

Annual Education Report

2009-2010

Prairie Ridge Elementary School

2294 S. Ninth Street

Kalamazoo, MI 49009

Phone Number: 269.337.0630 . Fax Number: 269.337.1640

spencerka@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us



The mission of Prairie Ridge Elementary School is to ensure that each student becomes a life-long learner, achieving maximum academic and personal success through the use of individualized instructional strategies and a comprehensive curriculum enhanced with technology, and guided by a dedicated and knowledgeable staff in partnership with families and the community.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Ms. Karen Spencer

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 Prairie Ridge Elementary School. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and state laws. The school's report contains information about student assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact Ms. Karen Spencer 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, Prairie Ridge made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. While we are pleased to have reached this important goal, we are continuously working to improve. We appreciate the continued support of parents, staff and our community in this effort. State law requires that we also report additional information.

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

Sincerely,

Karen Spencer
Principal

Overview of School

Accreditation Status & Education YES! Grades

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

Education Yes! Report Card	2009-2010		2008 – 2009	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	95.5	A	97.2	A
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	78.8	C
Reading	88.1	B	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	91.8	A	88	B
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	94	A	92	A
AYP Status	Met AYP: Y		Met AYP: Y	
Composite Grade	A		A	
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

2009–2010 Highlights

- We achieved AYP.
- Over 90% daily attendance
- Two Title I Parent Events: Pancake Breakfast to share with parents the importance of reading at home providing information on how parents can reinforce reading skills and incentive charts for students. Build a Backpack event to share with parents the importance of summer reading providing information on reinforcing reading skills and backpacks with summer learning tools including books, journals, pencils, incentive charts and stickers.
- 99% fall and 97% spring parent attendance for parent teacher conferences
- February Reading Incentive which provided students with free books determined by the number of minutes read at home.
- Monthly PRIDE Assemblies recognizing student achievement
- Girls on the Run which included sixty girls in grades three, four and five.
- Fifth grade attended Sherman Lake Camp
- Parent Corps participation
- Chess Club
- Empty Bowls Event-students and staff created bowls which were put up for auction at a soup and salad dinner. Funds were donated to the Loaves and Fishes food bank

2009–2010 Highlights (cont.)

- Lunch math tutoring program
- After School Academic program
- Participation in the Education for the Arts
- America Reads tutors
- Kids Hope Mentors
- Professional Development to support guided reading instruction and the use of research-based reading interventions
- Second year implementation of MiBLSi initiative
- PEEP
- Prime Time partnership with the YMCA
- Active Parent Teacher Organization
- Partnership with WMU college of Education-Intern Cluster Site
- Fifth grade choir participation in the Kalamazoo County Bach Festival
- Received donation in memory of Artist Douglas Huebler in recognition of outstanding student art work. The donation will be used to purchase frames.
- Community service assisting Haiti earthquake victims

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	#	%	#	%
Prairie Ridge	482	99	456	97

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.

Prairie Ridge 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 score proficient on the MEAP reading assessment by the year 2012.
Data to support goal selection:	Although there have been substantial increases in the number of students scoring proficient on the MEAP Reading assessment, there remains a 20% gap between African American and White students at fourth grade scoring proficient. There is a substantial gap between subgroups scoring highly proficient. At third grade there is a 21% gap between African American and White students scoring highly proficient, at fourth grade this gap is 55%. At fifth grade the gap between students scoring highly proficient is 38% between African American students and White students and 22% between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will provide intensive, systematic, research-based instruction three to five times a week on up to three fundamental reading skills to students who score below benchmark on universal screening measures.
Accomplishments:	The number of fifth grade students who scored proficient on the MEAP reading assessment increased from 64% in 2008 to 87% in 2009, an increase of 23%. The number of African American students who scored proficient on the MEAP reading assessment increased at each grade level. Third grade African American students scoring proficient increased from 72% in 2008 to 89% in 2009. Fourth grade African American students scoring proficient increased from 53% in 2008 to 70% in 2009. Fifth grade African American students scoring proficient increased from 45% in 2008 to 80% in 2009. The number of economically disadvantaged students who scored proficient on the MEAP reading assessment increased at each grade level. Third grade economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient increased from 81% in 2008 to 89% in 2009. Fourth grade economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient increased from 68% in 2008 to 79% in 2009. Fifth grade economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient increased from 58% in 2008 to 86% in 2009.
Implications for next year:	Continue to provide intensive, systematic research-based instruction three to five times a week on up to three fundamental reading skills for students who score below benchmark on universal screening measures.

