Annual Education Report

2009-2010

Loy Norrix High School

606 E. Kilgore St.
Kalamazoo, MI Zip 49001
Phone Number: 269.337.0200 . Fax Number: 269.337.0045
EdwardsJF@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us

Loy Norrix High School Purpose Statement

We, the staff and students of Loy Norrix High School will:

1. Establish mutual accountability;
2. Provide clear expectations;
3. Maximize student's academic, social, and personal success;
4. Uphold a safe, welcoming, and orderly environment; and
5. Partner with all stakeholders.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice
Principal: Mr. Johnny F. Edwards, Jr.

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 Loy Norrix High 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. Johnny Edwards 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, Loy Norrix made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics; however, we are still identified for Phase 6: RESTRUCTURING. We must make AYP for two consecutive years to no longer be identified for improvement. We will continue to emphasize the importance of literacy through reading, writing, and language development. We will dedicate 30 minutes per week to reading and each student will keep a writing folder/portfolio in their English Language Arts course. As parents and community members, you can assist us by frequently taking your child to the local library to check out books to read for enjoyment, purchase books as a gift for your child, and/or donate used high school appropriate books to Loy Norrix High 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 IMMPROVEMENT 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 ACHEIVEMENT RESULTS FOR ANY LOCAL COMPENTENCY TESTS OR NATIONALLY NORMED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
6. IDENTIFY THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS REPRESENTED BY PARENTS AT PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES
7. FOR HIGH SCHOOLS ONLY ALSO REPORT ON THE FOLLOWING:

a. THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENTS (DUAL ENROLLMENT)
b. THE NUMBER OF COLLEGE EQUIVALENT COURSES OFFERED (AP/IB)
c. THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN COLLEGE EQUIVALENT COURSES (AP/IB)
d. THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING A SCORE LEADING TO COLLEGE CREDIT

Sincerely,

Johnny Edwards
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	2009-10		2008 – 2009	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	64.3	D	56.1	F
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	59.3	F
Reading	57	F	N/A	N/A
Science	63	D	62.3	D
Social Studies	68.9	D	59.8	D
Achievement Subtotal	63.3	D	59.4	F
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	75	C	73	D
AYP Status	Met AYP: Y		Met AYP: N	
Composite Grade	C		D-alert	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	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

Retention Rate

Retention rate means the proportion of students who have not dropped out of school.

RETENTION RATE		
School	2008-09	2009-10
District	**82**	**85.5**
Loy Norrix	83	86

2009-2010 Highlights

The LNHS Class of 2010 had 5 Valedictorians (GPA 4.0 or above) and 7 Salutatorians (GPA 3.9).

Seniors Andrew Hassevort and Evan Klee-Peregon were announced as semi-finalists in the National Merit Scholarship competition. Seniors Megan Davis and Hannah Duke were named as Commended Students.

Heyl Scholarships were accepted by the following LNHS students: Matthew Beck, Megan Davis, and Chelsea Olivares.

28 Juniors were inducted into the National Honor Society (GPA 3.5 or above).

LNHS students collected over 7,776 items of food for the Kalamazoo Area Food Drive.

LNHS Key club donated $900 to Pretty Lake Vacation Camp.

2009-2010 Highlights (cont.)

21 LNHS Staff members pledge a total of $5,072.10 in the United Way campaign.

LNHS Latin students continued our tradition for excellence in the National Latin Exam winning 30 awards this spring. Gold medal were won by Stuart Melvin, Paxton Plum, Faiz Khaja, Holden Faora, Marissa Klee-Peregon, and Marquis Neely competing at Level II. At the introductory level, Samantha Brown and Lucy Smith had perfect papers.

Sixteen students at LNHS earned Advanced Placement (AP) Scholar Awards in recognition of their exceptional achievement on AP exams.

Lauren McGlinn attained a perfect score in the American Computer Science League sophomore classroom division competition, which helped lead to the first-place international finish for Kalamazoo Area Match and Science Center (KAMSC) in that division.

