

Annual Education Report

2009-2010

Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet Center for the Arts

3215 Oakland Dr.

Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Phone Number 269.337.0790 . Fax Number 269.337.1637



Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet Center for the Arts --where academics and the arts create opportunities for learning.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Mr. William M. Hawkins

2009-10 Board of Education

President: Ms. Mollie Peterson

Vice-President: Ms. Carol McGlenn

Secretary: Ms. Marcy L. Peake

Treasurer: Mr. Ervin Armstrong

Trustee: Ms. Patti Sholler-Barber

Trustee: Mr. Eric Breisach

Trustee: Ms. Liz Henderson



Kalamazoo Public Schools

Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Annual Education Report (AER) Cover Letter

August, 2010

Dear Parents and Community Members:

We are pleased to present you with the Annual Education Report (AER) which provides key information on the 2009-2010 educational progress for the Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet for the Arts. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and state laws. The school's report contains information about student assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact Mr. Mitch Hawkins 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, Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet for the Arts did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) because we did not attain target achievement goals for one subgroup of students in English language arts. If we do not make AYP for two years in a row, we will be identified for school improvement.

Woods Lake Elementary has adopted a professional learning community model, where school personnel analyzes student achievement data, uses the achievement data to make informed decisions about instruction, and participates in professional development focused on improving student achievement. Teachers meet regularly to design GLCE aligned lessons and common assessments which provides immediate feedback for teachers and their teams. These teams collaboratively assess the lessons, the instruction, and the assessments. Each team makes adjustments according to the achievement data and by doing this, the teaching teams build their capacity to improve student achievement and provide a personalized educational experience for each and every student. Woods Lake Elementary

Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet Center for the Arts encourages parents to be active in their child's education. We invite parents to attend our open house, parent teacher conferences, family fun nights, book fairs, honor assemblies, performances, classrooms, and even the cafeteria to have lunch with their child. Parents are also encouraged to participate in the decision making process of the school. School Improvement Team participation, committee work, PTO, fundraising, event planning, and volunteering are other ways to become actively involved in your child's education. Informational monthly meetings are held to provide parents with support and to address any questions or areas of concern and classroom teachers provide progress reports, report cards, phone calls, and helpful hints to parents, helping to keep them informed and involved with their child's growth.

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,

Mitch Hawkins
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	86.1	B	75.7	C
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	61	D
Reading	82.9	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	84.5	B	68.4	D
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	90	A	79	C
AYP Status	Met AYP: N		Met AYP: Y	
Composite Grade	B		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

Woods Lake: A Magnet Center for the Arts, using two-way integration and multiple intelligences to deliver academic and arts instruction.

2009–2010 Highlights

- Reading First successfully implemented in its' fifth year.
- Tutors and Title I Parent Corps workers worked with K-5 classroom teachers during the day, providing instructional support with math and reading.
- The 21st Century After-School Program provided focused supplemental support to more than 80 students in the areas of ELA and math.
- Multiple interventions were used and documented for children at the strategic and intensive levels as indicated by DIBELS and Benchmark assessments for ELA.
- Continuation of Positive Behavior Supports was established and specific procedures and routines were modeled and practiced throughout the year. SWIS data was routinely reported to the School Improvement Team and staff in creating behavior plans for targeted students.
- A Title I Academic Coach, Title I Academic Behavioral Specialist, Title I Reading/Math/Arts Integration Specialist, Title I School Community Resource Facilitator, and Title I Home Support Specialist worked with identified students on academic achievement and desired school appropriate behaviors.
- A Title I Academic Coach helped to facilitate grade level meetings, work with students, coordinate assessment schedule, provide professional development, and guides instructional interventions.
- A Reading First facilitator helped to facilitate grade level meetings, coach and train teachers, provide instructional resources, and collect and interpret ELA achievement data. A Reading First Sustainability Grant was issued and Staff members received extensive training in instructional delivery and interventions.

2009–2010 Highlights (cont.)