Writing	
Goal:	All students will be proficient writers.
Data to support goal selection:	The Fall 2008 MEAP writing assessment indicates a gap between subgroups at both the third and fourth grades. At third grade there is a 42% gap between African American students scoring proficient (32%) and White students scoring proficient (76%). Also, at third grade, there is a 25% gap between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students. At fourth grade a 20% gap exists between economically disadvantaged students(30%) and non-economically disadvantaged students.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Staff will continue to strengthen and refine the implementation of the District's writing curriculum in all K-5 classrooms during the specified 30-60 minute daily writing block.
Accomplishments:	Student writing continues to improve as evidenced by the three District benchmark writing assessments and the continuum of writing analysis.
Implications for next year:	Continue to use the district benchmark writing assessments to identify strengths and areas of need. Use the Writer's Workshop instructional format to provide differentiated mini lessons based on

School Improvement Plan

Math	
Goal:	All students will score proficient on the MEAP mathematics assessment by the year 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	Although there have been substantial increases in the number of students scoring proficient on the MEAP Mathematics assessment, there remains a gap between subgroups scoring highly proficient. At third grade there is a 30% gap between African American students and White students. At fourth grade there is a 38% gap between African American students and White students and a 23% gap between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students. At fifth grade there is a 38% gap between African American students and White students and a 22% gap between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will use data analysis to identify those students at risk for performing below highly proficient on the MEAP and below grade level on the Performance Series due to mathematics difficulties and then provide research-based instruction and/or interventions to students identified as at risk. Teachers will use data from IOWA, Performance Series, unit assessments, cumulative review and AYP.
Accomplishments:	All third, fourth and fifth grade student subgroups scored above the district average with 96% of African American students scoring proficient and 98% of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient at third grade, 82% of African American students scoring proficient and 91% of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient at fourth grade, and 73% of African American students scoring proficient and 75% of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient at third grade.
Implications for next year:	Teachers will use data analysis to identify the possible reasons that student MEAP mathematics scores at fifth grade are lower than the scores at third and fourth grade.

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All students will score proficient on the MEAP science assessment by the year 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	There is a gap between subgroups in scoring proficient on the 2009 science MEAP. The percentage of African American students scoring proficient was 41% while 79% White students scored proficient. This results in a gap of 42% between these subgroups. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient was 73% while 78% of non-economically disadvantaged students scored proficient resulting in a of 5%.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will provide systematic and explicit content area vocabulary instruction.
Accomplishments:	The number of female fifth grade students scoring proficient increased for 48% on the 2008 MEAP to 75% on the 2009 MEAP. This is an increase of 27%. The number of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient increased from 63% on the 2008 MEAP to 73% on the 2009 MEAP. This is an increase of 10%.
Implications for next year:	Teachers will provide systematic and explicit content area vocabulary instruction.

Social Studies	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in the areas of social studies as specified in the Grade Level Content Expectations (Grades K-5) as demonstrated on the 6th Grade MEAP by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	According to the Fall 2008 Social Studies MEAP there is a significant gap between subgroups. The percentage of African American students scoring proficient was 50% while 91% of White students scored proficient. This is a gap of 41% between subgroups. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient was 61% while 86% of non-economically disadvantaged students scored proficient with a gap of 25%.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will provide systematic and explicit content area vocabulary instruction.
Accomplishments:	Building wide vocabulary study was successful in raising student knowledge of selected vocabulary words.
Implications for next year:	Continue the building wide vocabulary study with additional focus on content area vocabulary. Increase systematic, explicit content area vocabulary instruction.



