

Annual Education Report

2009-2010

Washington Writers' Academy

1919 Portage Street

Kalamazoo, MI 49001

Phone Number: 269.337.0770 . Fax Number 269.337.1635

kleinjg@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us



Washington Writers' Academy will create a safe learning environment where all children gain the skills necessary to promote academic and social successes leading to positive life choices.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: John Klein

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 Washington Writer's Academy. 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. John Klein 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, Washington Writer's Academy 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,

John Klein
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	65.1	D	70.9	C
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	59	F
Reading	57.5	F	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	61.3	D	65	D
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	74	C	77	C
AYP Status	Met AYP: Y		Met AYP: Y	
Composite Grade	C		C	
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

Specialized School

Washington Writers' Academy offers all learners the opportunity to develop strong written and oral communication skills through classroom interactions, presentations with professional writers, and access to the latest technology.

2009–2010 Highlights

- John Klein, Principal, and April Zapata, 5th grade teacher, attended the Third Coast Writing Project's Invitational Summer Institute at WMU
- KCIS 21st Century After-School program kicked off in October 2009
- 2nd Annual Thanksgiving Dinner for the school community attended by over 350 people
- Expansion of Lunch Mentoring Program involving WMU students from Young Black Males and Young Black Beautiful Women campus organizations
- Neighborhood Read-In in March had over 50 community members volunteer to read to classes and talk about their careers
- All 3rd grade students and many parents visited the campus of Michigan State University with WWA staff and WMU Counselors, touring the campus, attending student and parent break out sessions, and having lunch in the cafeteria
- Awarded \$330,000 for a Reading First Summer Sustainability Grant, including training as professional learning communities and \$200,000 invested in classroom libraries
- Increased Reading and Math MEAP scores for 3rd grade
- Three staff members attended a Title I Workshop in Grand Rapids based on Joyce Epstein's research to create an action plan designed to improve parent involvement
-

2009–2010 Highlights (cont.)

- Staff began professional development with the KPS Anti-Racism Team
- John Klein and a WMU Counselor were awarded a \$500 ChangeMakers Grant from the Kalamazoo Community Foundation for 28 fourth graders to visit the African American History Museum in Detroit
- Christy Roth, 3rd grade teacher, awarded a \$250 ChangeMakers Grant from the Kalamazoo Community Foundation to visit the Farmer's Market and grow vegetables over the summer
- Turn 2 group received a \$32,000 grant for after school program to develop leadership skills in students
- Began a partnership with the Edison Voice newspaper where WWA has a regular column for staff and student writing
- 5th graders visited WMU Engineering Dept for hands-on science experiments
- Hosted three Writers' Expos to celebrate students' published writing with the school community
- Hosted two Merit Award assemblies with KCIS Parent Liaison to recognize outstanding student achievement
- Global Reading Challenge Team placed 3rd in the city competition
- 3 RIF assemblies gave books to all K-2 students

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	#	%	#	%
Washington	293	83	281	83

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.

Washington 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 student subgroups will meet or exceed state achievement targets for Reading by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In 3rd grade 80% of all students were proficient on the Reading MEAP test, exceeding the AYP target of 70%; 82% of African American students and 78% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient on the MEAP Reading test. ● In 4th grade 47% of all students were proficient on the Reading MEAP test, a 22% difference between performance and the AYP target of 69%; 44% of African American students and 47% of economically disadvantaged were proficient on the MEAP Reading test. ● In 5th grade 56% of all students were proficient on the Reading MEAP test, a 12% difference between performance and the AYP target of 68%; 47% of African American students and 56% of economically disadvantaged were proficient on the MEAP Reading test.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kindergarten teachers will provide additional literacy opportunities for students with an extended instructional day to increase all students' reading abilities, including African American and economically disadvantaged students. ● All K-5 teachers will provide students with small group differentiated instruction to increase all students' reading abilities, including African American students and economically disadvantaged students. ● Teachers and support staff will provide K-3 Tier II students additional reading interventions matched to their individual needs designed to bring them to grade level expectations. ● All teachers will make informed instructional decisions based on an analysis of data. ● All K-5 teachers will use goal-setting and monthly progress monitoring to increase the instructional reading levels of all students. ● Teachers will teach and reinforce Positive Behavior Supports expectations and procedures to increase instructional time for all students, including African American students and economically disadvantaged students.
Accomplishments:	K-5 teachers assessed all K-5 students using the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System in the Fall and Winter, collaboratively analyzed the data, and planned interventions for students with similar needs. All K-5 teachers took running records for students either weekly (for Tier III students), bi-weekly (for Tier II students), or monthly (for Tier I students). The principal met individually with teachers every month to set end of the year reading goals and monthly targets, monitor student progress, report data to staff and parents, and provide support to teachers.
Implications for next year:	Continue the goal setting and monitoring strategies. Expand communication with parents through the monthly conversations format.

