	57.6%	15.1%	42.4%	36%	6.5%

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)
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	62.6%	51.2%	54%	14.3%	39.7%	42.9%	3.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	79.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	93.9%	83.3%	<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	2008-09	100%	75.4%	67.1%	71.9%	28.1%	43.9%	28.1%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	75.3%	65.6%	65%	17.5%	47.5%	35%	0%
White	2008-09	99.2%	87.9%	78.8%	83.3%	58.3%	25%	12.5%	4.2%
White	2009-10	100%	87.6%	88.5%	93.8%	67.5%	26.3%	6.3%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	66%	61%	69.2%	21.2%	48.1%	28.8%	1.9%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	66%	58.8%	60.7%	7.1%	53.6%	39.3%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Alaska Native									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	63%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	89.4%	78.6%	<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	2008-09	100%	64.5%	46.1%	48.9%	13.3%	35.6%	33.3%	17.8%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	59.1%	53.2%	60.9%	30.4%	30.4%	26.1%	13%
White	2008-09	100%	80.8%	75.3%	73.3%	47.7%	25.6%	22.1%	4.7%
White	2009-10	100%	77.1%	73.5%	79.5%	57.3%	22.2%	15.4%	5.1%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	57.1%	40.7%	46.8%	14.9%	31.9%	36.2%	17%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	50.2%	44.8%	50%	13.2%	36.8%	26.3%	23.7%

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)
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	38.6%	30.9%	25.9%	7.4%	18.5%	44.4%	29.6%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	31.6%	15.9%	16.7%	5.6%	11.1%	61.1%	22.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	61.6%	44.5%	43.1%	12.3%	30.8%	35.5%	21.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	56.3%	40.8%	46%	21.3%	24.7%	39.7%	14.4%
Science									
Grade: 08									
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.3%	53.9%	46.8%	12.6%	34.2%	33.1%	20.1%
All Students	2009-10	100%	75.9%	54.6%	62.5%	23.5%	39%	29.8%	7.7%
Female	2008-09	100%	77.2%	53.5%	45%	11.4%	33.6%	34.2%	20.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	77%	54.7%	60.3%	20.6%	39.7%	30.1%	9.6%
Male	2008-09	100%	75.4%	54.3%	48.8%	14%	34.9%	31.8%	19.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	74.9%	54.5%	64.7%	26.5%	38.2%	29.4%	5.9%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	50.5%	37.2%	29.4%	4.2%	25.2%	43.4%	27.3%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	50%	37.3%	39.4%	6.1%	33.3%	43.4%	17.2%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	74.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	70.4%	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	87.3%	92.9%	<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	2008-09	100%	63.9%	54.5%	50%	4.5%	45.5%	31.8%	18.2%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	65%	42%	46.8%	10.6%	36.2%	51.1%	2.1%
White	2008-09	100%	83.5%	75.6%	72.1%	31.4%	40.7%	17.4%	10.5%
White	2009-10	100%	83.1%	79.3%	86.6%	42%	44.5%	11.8%	1.7%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	48.3%	50%	52.2%	4.3%	47.8%	30.4%	17.4%
Limited	2009-10	100%	48.3%	36.2%	35.9%	2.6%	33.3%	59%	5.1%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Proficient									
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	42.5%	19.2%	14.8%	0%	14.8%	40.7%	44.4%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	42.3%	26.9%	25%	0%	25%	65%	10%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	61.9%	39.2%	34.1%	3.8%	30.3%	40.3%	25.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	63.1%	42.1%	47.2%	7.4%	39.8%	41.5%	11.4%

Michigan Merit Examination (MME)

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

MI-Access

Functional Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	<10	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	86.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	90.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 07								
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	88.2%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	89%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	86.9%	<10	<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

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	87.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	89.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	91.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	91.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	92.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	90.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	87.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	91.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	93%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	93.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	82.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 07								
All Students	2008-09	<10	72.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	70.9%	40%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	69.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	74.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	72.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	61.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	76.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	85.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	82.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	78%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	81.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
White	2008-09	<10	86.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	47.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	52.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	50.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	53.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	53.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	57.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	60.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Supported Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 07								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	78.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	82.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	80.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	80.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 07								
All Students	2009-10	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	86.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	86.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
All Students	2008-09	<10	89%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	89%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	84.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	74.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	77.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	70.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Participation

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

MEAP-Access

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Reading								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	100%	48.3%	39%	38.5%	0%	38.5%	61.5%
Female	2009-10	<10	49.4%	26.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	47.8%	46.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	39.1%	31.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	39.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52%	36.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	42.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	44.3%	38.9%	38.5%	0%	38.5%	61.5%
Grade: 07								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
All Students	2009-10	<10	52.1%	41.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	49.8%	38.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	41.1%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	50.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	55.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	41.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	48.7%	43.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2009-10	<10	58%	52.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	54.2%	40%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	56.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	61.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	51.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	57.1%	58.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Mathematics								
Grade: 06								
All Students	2009-10	100%	47.7%	37.5%	36.4%	0%	36.4%	63.6%
Female	2009-10	<10	46.4%	42.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	48.5%	34.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	46.4%	46.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	46.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	49%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	53.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	48.1%	34.3%	36.4%	0%	36.4%	63.6%
Grade: 07								
All Students	2009-10	<10	47.2%	41.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	49.6%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African	2009-10	<10	38.2%	25%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
American								
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	45.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	50.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	49.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	46.1%	39.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2009-10	<10	37.4%	41.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	36.8%	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	54.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	37.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	47.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	35.2%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts

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	99.7%	89.2%
Mathematics	99.4%	90.5%
Black or African American		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	85.2%
Mathematics	99.5%	85.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	85.2%
Mathematics	99.6%	84.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	91.5%	92.6%
Mathematics	91.5%	97.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

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

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	99.8%	89.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	90.7%
Mathematics	102.4%	94.4%
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	99%	92.8%
Mathematics	98.7%	94.4%
Multiracial		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
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	99%	85.7%
Mathematics	100%	92.9%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Students with Disabilities		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100.5%	63.2%
Mathematics	100.6%	71%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	95.5%	65.5%
Mathematics	95.5%	75.9%
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	85.8%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	99.5%	87.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	98.3%	86.1%
Mathematics	98.5%	87%

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

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

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

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

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

District

<5%

White

State

81.85%

District

72.89%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

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

State

65.51%

District

47.06%

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

33.33%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

55.83%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

All Students

State

94.7%

District

92.1%

School

90.9%

Black or African American

State

91%

District

90.3%

School

88.7%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

93.7%

District

91%

School

89.9%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

96.5%

District

95.4%

School

97.6%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

District

93.2%

School

92.8%

White

State

95.7%

District

93.9%

School

92.7%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

Multiracial

State

94.8%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

District

93.3%

School

92.8%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
District	
	89.1%
School	
	86.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	94.8%
District	
	91.9%
School	
	91%

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

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

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

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

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

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Mathematics

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

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

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts

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	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	C	Restructuring	7

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

Street Magnet School for the Arts

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	21	29	1

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

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

Michigan Report Card for the National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Results

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

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

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

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

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

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

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

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

Rounds to zero

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

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

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

Rounds to zero

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

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