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

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

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

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	08-09	09-10	08-09	09-10
First Grade				
All	1.7	2.1	1.6	1.8
African American	1.5	1.7	1.1	1.5
Hispanic	1.7	N/A	1.6	N/A
White	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.0
Economically Disadvantaged	1.6	2.0	1.5	1.6
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Second Grade				
All	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9
African American	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.4
Hispanic	2.9	N/A	2.8	N/A
White	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.3
Economically Disadvantaged	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.8
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Third Grade				
All	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9
African American	3.3	3.7	3.2	3.5
Hispanic	3.7	N/A	3.5	N/A
White	4.6	4.2	4.2	4.2
Economically Disadvantaged	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.9
Special Education	2.8	N/A	3.1	N/A
Fourth Grade				
All	5.0	4.8	5.2	4.6
African American	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0
Hispanic	5.3	N/A	5.3	N/A
White	5.4	5.5	5.7	5.1
Economically Disadvantaged	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.4
Special Education	3.5	N/A	3.1	N/A

Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Performance Series

Performance Series				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	08-09	09-10	08-09	09-10
Fifth Grade				
All	5.5	6.2	4.8	5.7
African American	4.7	4.9	4.0	4.6
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	5.9	7.0	5.2	6.3
Economically Disadvantaged	5.4	5.6	4.7	5.2



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.

Prairie Ridge Elementary School Student/Teacher/Parent Compact

Through the Student/Teacher/Parent Contract, expectations of teachers, students and parents are shared. Parents are asked to agree to all stipulations in the Parent Compact.

Student Agreement

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

- Come to school ready to learn
- Finish my schoolwork and participate in classroom activities
- Follow all classroom rules and the Four Standards of Prairie Ridge
- Respect others and their belongings
- Do my part in keeping my school clean and safe
- Set aside a regular time and place each night to complete homework

Teacher Agreement

It is important that all students achieve. Therefore, I will do my personal best to:

- Provide teaching and leadership
- Demonstrate care and concern for each student
- Make efficient use of academic learning time
- Use special activities in the classroom to make learning enjoyable
- Create a partnership with every family in my class
- Keep parents informed of the student's progress in a timely manner (test data, interim report cards, report cards, etc.)

Parent/Guardian Agreement

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

- See that my child is punctual and attends school daily
- Support the school in its efforts to maintain proper discipline
- Encourage my child's efforts to do his/her best
- Stay aware of what my child is learning
- Attend parent/teacher conferences and other school functions
- Communicate with teachers and/or school officials
- Establish a time for sharing daily school experiences and/or completing homework
- Encourage daily reading at home

Parents are encouraged to participate in:

1. Parent Corps
2. Literacy Night
3. Parent Teacher Conferences
4. Parent Teacher Organization monthly meetings
5. Title I Parent Events
6. Observations of classroom activities
7. Volunteering in their child's classroom
8. School Improvement Team monthly meetings

Full Annual Education Report

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

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Language Arts / Reading									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	86.4%	78.4%	85.7%	38.6%	47.1%	14.3%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	86.5%	88.9%	34.6%	54.3%	11.1%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	79.4%	84.4%	40.6%	43.8%	15.6%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	88.4%	90.7%	34.9%	55.8%	9.3%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	77.5%	86.8%	36.8%	50%	13.2%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	84.7%	86.8%	34.2%	52.6%	13.2%	0%
Black or	2008-09	100%	75.1%	72.6%	72%	20%	52%	28%	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)
African American									
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	80.6%	81.9%	88.9%	18.5%	70.4%	11.1%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	84.6%	81.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	84.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	93.1%	91.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	95.1%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	79%	70.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	84.6%	80.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	90%	87.4%	97.4%	55.3%	42.1%	2.6%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	92.4%	86.7%	40%	46.7%	13.3%	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)
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	74.9%	67.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	82.2%	82.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.4%	51%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	71%	69.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	79.1%	71.8%	81%	28.6%	52.4%	19%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	82.1%	88.7%	30.2%	58.5%	11.3%	0%
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	66.8%	78.7%	34.4%	44.3%	16.4%	4.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	70.6%	81.6%	35.5%	46.1%	17.1%	1.3%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.7%	70.1%	73.1%	34.6%	38.5%	19.2%	7.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	72.4%	83.8%	40.5%	43.2%	13.5%	2.7%
Male	2008-09	100%	80.9%	63.5%	82.9%	34.3%	48.6%	14.3%	2.9%
Male	2009-10	100%	82.1%	68.7%	79.5%	30.8%	48.7%	20.5%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	65.6%	53.6%	52.6%	15.8%	36.8%	31.6%	15.8%