School Improvement Plan

Writing	
Goal:	All 4th grade students will meet or exceed state achievement targets for Writing by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	<p>In 3rd grade 18% of African American students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 25% difference between performance and the state level of 43%; in 3rd grade 19% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 29% difference between performance and the state level of 48%; in 3rd grade 18% of all students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 43% difference between performance and the state level of 61%.</p> <p>In 4th grade 8% of African American students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 36% difference between performance and the state level of 44%; in 4th grade 15% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 15% difference between performance and the state level of 30%; in 4th grade 14% of all students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 30% difference between performance and the state level of 44%.</p> <p>In 5th grade 26% of African American students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 17% difference between performance and the state level of 43%; in 5th grade 23% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 26% difference between performance and the state level of 49%; in 5th grade 26% of all students were proficient on the MEAP Writing test, a 37% difference between performance and the state level of 63%.</p>
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will provide all students with differentiated writing instruction during their writing blocks. • All teachers will make informed instructional decisions based on an analysis of data. • All teachers will provide students daily writing instruction through scheduled writing blocks. • All teachers and students will celebrate published writing pieces as a school community. • Fourth and fifth grade teachers and students will use writing as a channel for two-way communication about school issues. • All K-5 teachers will supplement the Lucy Calkins's Units of Study curriculum with teacher-created genre study units that were written using the Understanding by Design framework and are aligned to GLCEs.
Accomplishments:	All students were given a fall, winter, and spring writing benchmark assessment and grade level teams of teachers scored the pieces using the Lucy Calkins K-8 Continuum for Assessing Narrative Writing. Teachers and the writing coach collaboratively analyzed the assessment data to scaffold Units of Study and to craft small group writing lessons in response to students' needs.
Implications for next year:	Teachers will need greater professional development in analyzing summative and formative writing data to plan small group writing strategy lessons.

Math	
Goal:	All student subgroups will meet or exceed state achievement targets for Math by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 3rd grade 94% of all students were proficient on the Math MEAP test; exceeding the AYP target of 67%; 91% of African American students and 94% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient on the MEAP Math test. • In 4th grade 70% of all students were proficient on the Math MEAP test; exceeding the AYP target of 65%; 67% of African American students and 70% of economically disadvantaged were proficient on the MEAP Math test. • In 5th grade 36% of all students were proficient on the Math MEAP test; a difference of 26% between performance and the AYP target of 62%; 27% of African American students and 36% of economically disadvantaged were proficient on the MEAP Math test.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kindergarten teachers will provide additional mathematics opportunities for students with an extended day to increase all students' mathematical abilities, including African American and economically disadvantaged students. • All K-5 teachers will use small group differentiated instruction at least three times a week. • All K-5 teachers will use manipulatives in math activities. • K-5 classroom teachers will provide students with 10 minutes of daily differentiated math fact practice to achieve automaticity.
Accomplishments:	All K-5 teachers utilized newly aligned curriculum guides and math resources in their first year of implementation. Teachers also taught small groups in math at least three times a week based on diagnostic and formative data.
Implications for next year:	Teachers will continue to learn more about their math series and curriculum guides. Teachers will also schedule 10 minutes of differentiated daily fact practice to encourage greater fact fluency. Professional development in this area will be needed to best utilize the fact fluency program.

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All students will meet or exceed state achievement targets for Science by 2014.
Data to support goal selection:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 5th grade 40% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient on the Science MEAP test, a 31% difference between the school and the state average. • In 5th grade 32% of African American students were proficient on the Science MEAP test, a 28% difference between the school and the state average. • In 5th grade 42% of all students were proficient on the Science MEAP test, a 39% difference between the school and the state average.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will write critical thinking questions into lesson plans to prompt higher order thinking. • All K-5 teachers will integrate the teaching of science content in guided reading groups.
Accomplishments:	WWA received a Reading First grant to invest \$200,000 in classroom leveled libraries. At least half of the classroom library will contain nonfiction books. Teachers selected nonfiction books to connect with science GLCEs.
Implications for next year:	Teachers will need to organize and create action plans for utilizing their classroom libraries. Teachers will also work collaboratively to integrate science GLCEs into guided reading lessons.