- Core content was reinforced through arts integration activities, which included the Gilmore Keyboard lab that provides group piano lessons for 100 students, 3rd grade workshops with the Wellspring Dance Company members, the Kalamazoo Symphony Orchestra, The Education for the Arts Foundation, Western Michigan University,
- A KPS Innovation Grant was awarded to Woods Lake to support the development of the vocabulary and nutrition. The grant provided opportunities for students to increase their vocabulary by attending cooking classes and creating their very own garden.
- Two bilingual staff members worked with more than 80 students in the Bi-lingual Center and were translators at Parent/Teacher Conferences and for school newsletters.
- Both a Literacy and Science night were targeted for all students. They were held in the fall and spring, each included a meal, stations to see teachers and literacy coaches working with children, student work was displayed, materials for parents to take home to work with their child, and door prizes. Translators were also provided to assist with Spanish speaking parents.
- Professional Learning Communities have been in place and have helped direct instruction through data analysis, common assessments, and intervention implementation.
- Participated with local high schools in a mentoring program. More than 35 Kalamazoo Central High School students and Phoenix High School students volunteer and tutor students in the areas of Reading, Math, Writing, Social Studies, and Science.

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	#	%	#	%
Woods Lake	450	94	440	94

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.

Woods Lake 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. The Title I School and Community Resource Facilitator works with parents and coordinates parent communications, family nights, and informational meetings for parents involving academic support, behavior concerns, community resources, and basic needs.

School Assignment Process

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

School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in Reading for the 2010—2011 School Year.
Data to support goal selection:	Based on a review of student achievement data on the 2009 - 2010 MEAP, economically disadvantaged students in third grade are 11 points below the district level. The MEAP reading scores of fourth grade students who are economically disadvantaged are 3 points below the district level. The MEAP reading scores of fifth grades who are economically disadvantaged are 25 points below the district level.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will receive professional development in the areas of instruction, intervention, guided reading, Response To Intervention, content integration, and collaboration. Entire staff will continue to receive training in the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities and will receive training in the Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) systems for reading interventions. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis. Benchmark assessment training has given teachers a tool to diagnose and detect reading deficiencies and prescribe interventions and strategies to improve reading proficiency. Grade level curriculum guides will be used to assist teachers and provide resources for the delivery of instruction. An after-school program will be held to support literacy instruction and intervention, providing supplemental support to at risk students, five days a week.
Accomplishments:	Reading First was successfully implemented in its' fifth year. Multiple interventions were used and documented for children at the strategic and intensive levels as indicated by DIBELS and Benchmark assessments for ELA. A Reading First facilitator helped to facilitate grade level meetings, coach and train teachers, provide instructional resources, and collect and interpret ELA achievement data. The Reading First Sustainability Grant was issued and Staff members received extensive training in instructional delivery and interventions. All teachers were able to obtain classroom libraries of leveled readers that addressed the five content areas.
Implications for next year:	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative assessments, data analysis, job embedded professional development, ongoing conversation and horizontal and vertical collaboration. We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this process through the School Improvement Planning Team and student achievement data.

Writing	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in writing for the 2010—2011 School Year.
Data to support goal selection:	Based on a review of student achievement data on the 2008 - 2009 Writing MEAP, African American students in third grade were 14 points below the district score, Hispanic students scored 25 points below the district and White students scored 12 points above the district score. African American students in fourth grade were 4 points below the district score, Hispanic students scored 2 points above the district and the White students scored 13 points below the district. African American students in fifth grade scored 5 points below the district level, Hispanic students scored at the district level with 33 and White students scored 3 points above the district score for the Writing MEAP.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities and will use the Lucy Calkins writing curriculum to increase achievement in writing. Writing folders will be kept to monitor students growth and professional development (The Daily 5) will be provided to assist in improving writing workshops and student writing skills.
Accomplishments:	Writing folders were created for every child. The collection of work was shared with students and their parents. The folder is a collection of their work and travels with the student for their elementary career. The Daily 5 writing workshop will be implemented for the 2010-2011 school year, as teachers receive training in the summer of 2010. Woods Lake has a Publishing Center for all of its students,. Students are able to create, revise, edit, and publish their writing in a professional manner.
Implications for next year:	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative assessments, data analysis, job embedded professional development, ongoing conversation and horizontal and vertical collaboration. We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this process through the School Improvement Planning Team and student achievement data.