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	2009-10	100%	68.6%	58.5%	69.7%	3%	66.7%	27.3%	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	81.7%	61.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	83.5%	81.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	91.6%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	90.5%	95%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	72.6%	58.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.3%	61.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	88%	84.7%	88.2%	41.2%	47.1%	11.8%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	86.2%	90%	57.5%	32.5%	10%	0%
Limited English	2008-09	<10	61.2%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Proficient									
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	64.3%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	54.7%	30.6%	40%	0%	40%	40%	20%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	58%	47.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	56.4%	67.7%	19.4%	48.4%	22.6%	9.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75.7%	62.5%	78.9%	33.3%	45.6%	19.3%	1.8%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	64.1%	63.6%	18.2%	45.5%	34.5%	1.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	72.4%	87%	51.9%	35.2%	9.3%	3.7%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	66.4%	56.5%	13%	43.5%	43.5%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	76.8%	92.3%	61.5%	30.8%	7.7%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	61.7%	68.8%	21.9%	46.9%	28.1%	3.1%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	67.8%	82.1%	42.9%	39.3%	10.7%	7.1%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	63.5%	52.9%	45.5%	4.5%	40.9%	54.5%	0%
Black or African	2009-10	100%	70.4%	61.8%	80%	26.7%	53.3%	13.3%	6.7%