Social Studies	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in social studies as specified in the GLCEs for Grades K-5 as demonstrated on the 6th Grade MEAP.
Data to support goal selection:	In 6th grade, 26% of the students who attended Washington Writers' Academy as 5th graders were proficient on the Fall 2009 Social Studies MEAP, compared to 73% in the state of Michigan and 47% in Kalamazoo Public Schools. This is a 47% gap between school performance and the state score and a 21% gap between school performance and the district average.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will write critical thinking questions into lesson plans to prompt higher order thinking. • All K-5 teachers will integrate the teaching of social studies content in guided reading groups.
Accomplishments:	WWA received a Reading First grant to invest \$200,000 in classroom leveled libraries. At least half of the classroom library will contain nonfiction books. Teachers selected nonfiction books to connect with social studies GLCEs.
Implications for next year:	Teachers will need to organize and create action plans for utilizing their classroom libraries. Teachers will also work collaboratively to integrate social studies GLCEs into guided reading lessons.

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

At Washington Writers' Academy 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 are performing compared to their national peers and on the Michigan GLCE's.

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

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	08-09	09-10	08-09	09-10
First Grade				
All	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.3
African American	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.1
Hispanic	1.4	N/A	1.5	N/A
White	1.5	2.0	1.3	1.8
Economically Disadvantaged	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.3
Special Education	1.3	N/A	1.1	N/A
Second Grade				
All	2.8	2.3	2.4	2.2
African American	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.1
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	3.3	2.5	2.8	2.6
Economically Disadvantaged	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.2
Special Education	2.1	N/A	1.9	N/A
Third Grade				
All	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.2
African American	3.0	3.1	2.8	3.0
Hispanic	3.1	N/A	3.5	N/A
White	3.3	4.1	3.4	3.9
Economically Disadvantaged	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.2
Special Education	2.8	N/A	2.4	N/A
Fourth Grade				
All	4.3	3.7	3.9	3.9
African American	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.9
Hispanic	5.4	N/A	4.8	N/A
White	5.0	3.8	4.7	3.8
Economically Disadvantaged	4.3	3.7	3.9	3.4
Special Education	3.4	N/A	3.4	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	4.6	4.9	3.8	4.2
African American	4.6	4.6	3.7	3.9
Hispanic	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
White	n/a	5.4	n/a	4.9
Economically Disadvantaged	4.5	4.9	3.8	4.2

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.

Title I Parent Compact
Washington Writers' Academy
Parent/Student/Teacher Compact
2009-2010

Learning best takes place where there is a combination of effort, communication, and respect between parents, teachers and students. As parents/guardians and teachers, we are committed to (child's name) _____'s progress in school, and we will do our best to promote his/her achievement.

This agreement is a promise to work together as students, parents/guardians, and school staff to ensure that each child receives all the possible help required to achieve the highest level of success in school.

As a student I will:

- Attend school daily unless I am sick.
- Be on time and prepared for school.
- Be respectful, be responsible and be safe and ready to learn.
- Ask questions when I don't understand.
- Read for at least 20 minutes a day.

As a parent/guardian I will:

- Send my child to school daily unless he/she is sick.
- Make sure my child is on time and prepared for school.
- Talk to my child about school daily.
- Supervise my child's home work.
- Read to my child and have them read to me daily.
- Communicate with school staff about my child's progress.

As a teacher I will:

- Set high behavioral and academic expectations for all students.
- Practice different teaching strategies to fit each child's learning style.
- Encourage parents/guardians to be a part of their child's education.
- Keep parents/guardians informed about their child's progress.

Student Signature

Parent Signature

Teacher Signature

Please take time to discuss this agreement with your child, then sign and return it to school.

John Klein
Principal

Emily Ziegler
Title I Academic Coach: English-Language Arts

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Washington Writers' Academy

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%	66.1%	6.5%	59.7%	32.3%	1.6%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	86.5%	79.6%	16.3%	63.3%	16.3%	4.1%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	79.4%	65.5%	10.3%	55.2%	31%	3.4%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	88.4%	85.7%	23.8%	61.9%	9.5%	4.8%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	77.5%	66.7%	3%	63.6%	33.3%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	84.7%	75%	10.7%	64.3%	21.4%	3.6%
Black or	2008-09	100%	75.1%	72.6%	66.7%	2%	64.7%	31.4%	2%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
African American									
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	80.6%	81.9%	82.4%	8.8%	73.5%	14.7%	2.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	84.9%	<10	<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	<10	90%	87.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	92.4%	75%	41.7%	33.3%	16.7%	8.3%
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	2008-09	100%	79.1%	71.8%	65%	6.7%	58.3%	33.3%	1.7%