School Improvement Plan

Math	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in Math.
Data to support goal selection:	<p>Based on the 2009-2010 MEAP math scores it has been determined that the third grade economically disadvantaged students are 10 percentage points below the district score. The MEAP math scores of fourth grade economically disadvantaged students are 4 percentage points below the district score. The MEAP math scores of fifth grade economically disadvantaged students are 7 percentage points below the district score.</p> <p>According to the Scantron Performance Series tests, the third grade African American GLE (Grade Level Equivalency) in math was (3.0) four months behind the district (3.4). Hispanic students scored (2.7) seven months behind the district, and White students scored (3.9) five months ahead of the district. The fourth grade African American GLE in math was (3.6) four months behind the district (4.0). Hispanic students scored (3.9) one month behind the district, and White students scored (4.3) three months ahead of the district. The fifth grade African American GLE in math was (4.4) four months behind the district (4.8). Hispanic students scored (3.8) one year one month behind the district, and White students scored (4.4) four months behind of the district.</p>
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will receive professional development in differentiated instruction and Response To Intervention. Teachers will analyze student achievement data using the district approved curriculum. The data will be used to determine Tier I, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students. The data will provide vital information and direct instruction to meet the needs of each student. Assessments and data will be used to identify students needing support with specific GLCE's. Once students have been identified teachers will regroup (Tier 2) students and provide instructional support in the areas of concern. Tier 3 students will receive one-on-one support by teachers, tutors, and after-school staff.
Accomplishments:	The teaching staff has begun to implement the newly adopted math curriculum. Several teachers are implementing guided math groups by utilizing differentiated instructional methods and by providing students with task at their independent instructional level. The building Math Coach played a significant role by providing staff with resources and modeling strategies, games, and mini lessons. All teachers were able to obtain classroom libraries of leveled readers that addressed the five content areas..
Implications for next year:	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative assessments, data analysis, job embedded professional development, ongoing conversation and horizontal and vertical collaboration. We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this process through the School Improvement Planning Team and student achievement data.



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All fifth grade students will be proficient in science (MEAP).
Data to support goal selection:	Based on a review of student achievement data on the 2009 - 2010 Science MEAP, African American students in fifth grade scored 13 points below the district level, Hispanic students scored 4 points below the district and White students scored 15 points above the district score for the Science MEAP. According to the Scantron Performance Series tests, the third grade African American GLE (Grade Level Equivalency) in science was (3.0) eight months behind the district (3.8). Hispanic students scored (2.8) one year behind the district, and White students scored seven months ahead of the district. The fourth grade African American GLE in science was (3.2) eight months behind the district (4.3). Hispanic students scored (3.2) eight months behind the district, and White students scored seven months ahead of the district. The fifth grade African American GLE in science was (4.4) six months behind the district (5.0). Hispanic students scored (3.9) one year one month behind the district, and White students scored (4.5) five months behind of the district.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities and will use the Battle Creek Science Kits and content specific leveled readers to improve student achievement. Teachers will receive professional development in differentiated instruction and content integration through ELA to make meaningful and real world connections across the curriculum.
Accomplishments:	A KPS Innovation Grant was awarded to Woods Lake to support the development of science vocabulary and nutrition. The grant provided opportunities for students to increase their vocabulary and creating their very own garden. Science night was targeted for all students. It was held in the spring, and included a meal, stations to see teachers and literacy coaches working with children, student work was displayed, and materials for parents to take home to work with their child were available. All teachers were able to obtain classroom libraries of leveled readers that addressed the five content areas..
Implications for next year:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in both the MDE model, focused on the instructional core and the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis. The hands-on activities from the Battle Creek Science curriculum has made science more interactive and continues to assist our students in comprehending the GLCE's
Social Studies	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in social studies (MEAP).
Data to support goal selection:	Based on a review of student achievement data on the 2009 - 2010 Social Studies MEAP, African American students in sixth grade are 11 percentage points below the district level, Hispanic students scored 12 percentage points above the district and White students scored 1 percentage point above the district score for Social Studies MEAP.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	The teaching staff will continue to receive training in the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities and will use content specific leveled readers and the district adopted curriculum to provide instruction in social studies. Teachers will receive professional development in differentiated instruction and content integration through ELA to make meaningful and real world connections across the curriculum.
Accomplishments:	All teachers were able to obtain classroom libraries of leveled readers that address the GLCE's for Social Studies. An in depth look at the Social Studies curriculum at grade level meetings helped teachers integrate the ELA and S.S. curriculum. District led training supported the integration and grade level teams created lessons and assessments in alignment with the GLCE's.
Implications for next year:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in both the MDE model, focused on the instructional core and the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis.