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)
American									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	80.9%	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	82.5%	91.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.8%	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	90.6%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	71.2%	67.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.6%	64%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	76.5%	75%	28.6%	46.4%	21.4%	3.6%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	86.3%	87.1%	64.5%	22.6%	9.7%	3.2%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	56.2%	63.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited	2009-10	<10	61.8%	62.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Proficient									
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	49.2%	34.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	57.6%	46.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	70.5%	55.6%	57.5%	17.5%	40%	40%	2.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	76.6%	63.1%	85.7%	42.9%	42.9%	7.1%	7.1%
Grade: 06									
All Students	2008-09	100%	80.5%	70%	84.7%	42.4%	42.4%	6.8%	8.5%
Female	2008-09	100%	82.9%	71.7%	88%	52%	36%	8%	4%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.2%	68.1%	82.4%	35.3%	47.1%	5.9%	11.8%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	63.5%	57%	55.6%	16.7%	38.9%	16.7%	27.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	78.2%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian,	2008-09	<10	89.1%	92.3%	<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)
or Pacific Islander									
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	68.7%	70.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.7%	84.5%	100%	57.6%	42.4%	0%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	51.2%	63.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	44.7%	26.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69.2%	61.4%	73.3%	23.3%	50%	10%	16.7%
Mathematics									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	81.2%	95.7%	64.3%	31.4%	4.3%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.4%	98.8%	48.1%	50.6%	1.2%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	78.6%	93.8%	59.4%	34.4%	6.3%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.2%	100%	41.9%	58.1%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	83.7%	97.4%	68.4%	28.9%	2.6%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.6%	97.4%	55.3%	42.1%	2.6%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	78.9%	73.7%	96%	36%	60%	4%	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)
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	87.7%	89.2%	96.3%	29.6%	66.7%	3.7%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	92.4%	81.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	92.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	96%	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	98%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	86.9%	74.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	92.3%	90.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	92.2%	94.7%	81.6%	13.2%	5.3%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	96.1%	100%	60%	40%	0%	0%
Limited English	2008-09	<10	85.1%	71.9%	<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)
Proficient									
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	92.1%	90.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	79.7%	71.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	87.8%	82.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	85.7%	76.1%	95.2%	61.9%	33.3%	4.8%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	91.9%	90.2%	98.1%	37.7%	60.4%	1.9%	0%
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	87.9%	69%	88.5%	49.2%	39.3%	6.6%	4.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	92.3%	83.1%	92.2%	35.1%	57.1%	7.8%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	87.9%	67.9%	84.6%	50%	34.6%	7.7%	7.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	92.9%	83.5%	94.7%	36.8%	57.9%	5.3%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	87.8%	70.2%	91.4%	48.6%	42.9%	5.7%	2.9%
Male	2009-10	100%	91.6%	82.6%	89.7%	33.3%	56.4%	10.3%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	73.8%	56.9%	84.2%	36.8%	47.4%	10.5%	5.3%
Black or African	2009-10	100%	82.3%	74.9%	82.4%	14.7%	67.6%	17.6%	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)
American									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	87%	61.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	89.5%	72.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	95.1%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	96.9%	95%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	81%	67%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	89.3%	80.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	92%	83.9%	91.2%	50%	41.2%	2.9%	5.9%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	93.5%	100%	52.5%	47.5%	0%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	75.7%	64%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited	2009-10	<10	86.6%	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Proficient									
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	68.1%	46.9%	60%	40%	20%	20%	20%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	80%	70%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	59.4%	77.4%	32.3%	45.2%	12.9%	9.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	78.4%	91.2%	29.8%	61.4%	8.8%	0%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	54.3%	71.4%	46.4%	25%	26.8%	1.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	61.4%	85.2%	44.4%	40.7%	13%	1.9%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	51.4%	56.5%	30.4%	26.1%	43.5%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	63.6%	88.5%	46.2%	42.3%	11.5%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	57.2%	81.8%	57.6%	24.2%	15.2%	3%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	59.2%	82.1%	42.9%	39.3%	14.3%	3.6%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	55.2%	41.1%	59.1%	22.7%	36.4%	40.9%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	62.5%	50.1%	73.3%	20%	53.3%	20%	6.7%
American	2008-09	<10	72.3%	46.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Indian or Alaska Native									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	71.7%	41.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	92.3%	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93%	95.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	66.1%	40.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	71%	53.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	83%	74.7%	82.8%	62.1%	20.7%	13.8%	3.4%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	76.9%	90.3%	51.6%	38.7%	9.7%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	60.7%	41.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	67.6%	48.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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	<10	46.9%	29.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.8%	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	64.4%	44.9%	65%	40%	25%	32.5%	2.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	51.6%	75%	32.1%	42.9%	21.4%	3.6%
Grade: 06									
All Students	2008-09	100%	79.9%	68%	86.4%	64.4%	22%	13.6%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	80.9%	69.2%	88%	72%	16%	12%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.9%	66.7%	85.3%	58.8%	26.5%	14.7%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	61.2%	52.8%	77.8%	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	76.6%	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	93%	92.3%	<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)
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	71.3%	73.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.2%	82.9%	90.9%	75.8%	15.2%	9.1%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	62.3%	71.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	45.5%	31.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69%	58.6%	76.7%	53.3%	23.3%	23.3%	0%
Science									
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	83.1%	57.8%	67.9%	23.2%	44.6%	25%	7.1%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	59%	75.4%	38.6%	36.8%	22.8%	1.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	56.2%	47.8%	13%	34.8%	43.5%	8.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	81.1%	60.2%	75%	39.3%	35.7%	25%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	82.9%	59.4%	81.8%	30.3%	51.5%	12.1%	6.1%
Male	2009-10	100%	80.8%	57.7%	75.9%	37.9%	37.9%	20.7%	3.4%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	61.8%	42.4%	50%	9.1%	40.9%	31.8%	18.2%
Black or African	2009-10	100%	59.6%	42.7%	41.2%	11.8%	29.4%	52.9%	5.9%

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)
American									
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	83.9%	66.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	77.2%	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.9%	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	88.8%	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	72.9%	52.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.8%	58.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	78.5%	79.3%	31%	48.3%	20.7%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	78.9%	90.6%	50%	40.6%	9.4%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	59%	48.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited	2009-10	<10	56.7%	52.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Proficient									
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.6%	47.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	60.7%	36.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.3%	47.8%	62.5%	22.5%	40%	27.5%	10%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	48.6%	73.3%	23.3%	50%	23.3%	3.3%

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: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	64.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	81.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	83%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	84.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.9%	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	90.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	86.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or	2008-09	<10	84.5%	<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)
African American								
White	2008-09	<10	89.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	74.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.1%	35.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	65.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	75.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	78.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.1%	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	81.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	84.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	59.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	58%	21.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	51.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	60.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	65.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	63.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Supported Independence