Senior Luke Breznau State Champion in Broadcasting-LNHS Forensics

LNHS Athletics
Ondrea Hughes, Girls' Basketball, SMAC Central Player of the Year, Cleveland State-NCAA Division I

Jeffery Hoskins, Boys' Basketball, SMAC Central Player of the Year, Indiana Wesleyan-NAIA Division II

Andrew Darrell, Boys' Tennis, Grand Valley State University-NCCA Division II

Girls' Basketball Team—SMAC Central Division Champions, 7th year in a row

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	#	%	#	%
Loy Norrix	410	32	291	25

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.

Loy Norrix'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

School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in Reading on the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).
Data to support goal selection:	LNHS staff have analyzed our standardized test data for the MME, EdPerformance, Read 180, PLAN and ACT.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	All LNHS staff members will use a research-based strategy called Sustained Silent Reading (SSR).
Accomplishments:	Students enrolled in Strategic Reading courses have increased their reading levels as much as three reading levels in one school year. We have raised our reading scores 10% on the MME.
Implications for next year:	We allocate 30 minutes per week specifically targeted for Sustained Silent Reading.

Writing	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in Writing on the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).
Data to support goal selection:	LNHS staff have analyzed our standardized test data for the MME, EdPerformance, Read 180, PLAN and ACT.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	All teachers will use a research-based strategy called John Collins Writing.
Accomplishments:	LNHS had a 3% increase in writing scores on the MME.
Implications for next year:	Each student will have cumulative writing folder that will showcase their writings for the entire school year.

School Improvement Plan

Math	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in Math on the Michigan Merit Exam.
Data to support goal selection:	LNHS math department has analyzed our standardized test data for the MME, EdPerformance, PLAN and ACT.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	All LNHS mathematics teachers will use an anticipatory set with Algebra Everyday.
Accomplishments:	LNHS had a 12% increase in math scores on the MME.
Implications for next year:	Students who have difficulty in math will have the opportunity to take Algebra II over 4 trimesters. We are adding Advanced Placement (AP) statistics to our master schedule.

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in Science on the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).
Data to support goal selection:	LNHS science department has analyzed our standardized test data for the MME, EdPerformance, PLAN and ACT.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	All LNHS science teachers will use department developed rubrics to assess students ability of inquiry and reflection.
Accomplishments:	LNHS had a 7% increase in Science scores on the MME.
Implications for next year:	LNHS will increase our AP science offerings from 2 to 3. We are adding Advanced Placement (AP) Physics to our schedule along with current AP science offerings of AP Biology and AP Chemistry.

Social Studies	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in Social Studies on the Michigan Merit Exam.
Data to support goal selection:	LNHS social studies department has analyzed our standardized test data for the MME, EdPerformance, PLAN and ACT.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	All LNHS social studies teachers will used a research-based strategy call Academic Vocabulary.
Accomplishments:	LNHS had a 6% increase in Social Studies scores on the MME.
Implications for next year:	LNHS social studies department offer the most AP courses and have the most AP students. We are adding AP Psychology to the master schedule.

Required High School Criteria for Current Year and Previous Year

Advanced Placement/College Equivalent Courses

School Year	# of Courses	Course Title(s)	Course Title(s)
2008-09	12	AP Art History	AP Spanish
		AP Biology	AP Studio Art Portfolio
		AP Calculus AB	AP U.S. Government and Politics
		AP Chemistry	AP U.S. History
		AP English: Language & Comp.	
		AP English: Literature & Comp.	
		AP European History	
		AP Physics AB	
2009-10	12	AP Biology	AP Psychology
		AP Calculus AB	AP Spanish
		AP Chemistry	AP Studio Art Portfolio
		AP English: Language & Comp.	AP U.S. Government and Politics
		AP English: Literature & Comp.	AP U.S. History
		AP European History	
		AP Physics AB	

Enrollment/Passing Rate

College Equivalent Courses by Grade Level	# of Enrolled Students	% of Enrolled Students	Passing Rate %	# of Enrolled Students	% of Enrolled Students	Passing Rate %
	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09	2009-10	2009-10	2009-10
9th Grade	1	0.2	100	1	0.2	100
10th Grade	67	22.3	93	75	24	93.7
11th Grade	23	10.2	91.7	47	18	96.2
12th Grade	66	24.5	89.4	64	31	95.9

College Credit/Dual Enrollment

	2008-2009		2009-2010	
	# Students	% of Students	# Students	% of Students
Students Receiving College Credit through Dual Enrollment	50	86	14	39
Students Who Achieved a Score to Receive College Credit	120	59	90	52

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 teaches 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 2008-20109, 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 assembled in winter 2009 to strengthen currently used guides. In winter 20009, 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 2008-20-9. Curriculum teams worked during the summer in writing these guides to provide teaches with drafts and professional development in the fall 2009. Teachers will fully implement revised guides in 2011 wit 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 1010 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.

