

# Annual Education Report

2008-2009

## Hillside Middle School

1941 Alamo Ave.

Kalamazoo, MI 49006

Phone Number: 269.337.0570 Fax Number: 269.337.1618

[fostergp@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us](mailto:fostergp@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us)



The mission of Hillside Middle School, a diverse family of learners, is to ensure that everyone achieves excellence and social responsibility in an ever-changing world through school and community network.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Ms. Gloria P. Foster-Wimbley

### 2008-09 Board of Education

President: Ms. Patti Sholler-Barber

Vice-President: Ms. Mollie Peterson

Secretary: Ms. Liz Henderson

Treasurer: Mr. Eric Breisach

Trustee: Mr. Phillip W. Dietrich

Trustee: Ms. Marcy L. Peake

Trustee: Ms. Carol McGlenn



Kalamazoo Public Schools

Every child, every opportunity, every time!

# 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	2008 – 2009		2007 – 2008	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	88.7	B	79.7	B
English Language Arts	66.1	D	63.3	D
Science	68.6	D	68.2	D
Social Studies	62.3	D	64.2	D
Achievement Subtotal	71.4	C	68.9	D
Indicators of School	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	81	B	79	C
AYP Status	Met AYP Y		Met AYP Y	
Composite Grade	B		C	
Michigan Accreditation	Accredited		Accredited	

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

## 2008–2009 Highlights

- Eleven students were selected for the State Honors Choir.
- Nineteen students were invited to KAMSC for the fall 2009.
- Hillside conducted its Winter Reading Olympics December through February. Six reading events, one event the All School Read-Hidden Talents by David Lubar. 115 students earned bronze medals for reading 2 books. 95 students earned silver medals for reading 4 books and 66 students earned the gold for reading a book in each event.
- Author visit– Sharon Draper visited in the fall, copies of her book “The Battle of Jericho” were available to students. An assembly was held for Ms. Draper to talk about her writing & answer student questions.
- A grand total of 11,441 books were read by 7th and 8th graders. Certificates were presented to 7th graders who read 50 books or more and five 8th graders received certificates for reading 83,132,138,171 and 238 books.
- Held end of the year award ceremonies for 7th and 8th graders.
- Two students invited to be chef’s for a day with Chef Korycki.

## 2008–2009 Highlights (cont.)

- Held 7th grade Science Fair. Over 200 projects were featured.
- Held Career Fair during Promise Week, over 25 local professionals spoke to our 8th graders.
- Earned AYP for the 2008-2009 school year.
- Honored 1 turn-around student.
- Two 8th grade students received the McCaslin Scholarship Award for \$1000.00 each.
- New after-school Engineering club was implemented. Two EFE teachers from the high school received a K-RESA grant to expose 8th graders to engineering.
- Literacy Night– Celebrated Winter Reading Olympians. Dinner was provided for parents and students while staff emphasized the importance of reading.
- 7th and 8th gr. Choirs qualified for the State competition.

## Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2008		Spring 2009	
	#	%	#	%
Hillside	357	63	324	58

## 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.*

### **Hillside's Parent Involvement**

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

## Highly Qualified Staff

- 100% of the staff is teaching in their credential area of experience.
- No teachers with emergency or provision credentials are teaching in either the high or low poverty schools.
- No teachers are teaching in the classroom in either the high or low poverty schools that are not highly qualified.
- 2 Administrators with a Masters Degree
- 39 teachers; 14 with a Bachelors Degree; 22 with a Masters Degree; and 3 with a Masters+30
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