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)
Disadvantaged									
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	82.1%	78.3%	13%	65.2%	17.4%	4.3%
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	66.8%	50%	12%	38%	42%	8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	70.6%	47.4%	7%	40.4%	43.9%	8.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.7%	70.1%	57.1%	9.5%	47.6%	38.1%	4.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	72.4%	69.2%	7.7%	61.5%	26.9%	3.8%
Male	2008-09	100%	80.9%	63.5%	44.8%	13.8%	31%	44.8%	10.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	82.1%	68.7%	29%	6.5%	22.6%	58.1%	12.9%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	65.6%	53.6%	41.7%	5.6%	36.1%	50%	8.3%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	68.6%	58.5%	44.4%	2.2%	42.2%	48.9%	6.7%
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
Hispanic or	2008-09	<10	72.6%	58.2%	<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)
Latino									
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.3%	61.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	88%	84.7%	66.7%	25%	41.7%	25%	8.3%
White	2009-10	<10	88.9%	86.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	61.2%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	64.3%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	54.7%	30.6%	25%	0%	25%	58.3%	16.7%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	58%	47.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	56.4%	50%	10.4%	39.6%	43.8%	6.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75.7%	62.5%	47.4%	7%	40.4%	43.9%	8.8%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	64.1%	58.5%	5.7%	52.8%	24.5%	17%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	72.4%	56.1%	24.4%	31.7%	24.4%	19.5%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	66.4%	65.5%	6.9%	58.6%	27.6%	6.9%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	76.8%	64.7%	35.3%	29.4%	23.5%	11.8%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	61.7%	50%	4.2%	45.8%	20.8%	29.2%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	67.8%	50%	16.7%	33.3%	25%	25%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	63.5%	52.9%	58.1%	4.7%	53.5%	27.9%	14%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	70.4%	61.8%	46.7%	20%	26.7%	26.7%	26.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	80.9%	80%	<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	<10	86.9%	76.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	89.8%	86.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	56.2%	63.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English	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)
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%	55.3%	2.1%	53.2%	25.5%	19.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	76.6%	63.1%	56.4%	25.6%	30.8%	25.6%	17.9%
Mathematics									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	81.2%	75.8%	21%	54.8%	22.6%	1.6%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.4%	94.1%	29.4%	64.7%	3.9%	2%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	78.6%	82.8%	20.7%	62.1%	17.2%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.2%	86.4%	31.8%	54.5%	9.1%	4.5%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	83.7%	69.7%	21.2%	48.5%	27.3%	3%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.6%	100%	27.6%	72.4%	0%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	78.9%	73.7%	74.5%	13.7%	60.8%	23.5%	2%
Black or African	2009-10	100%	87.7%	89.2%	91.4%	28.6%	62.9%	5.7%	2.9%

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	2009-10	<10	92.8%	<10	<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	<10	94.9%	92.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	96.1%	100%	38.5%	61.5%	0%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	85.1%	71.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
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%	76.7%	21.7%	55%	21.7%	1.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	91.9%	90.2%	93.8%	27.1%	66.7%	4.2%	2.1%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	87.9%	69%	67.3%	22.4%	44.9%	28.6%	4.1%
All Students	2009-10	100%	92.3%	83.1%	70.2%	17.5%	52.6%	29.8%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	87.9%	67.9%	61.9%	28.6%	33.3%	33.3%	4.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	92.9%	83.5%	73.1%	23.1%	50%	26.9%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	87.8%	70.2%	71.4%	17.9%	53.6%	25%	3.6%
Male	2009-10	100%	91.6%	82.6%	67.7%	12.9%	54.8%	32.3%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	73.8%	56.9%	63.9%	13.9%	50%	30.6%	5.6%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	82.3%	74.9%	66.7%	8.9%	57.8%	33.3%	0%
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
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