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

At Woods Lake: A Magnet Center for the Arts 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	1.5	1.7	1.4	1.4
African American	1.5	1.6	1.3	1.4
Hispanic	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.4
White	1.7	1.9	1.6	1.4
Economically Disadvantaged	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.3
Special Education	1.4	N/A	1.2	N/A
Second Grade				
All	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.5
African American	2.2	2.6	2.3	2.4
Hispanic	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.5
White	3.6	2.8	2.9	2.7
Economically Disadvantaged	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5
Special Education	2.1	N/A	2.2	N/A
Third Grade				
All	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4
African American	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.1
Hispanic	3.1	2.8	3.2	3.0
White	3.9	4.3	3.6	3.9
Economically Disadvantaged	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3
Special Education	3.3	N/A	3.1	N/A
Fourth Grade				
All	4.5	4.0	4.2	4.6
African American	4.3	3.6	4.0	4.0
Hispanic	4.2	3.7	3.8	4.7
White	5.1	3.6	4.5	5.1
Economically Disadvantaged	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.4
Special Education	3.2	N/A	3.5	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	5.2	4.8	4.2	4.3
African American	4.9	5.1	3.9	4.4
Hispanic	4.9	4.1	3.9	3.8
White	5.6	4.9	4.7	4.4
Economically Disadvantaged	4.9	4.7	4.1	4.2



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.



**Woods Lake Elementary:
A Magnet Center for the Arts**
Student-Parent-Teacher Agreement 2009-2010



Dear Woods Lake Elementary Parents/Guardians,

Please read and sign this agreement with your child. This is a reminder, that we all believe in working together to make this school year the very best for your child!

As a Parent/Guardian I will encourage my child's learning by:

- “ Taking the time to talk about school activities every day.
- “ Establishing a regular time for homework.
- “ Encouraging positive attitudes about school.
- “ Supporting the KPS Strategic Planning Expectations.
- “ Attending all Parent/Teacher conferences and meetings concerning my child's progress.
- “ Monitoring television watching and making positive use of extracurricular time.
- “ Supporting the building-wide expectations of the A.R.T.S. (**A**cademic Excellence, **R**espect, **T**aking Responsibility, **S**afety).
- “ Promoting the Arts and its' ability to improve academic achievement.

Signed:_____

As a school, we will encourage and support students and parents by:

- “ Demonstrating care and concern for each student.
- “ Providing a strong, individualized, challenging curriculum integrating the arts with academics.
- “ Supporting parent academic and behavioral concerns through Building Team meetings which are linked to community resources and school interventions.
- “ Providing parents with regular reports on their children's progress.
- “ Involving parents in the decision making process of the school.
- “ Communicating information about school, community, classroom activities, events and resources through newsletters, community meetings, and phone calls.
- “ Modeling the KPS Strategic Planning Expectations.
- “ Welcoming and supporting suggestions for improvement between home and school.

Signed:_____

As a Student, I will be an active partner in my own learning by:

Attending school regularly and being on time. Completing my assignments and homework. Cooperating with adults and students and honoring the A.R.T.S.

(Academic excellence, **R**espect, **T**aking responsibility, **S**afety).

Signed:_____

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Woods Lake Elementary:A Magnet Center For The Arts

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Language Arts / Reading									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	86.4%	78.4%	75.9%	12.7%	63.3%	20.3%	3.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	86.5%	77.9%	26%	51.9%	20.8%	1.3%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	79.4%	78.6%	14.3%	64.3%	16.7%	4.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	88.4%	85.3%	29.4%	55.9%	14.7%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	77.5%	73%	10.8%	62.2%	24.3%	2.7%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	84.7%	72.1%	23.3%	48.8%	25.6%	2.3%
Black or	2008-09	100%	75.1%	72.6%	75.8%	6.1%	69.7%	21.2%	3%

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%	65.6%	12.5%	53.1%	31.3%	3.1%
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	100%	79%	70.6%	81.3%	6.3%	75%	18.8%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	84.6%	80.9%	69.2%	7.7%	61.5%	30.8%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	90%	87.4%	70.4%	22.2%	48.1%	22.2%	7.4%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	92.4%	93.5%	48.4%	45.2%	6.5%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	74.9%	67.4%	82.4%	11.8%	70.6%	17.6%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	82.2%	82.4%	69.2%	7.7%	61.5%	30.8%	0%
Students with	2008-09	100%	63.4%	51%	58.3%	8.3%	50%	33.3%	8.3%