Variances

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, Loy Norrix High 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)
No records to display.									

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)
English Language Arts / Reading									

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)
Grade: 11									
All Students	2008-09	99.6%	59.9%	51.4%	46.7%	2.7%	44%	22.7%	30.7%
All Students	2009-10	99.6%	65.2%	57.3%	56.7%	3.3%	53.5%	24.9%	18.4%
Female	2008-09	99.1%	64.2%	58.7%	47.6%	1.9%	45.7%	26.7%	25.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	68%	57.2%	60%	2.4%	57.6%	23.2%	16.8%
Male	2008-09	100%	55.5%	44%	45.8%	3.3%	42.5%	19.2%	35%
Male	2009-10	99.2%	62.3%	57.4%	53.3%	4.2%	49.2%	26.7%	20%
Black or African American	2008-09	99%	33.4%	31.6%	25.5%	0%	25.5%	27.6%	46.9%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	37.5%	38.3%	29.9%	0%	29.9%	33%	37.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	51.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	67.2%	62.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	2009-10	<10	74.9%	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Islander									
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	44.5%	42.5%	41.7%	0%	41.7%	4.2%	54.2%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	50.7%	39.6%	43.5%	0%	43.5%	34.8%	21.7%
White	2008-09	100%	66.1%	74.7%	68.8%	6.3%	62.5%	22.9%	8.3%
White	2009-10	99.2%	71.5%	80.5%	80%	6.7%	73.3%	16.7%	3.3%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	18.6%	18.9%	25.9%	0%	25.9%	3.7%	70.4%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	22.2%	27%	35.3%	0%	35.3%	35.3%	29.4%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	23.5%	13.3%	9.8%	0%	9.8%	19.5%	70.7%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	23.6%	16.7%	13.8%	0%	13.8%	20.7%	65.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	99.2%	42.4%	31.8%	30.5%	0%	30.5%	28.2%	41.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	99.3%	48.5%	41.3%	40.4%	0.7%	39.7%	32.5%	27.2%
Mathematics									

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)
Grade: 11									
All Students	2008-09	99.6%	49.3%	39.5%	34.7%	8.4%	26.2%	12%	53.3%
All Students	2009-10	99.2%	50.4%	43.7%	46.7%	9.8%	36.9%	12.3%	41%
Female	2008-09	99.1%	47.2%	42.3%	34.3%	3.8%	30.5%	14.3%	51.4%
Female	2009-10	100%	48.3%	40.1%	44.8%	9.6%	35.2%	12.8%	42.4%
Male	2008-09	100%	51.5%	36.7%	35%	12.5%	22.5%	10%	55%
Male	2009-10	98.3%	52.5%	48.1%	48.7%	10.1%	38.7%	11.8%	39.5%
Black or African American	2008-09	99%	16.4%	19%	15.3%	0%	15.3%	9.2%	75.5%
Black or African American	2009-10	99%	16.4%	17.4%	13.5%	1%	12.5%	14.6%	71.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	36.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	72.3%	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	2009-10	<10	72.1%	64.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Islander									
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	32.4%	37.5%	33.3%	12.5%	20.8%	4.2%	62.5%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	33.8%	29.2%	26.1%	0%	26.1%	13%	60.9%
White	2008-09	100%	56.5%	61.2%	53.1%	16.7%	36.5%	16.7%	30.2%
White	2009-10	99.2%	57.9%	73.9%	75.8%	18.3%	57.5%	10%	14.2%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	20.2%	21.6%	18.5%	7.4%	11.1%	3.7%	77.8%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	17.3%	13.5%	11.8%	0%	11.8%	11.8%	76.5%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	10.2%	5.1%	4.9%	0%	4.9%	0%	95.1%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	96.6%	11.2%	9.4%	3.6%	0%	3.6%	0%	96.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	99.2%	28.9%	22.4%	19.1%	1.5%	17.6%	9.9%	71%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	98.7%	30.4%	24.3%	28.7%	3.3%	25.3%	17.3%	54%