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)
White	2008-09	100%	92%	83.9%	72.7%	45.5%	27.3%	27.3%	0%
White	2009-10	<10	95.1%	93.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	75.7%	64%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	86.6%	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	68.1%	46.9%	72.7%	0%	72.7%	27.3%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	80%	70%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	59.4%	66.7%	20.8%	45.8%	29.2%	4.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	78.4%	70.2%	17.5%	52.6%	29.8%	0%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	54.3%	41.5%	5.7%	35.8%	45.3%	13.2%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	61.4%	35.7%	9.5%	26.2%	47.6%	16.7%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	51.4%	41.4%	6.9%	34.5%	51.7%	6.9%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	63.6%	35.3%	11.8%	23.5%	52.9%	11.8%
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	57.2%	41.7%	4.2%	37.5%	37.5%	20.8%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	59.2%	36%	8%	28%	44%	20%
Black or	2008-09	100%	55.2%	41.1%	39.5%	4.7%	34.9%	48.8%	11.6%

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%	62.5%	50.1%	26.7%	3.3%	23.3%	53.3%	20%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	72.3%	46.7%	<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	<10	83%	74.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	84.3%	76.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
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
Students	2008-09	<10	46.9%	29.9%	<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)
with Disabilities									
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.8%	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	64.4%	44.9%	36.2%	4.3%	31.9%	48.9%	14.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	51.6%	35.9%	10.3%	25.6%	48.7%	15.4%
Science									
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	83.1%	57.8%	49.1%	3.8%	45.3%	39.6%	11.3%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	59%	42.2%	11.1%	31.1%	46.7%	11.1%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	56.2%	34.5%	6.9%	27.6%	51.7%	13.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	81.1%	60.2%	42.1%	5.3%	36.8%	36.8%	21.1%
Male	2008-09	100%	82.9%	59.4%	66.7%	0%	66.7%	25%	8.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	80.8%	57.7%	42.3%	15.4%	26.9%	53.8%	3.8%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	61.8%	42.4%	48.8%	2.3%	46.5%	37.2%	14%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	59.6%	42.7%	32.3%	3.2%	29%	54.8%	12.9%
American	2008-09	<10	83.9%	66.7%	<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									
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	<10	89.4%	78.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	78.9%	60%	30%	30%	30%	10%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	59%	48.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	56.7%	52.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
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	2008-09	100%	72.3%	47.8%	44.7%	2.1%	42.6%	44.7%	10.6%

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)
Disadvantaged									
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	48.6%	40.5%	9.5%	31%	47.6%	11.9%

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: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	82.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	82.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	80.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	71%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	75.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.5%	72.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	75.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	74.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	77.6%	<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)
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	69.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	64.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	81.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	76.5%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	80.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	76.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or	2009-10	<10	69.3%	<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	2009-10	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	86.5%	72.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	85%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	84.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	83.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	88.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.1%	35.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	65.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	65.3%	50%	<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	2009-10	<10	58%	21.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	51.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	48.2%	20%	<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	<10	50.7%	34.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	50.8%	31.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	43.8%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	49.8%	28%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	50%	31.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	53.8%	23.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	48%	37.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	41.1%	27.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52.5%	35.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	48%	28.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	73%	64.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74%	66.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	67.4%	68.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	72.5%	59.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	62.6%	60.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	60.9%	52.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	63.6%	68%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	55.2%	53.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	65.9%	78.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	60.3%	60.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Washington Writers' Academy

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	100.6%	81.8%
Mathematics	102.6%	86.6%
Black or African American		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	85.2%
Mathematics	99.5%	85.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100.9%	81.9%
Mathematics	101.8%	86.2%
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	103.1%	81.6%
Mathematics	109.4%	86.8%
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
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	123.6%	86.9%
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	98%	85.5%
Mathematics	99.1%	85.7%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Students with Disabilities		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100.5%	63.2%
Mathematics	100.6%	71%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<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%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	99.5%	87.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.7%	80.5%
Mathematics	104.1%	85.6%

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

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

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

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

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

District

<5%

White

State

81.85%

District

72.89%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

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

State

65.51%

District

47.06%

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

33.33%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

55.83%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

All Students

State

94.7%

District

92.1%

School

90.8%

Black or African American

State

91%

District

90.3%

School

90.8%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	93.7%
District	91%
School	85.9%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	96.5%
District	95.4%
School	97.1%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

District

93.2%

School

91.3%

White

State

95.7%

District

93.9%

School

90.8%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

Multiracial

State

94.8%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

District

93.3%

School

90.9%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
District	
	89.1%
School	
	88.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	94.8%
District	
	91.9%
School	
	89.9%

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

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

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

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

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

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Mathematics

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

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

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Washington Writers' Academy

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	C	N/A	0

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

Washington Writers' Academy

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	17	13	0

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

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

Michigan Report Card for the National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Results

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

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

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

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

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

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

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

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

Rounds to zero

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

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

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

Rounds to zero

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

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