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)
Disabilities									
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	71%	69.1%	53.3%	13.3%	40%	40%	6.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	79.1%	71.8%	75.7%	10%	65.7%	20%	4.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	82.1%	74.6%	19.4%	55.2%	23.9%	1.5%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	72.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	66.8%	61.2%	15.3%	45.9%	30.6%	8.2%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	70.6%	71.1%	18.1%	53%	24.1%	4.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.7%	70.1%	67.4%	13%	54.3%	26.1%	6.5%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	72.4%	71.7%	23.9%	47.8%	23.9%	4.3%
Male	2008-09	100%	80.9%	63.5%	53.8%	17.9%	35.9%	35.9%	10.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	82.1%	68.7%	70.3%	10.8%	59.5%	24.3%	5.4%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	65.6%	53.6%	56.4%	7.7%	48.7%	35.9%	7.7%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	68.6%	58.5%	60%	15%	45%	35%	5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	81.7%	61.5%	<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)
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	100%	72.6%	58.2%	57.9%	10.5%	47.4%	36.8%	5.3%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	74.3%	61.9%	73.3%	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	88%	84.7%	68%	32%	36%	20%	12%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	86.2%	82.6%	26.1%	56.5%	8.7%	8.7%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	61.2%	60%	55.6%	11.1%	44.4%	38.9%	5.6%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	64.3%	60%	76.5%	11.8%	64.7%	23.5%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	54.7%	30.6%	15.4%	0%	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%

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)
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	58%	47.2%	45.5%	0%	45.5%	36.4%	18.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	56.4%	56.9%	12.5%	44.4%	34.7%	8.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75.7%	62.5%	68%	14.7%	53.3%	26.7%	5.3%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	63.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	<10	68.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	64.1%	57.3%	24.4%	32.9%	29.3%	13.4%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	72.4%	60.8%	22.8%	38%	21.5%	17.7%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	66.4%	68.2%	31.8%	36.4%	22.7%	9.1%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	76.8%	72.1%	25.6%	46.5%	14%	14%
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	61.7%	44.7%	15.8%	28.9%	36.8%	18.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	67.8%	47.2%	19.4%	27.8%	30.6%	22.2%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	63.5%	52.9%	46.3%	24.4%	22%	34.1%	19.5%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	70.4%	61.8%	57.1%	14.3%	42.9%	20%	22.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	80.9%	80%	<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)
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
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	71.2%	67.8%	58.3%	8.3%	50%	33.3%	8.3%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	74.6%	64%	52.6%	10.5%	42.1%	26.3%	21.1%
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	76.5%	68%	28%	40%	24%	8%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	86.3%	70.8%	41.7%	29.2%	20.8%	8.3%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	56.2%	63.4%	69.2%	7.7%	61.5%	23.1%	7.7%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	61.8%	62.2%	52.9%	11.8%	41.2%	29.4%	17.6%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	49.2%	34.9%	30%	10%	20%	30%	40%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	57.6%	46.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	70.5%	55.6%	51.5%	19.1%	32.4%	33.8%	14.7%

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)
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	76.6%	63.1%	57.1%	17.1%	40%	22.9%	20%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	59%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	<10	68.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 06									
All Students	2008-09	100%	80.5%	70%	63.7%	15%	48.8%	21.3%	15%
Female	2008-09	100%	82.9%	71.7%	70.7%	17.1%	53.7%	17.1%	12.2%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.2%	68.1%	56.4%	12.8%	43.6%	25.6%	17.9%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	63.5%	57%	51.2%	9.8%	41.5%	31.7%	17.1%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	89.1%	92.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	68.7%	70.7%	83.3%	27.8%	55.6%	0%	16.7%
White	2008-09	100%	85.7%	84.5%	68.4%	15.8%	52.6%	21.1%	10.5%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	51.2%	63.5%	80%	20%	60%	0%	20%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	44.7%	26.3%	0%	0%	0%	54.5%	45.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69.2%	61.4%	62.9%	12.9%	50%	22.9%	14.3%