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

Participation

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

MEAP-Access

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Reading								
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	100%	50.7%	34.5%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	50.6%	42.9%	100%	0%	100%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	52.8%	41.7%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	49.8%	28%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	100%	50%	31.1%	33.3%	33.3%	0%	66.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	53.8%	23.8%	50%	50%	0%	50%
Male	2009-10	<10	48%	37.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	41.1%	27.6%	0%	0%	0%	100%
White	2009-10	<10	52.5%	35.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	48%	28.6%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Mathematics								
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	100%	73%	64.5%	50%	0%	50%	50%
Female	2009-10	100%	71.2%	57.1%	50%	0%	50%	50%
White	2009-10	100%	76.4%	69.2%	50%	0%	50%	50%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	72.5%	59.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	100%	62.6%	60.9%	100%	33.3%	66.7%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	60.9%	52.4%	100%	50%	50%	0%
Male	2009-10	<10	63.6%	68%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	55.2%	53.3%	100%	0%	100%	0%
White	2009-10	<10	65.9%	78.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	60.3%	60.5%	100%	0%	100%	0%

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Prairie Ridge Elementary School

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	89.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	89.9%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.3%
Mathematics	99.5%	97.2%
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	97.5%	83.7%
Mathematics	98.7%	93.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	91.5%	92.6%
Mathematics	91.5%	97.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

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

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	99.8%	89.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	94.2%
Mathematics	99.6%	95%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	97.6%
Mathematics	100%	98.8%
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
Limited English Proficient		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	123.6%	86.9%
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	98%	85.5%
Mathematics	99.1%	85.7%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Students with Disabilities		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100.5%	63.2%
Mathematics	100.6%	71%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	85.8%
Mathematics	99.5%	87.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	90.5%
Mathematics	99.3%	96.1%

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

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

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
All Students	
State	
	75.39%
District	
	63.74%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
District	
	58.52%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
	65%
District	
	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	84.47%
District	
	71.01%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	
	59.94%
District	
	<5%
White	

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

State

81.85%

District

72.89%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

District

47.06%

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

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

33.33%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

55.83%

Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)

All Students

State

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.7%
District	
	92.1%
School	
	95%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	90.3%
School	
	94.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	93.7%
District	
	91%
School	
	95.6%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	96.5%
District	
	95.4%
School	
	93.3%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.1%
District	
	93.2%
School	
	93.8%
White	
State	
	95.7%
District	
	93.9%
School	
	95.5%
Multiracial	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.8%
Limited English Proficient	
State	
	94.6%
District	
	93.3%
School	
	95.5%
Students with Disabilities	
State	
	93.5%
District	
	89.1%
School	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
93.9%	
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
94.8%	
District	
91.9%	
School	
95.1%	

* 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%

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

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Mathematics

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		47%				31%	33%
2002-03		47%				31%	33%
2003-04		47%				31%	33%
2004-05		56%				43%	44%
2005-06	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2006-07	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2007-08	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2008-09	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2009-10	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2010-11	75%	74%	71%	70%	67%	66%	67%
2011-12	83%	82%	81%	80%	78%	77%	78%
2012-13	91%	91%	90%	90%	89%	89%	89%

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

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

School AYP Status

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

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

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All	0	7	21	0

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School				

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

Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School with Emergency Certification	0%
	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 Eligibility					
Eligible	43	36	47	16	1
Not Eligible	56	11	40	40	9
Info not available	†	†	†	†	†
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	14	43	37	6

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

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	38	50	37	12	1
Not Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	23	40	29	8

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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 Eligibility					
Eligible	43	52	33	13	2
Not Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Info not available	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	28	36	28	8

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Black	19	65	26	7	1
Hispanic	5	49	34	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	21	37	25	17
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	10	66	24	8	3
Not SD	90	32	36	25	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	65	26	9	1
Not ELL	97	35	35	24	7

Rounds to zero

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	28	41	28	3
Male	51	33	42	23	2
Female	49	23	41	32	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	37	44	41	14	1
Not Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					

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

Rounds to zero

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

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