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: 11								
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	89.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	88%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	90.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	89.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	80.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	81.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	91%	<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)
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	85.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2008-09	<10	70.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	63.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	65.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	74.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	75.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	53.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	53.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	76.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically	2008-09	<10	68.9%	<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)
Disadvantaged								
Science								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2008-09	<10	62.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	70.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	59.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	67.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	65.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	73%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	42.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	51.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	71.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	45.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	60.6%	<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								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	74.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	74.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2009-10	<10	83.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	78.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	84%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.1%	<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)
Science								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2009-10	<10	77.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	75.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	77.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	77.9%	<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)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2009-10	<10	68.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	70.7%	<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)
Mathematics								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2009-10	<10	55.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	59.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	55.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2009-10	<10	46.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	47%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	46%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

MEAP-Access

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

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Loy Norrix High 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%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	87.6%
Mathematics	99.6%	76.1%
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%
Mathematics	99.5%	85.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	103.1%	72.5%
Mathematics	102.1%	58.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	91.5%	92.6%
Mathematics	91.5%	97.1%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
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		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	87.9%
Mathematics	99.8%	89.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
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	99.2%	99.1%
Mathematics	99.2%	90.3%

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

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	<30	<30
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	103.1%	45.8%
Mathematics	100%	37.5%
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	85.8%
Mathematics	99.5%	87.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	80%
Mathematics	99.3%	69.2%

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

* AYP Targets (Annual Measurable Objectives)

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)
All Students
State
75.39%
District
63.74%
School
68.94%
Black or African American
State

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)
56.59%
District
58.52%
School
60%
American Indian or Alaska Native
State
65%
District
<10
School
<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander
State

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)
84.47%
District
71.01%
School
78.38%
Hispanic or Latino
State
59.94%
District
<5%
School
<10
White
State

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)
81.85%
District
72.89%
School
79.23%
Multiracial
State
71.12%
District
<10
Limited English Proficient
State
65.51%
District

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)
47.06%
School
36%
Students with Disabilities
State
57.61%
District
33.33%
School
45.95%
Economically Disadvantaged
State
59.8%
District

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)
55.83%
School
58.55%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)
All Students
State
94.7%
District
92.1%
School
85.1%
Black or African American
State
91%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)
District
90.3%
School
79.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native
State
93.7%
District
91%
School
87%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander
State
96.5%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)
District
95.4%
School
94.6%
Hispanic or Latino
State
94.1%
District
93.2%
School
87.4%
White
State
95.7%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)
District
93.9%
School
89.9%
Multiracial
State
94.8%
Limited English Proficient
State
94.6%
District
93.3%
School
85.9%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)
Students with Disabilities
State
93.5%
District
89.1%
School
76.1%
Economically Disadvantaged
State
94.8%
District
91.9%
School
84.1%

* 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%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2002-03		47%				31%	33%
2003-04		47%				31%	33%
2004-05		56%				43%	44%
2005-06	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2006-07	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2007-08	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2008-09	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2009-10	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2010-11	75%	74%	71%	70%	67%	66%	67%
2011-12	83%	82%	81%	80%	78%	77%	78%
2012-13	91%	91%	90%	90%	89%	89%	89%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Loy Norrix High 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	Met	Met	Met	C	Restructuring	6

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Loy Norrix High School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	36	52	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	2.2%
	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 Program Eligility					
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 having a disability					
SD	12	42	39	17	2
Not SD	88	19	44	31	6
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	48	40	11	1
Not ELL	97	21	43	31	5

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch Program Eligility					
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 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 Program Eligility					
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 having a disability					
SD	10	66	24	8	3
Not SD	90	32	36	25	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	65	26	9	1
Not ELL	97	35	35	24	7

Rounds to zero

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	28	41	28	3
Male	51	33	42	23	2
Female	49	23	41	32	4
National Lunch Program Eligility					
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	‡	‡	‡	‡
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 Reading	82.08 72.05	2.771 2.592	81.98 72.01	2.786 2.63	91.89 81.16	3.063 3.53
8	Math Reading	76.39 70.72	2.561 3.239	76.21 70.46	2.578 3.298	93.13 85.15	4.12 4.505