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									
Migrant	2008-09	<10	61.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	81.2%	78.5%	36.7%	41.8%	21.5%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.4%	84.4%	27.3%	57.1%	15.6%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	78.6%	71.4%	33.3%	38.1%	28.6%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.2%	91.2%	23.5%	67.6%	8.8%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	83.7%	86.5%	40.5%	45.9%	13.5%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	92.6%	79.1%	30.2%	48.8%	20.9%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	78.9%	73.7%	63.6%	21.2%	42.4%	36.4%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	87.7%	89.2%	78.1%	15.6%	62.5%	21.9%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	96%	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian,	2009-10	<10	98%	100%	<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	100%	86.9%	74.3%	75%	37.5%	37.5%	25%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	92.3%	90.4%	76.9%	7.7%	69.2%	23.1%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	92.2%	96.3%	51.9%	44.4%	3.7%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	96.1%	93.5%	48.4%	45.2%	6.5%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	85.1%	71.9%	76.5%	41.2%	35.3%	23.5%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	92.1%	90.3%	76.9%	7.7%	69.2%	23.1%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	79.7%	71.3%	75%	16.7%	58.3%	25%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	87.8%	82.7%	73.3%	20%	53.3%	26.7%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	85.7%	76.1%	77.1%	34.3%	42.9%	22.9%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	91.9%	90.2%	82.1%	22.4%	59.7%	17.9%	0%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	79.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Grade: 04

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)
All Students	2008-09	100%	87.9%	69%	60.5%	20.9%	39.5%	37.2%	2.3%
All Students	2009-10	100%	92.3%	83.1%	81.5%	25.9%	55.6%	16%	2.5%
Female	2008-09	100%	87.9%	67.9%	63%	17.4%	45.7%	34.8%	2.2%
Female	2009-10	100%	92.9%	83.5%	80.4%	28.3%	52.2%	17.4%	2.2%
Male	2008-09	100%	87.8%	70.2%	57.5%	25%	32.5%	40%	2.5%
Male	2009-10	100%	91.6%	82.6%	82.9%	22.9%	60%	14.3%	2.9%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	73.8%	56.9%	56.4%	15.4%	41%	43.6%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	82.3%	74.9%	74.4%	17.9%	56.4%	20.5%	5.1%
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,	2009-10	<10	96.9%	95%	<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	100%	81%	67%	55%	10%	45%	40%	5%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	89.3%	80.6%	86.7%	13.3%	73.3%	13.3%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	92%	83.9%	72%	36%	36%	24%	4%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	93.5%	86.4%	36.4%	50%	13.6%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	75.7%	64%	52.6%	10.5%	42.1%	42.1%	5.3%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	86.6%	81%	93.8%	31.3%	62.5%	6.3%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	68.1%	46.9%	38.5%	0%	38.5%	61.5%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	80%	70%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	59.4%	56.2%	17.8%	38.4%	41.1%	2.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	78.4%	79.5%	23.3%	56.2%	17.8%	2.7%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	82.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	<10	88.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05									

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)
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	54.3%	53.7%	20.7%	32.9%	34.1%	12.2%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	61.4%	53.8%	16.7%	37.2%	32.1%	14.1%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	51.4%	52.3%	20.5%	31.8%	36.4%	11.4%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	63.6%	65.1%	11.6%	53.5%	23.3%	11.6%
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	57.2%	55.3%	21.1%	34.2%	31.6%	13.2%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	59.2%	40%	22.9%	17.1%	42.9%	17.1%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	55.2%	41.1%	47.5%	15%	32.5%	37.5%	15%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	62.5%	50.1%	50%	8.8%	41.2%	38.2%	11.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	72.3%	46.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
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
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	66.1%	40.9%	41.7%	16.7%	25%	50%	8.3%
Hispanic or	2009-10	100%	71%	53.8%	36.8%	5.3%	31.6%	47.4%	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)
Latino									
White	2008-09	100%	83%	74.7%	65.4%	23.1%	42.3%	23.1%	11.5%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	76.9%	70.8%	37.5%	33.3%	12.5%	16.7%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	60.7%	41.7%	50%	28.6%	21.4%	42.9%	7.1%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	67.6%	48.8%	35.3%	5.9%	29.4%	47.1%	17.6%
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%	54.4%	19.1%	35.3%	32.4%	13.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	51.6%	53.6%	14.5%	39.1%	31.9%	14.5%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	63.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	<10	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 06									
All Students	2008-09	100%	79.9%	68%	61.3%	26.3%	35%	32.5%	6.3%
Female	2008-09	100%	80.9%	69.2%	63.4%	26.8%	36.6%	36.6%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.9%	66.7%	59%	25.6%	33.3%	28.2%	12.8%
Black or	2008-09	100%	61.2%	52.8%	46.3%	17.1%	29.3%	48.8%	4.9%

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)
African American									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	93%	92.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	71.3%	73.7%	77.8%	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%
White	2008-09	100%	85.2%	82.9%	73.7%	36.8%	36.8%	21.1%	5.3%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	62.3%	71.8%	73.3%	20%	53.3%	13.3%	13.3%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	45.5%	31.2%	18.2%	9.1%	9.1%	72.7%	9.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69%	58.6%	58.6%	24.3%	34.3%	35.7%	5.7%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	72.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science									
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	83.1%	57.8%	57.3%	13.4%	43.9%	24.4%	18.3%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	59%	57.5%	16.1%	41.4%	33.3%	9.2%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	56.2%	63.6%	13.6%	50%	18.2%	18.2%

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)
Female	2009-10	100%	81.1%	60.2%	64.4%	20%	44.4%	28.9%	6.7%
Male	2008-09	100%	82.9%	59.4%	50%	13.2%	36.8%	31.6%	18.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	80.8%	57.7%	50%	11.9%	38.1%	38.1%	11.9%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	61.8%	42.4%	50%	12.5%	37.5%	17.5%	32.5%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	59.6%	42.7%	46.2%	2.6%	43.6%	46.2%	7.7%
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
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	72.9%	52.3%	58.3%	0%	58.3%	33.3%	8.3%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	68.8%	58.1%	55%	10%	45%	30%	15%
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	78.5%	65.4%	19.2%	46.2%	30.8%	3.8%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	78.9%	74.1%	40.7%	33.3%	18.5%	7.4%

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	100%	59%	48.4%	50%	0%	50%	42.9%	7.1%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	56.7%	52.3%	55.6%	11.1%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.6%	47.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	60.7%	36.6%	62.5%	12.5%	50%	37.5%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.3%	47.8%	54.4%	11.8%	42.6%	23.5%	22.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	48.6%	57.1%	13%	44.2%	32.5%	10.4%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	62.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	<10	64.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	75.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	83%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	84.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	69.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	74.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	75.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	66.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
White	2008-09	<10	78.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	59.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	60.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	47.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	65.8%	<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: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	31.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	31.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	29.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	30.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
All Students	2009-10	<10	50.7%	34.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	50.6%	<10	<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
White	2009-10	<10	52.8%	41.7%	<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
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	55.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52.5%	35.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	47.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	48%	28.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	60.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	62.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	54.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	60.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	73%	64.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	71.2%	<10	<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
White	2009-10	<10	76.4%	69.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	72.5%	59.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Disadvantaged								
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
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	62.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	65.9%	78.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	62.5%	<10	<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,
Woods Lake Elementary:A Magnet Center For The Arts**

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	89.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	89.9%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	88.3%
Mathematics	99.6%	89.9%
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	85.2%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	99.5%	85.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	96.6%	85.1%
Mathematics	96.6%	87.4%
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
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	94.2%	98.1%
Mathematics	94.2%	97.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	87.9%
Mathematics	99.8%	89.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	104.3%	90.4%
Mathematics	104.3%	87.7%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.6%	94.2%
Mathematics	99.6%	95%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	101.2%	91.5%
Mathematics	101.2%	94%
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
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	98%	90.9%
Mathematics	98%	86.4%
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	106.8%	62.1%
Mathematics	106.8%	77.6%
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	99.6%	87.1%
Mathematics	99.6%	89.2%

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

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

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
All Students	
State	
	75.39%
District	
	63.74%
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	
	94%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	90.3%
School	
	92.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	93.7%
District	
	91%
School	
	98.6%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	96.5%
District	
	95.4%
School	
	95.9%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.1%
District	
	93.2%
School	
	95.3%
White	
State	
	95.7%
District	
	93.9%
School	
	94.3%
Multiracial	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.8%
Limited English Proficient	
State	
	94.6%
District	
	93.3%
School	
	95.1%
Students with Disabilities	
State	
	93.5%
District	
	89.1%
School	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
91.6%	
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
94.8%	
District	
91.9%	
School	
94%	

* 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, Woods Lake Elementary:A Magnet Center For The Arts

School AYP Status

Title 1 Status	AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	Education Yes Report Card Grade	School Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
Yes	Not Met	Met	Not Met	B	N/A	0

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Kalamazoo RESA, Kalamazoo Public School District, Woods Lake Elementary:A Magnet Center For The Arts

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All	0	16	22	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	2.6%
	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