## School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	To improve Reading performance for the 2009-2010 school year. All students will be reading at or above grade level.
Data to support goal selection:	African American students scored 21% to 31% lower than White students. Economically disadvantaged students scored 24% to 32% lower than economically advantaged students.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will use district curriculum guides and assessments, will incorporate differentiated instruction to all students, and will encourage students to visit the library and to read 20 books or more in the school year.
Accomplishments:	Implementation of a Read 180, intensive reading program which is 90 minutes in length. All school read, all students are expected to read 20 books versus 18 books (2008-09) in the 2009-2010 school year, 59% of our students read more than 18 books or more
Implications for next year:	Study skills courses need to focus on reading strategies, and create a master schedule which will support more instructional time for reading for all students.
Writing	
Goal:	All students will write at or above grade level.
Data to support goal selection:	67% of 8th graders met or exceeded standards on the 2008 MEAP writing test; 55% of African American students met or exceeded standards, whereas 70% of Hispanic students met or exceeded standards while 80% White students met or exceeded the writing standards
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	All teachers will incorporate writing in weekly lesson plans. ELA teachers will utilize the Calkins method of writing and incorporate cooperative learning and alternative methods of instruction to improve student writing technique.
Accomplishments:	Writing strategies taught as part of the curriculum. Ongoing professional development with consultant.
Implications for next year:	Writing must be done in all classes using consistent writing strategies.
Math	
Goal:	To improve mathematics performance 2009-2010, all students will be performing math at or above grade level.
Data to support goal selection:	8th grade; 70% of all students scored proficient on the 2008 MEAP; Only 61% of African American and 59% of Hispanic while 81% of White student scored proficient. Only 59% of Economically disadvantaged students scored proficient while 80% Economically advantaged scored proficient
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Any student in need of additional support in math can receive assistance through extended activities and scheduled courses. Teachers and Counselors will identify minority and economically disadvantaged students who are eligible for advance course work and make recommendations for placement.
Accomplishments:	Implementation of teaching one 7th grade math unit in an EOD, allowing more time for challenging units in the year long math class. Continue math tutoring service for students Tuesday and Thursday every week of the school year.
Implications for next year:	Allowing more instructional time for students who have been identified via MEAP and Ed Performance, coupling and EOD with regularly scheduled math course.

## School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	To support goals for reading, writing and math through the integration of math, reading, and writing skills within the context of science.
Data to support goal selection:	African American students are scoring almost 3 grade levels behind White students. On the 2008 MEAP Science test African American and Economically disadvantaged students scored almost 30% below White and Economically advantaged students.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Incorporate math, reading, and writing skills within the context of science. All teachers will use interdisciplinary lessons.
Accomplishments:	
Implications for next year:	Emphasis for all core teams to incorporate interdisciplinary lessons on a consistent basis.

Social Studies	
Goal:	To support goals for reading, writing and math through the integration of math, reading and writing skills within the context of social studies.
Data to support goal selection:	N/A
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Incorporate math, reading and writing skills within the context of social studies. All teachers will use interdisciplinary lessons.
Accomplishments:	
Implications for next year:	Emphasis for all core teams to incorporate interdisciplinary lessons on a consistent basis.



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

## School Assessment Data

### Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: READING/ LANGUAGE ARTS (ELA)

Student Group 7th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	65	52	74	92	12	53	25	10
	2008-09	66	62	80	99	9	56	25	9
African American	2007-08	52	37	49	91	2	50	35	14
	2008-09	50	48	62	100	4	46	38	13
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08			70					
	2008-09			77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	85					
	2008-09	80	83	91	91	10	70	10	10
Hispanic	2007-08	56	48	62	84	6	50	38	6
	2008-09		59	71					
White	2007-08	79	73	82	95	23	56	15	6
	2008-09	81	79	85	98	14	66	14	5
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	17	14	32	66	0	17	52	30
	2008-09	33	27	41	100	0	33	22	44
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	50	46	43	74	0	50	36	14
	2008-09	46	54	54	100	0	46	38	15
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	47	37	59	91	2	45	37	16
	2008-09	51	52	69	96	5	46	37	13
Migrant	2007-08			50					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	56	46	70	89	13	43	32	13
	2008-09	61	57	76	100	7	54	25	14
Female	2007-08	76	58	79	96	11	65	18	6
	2008-09	71	67	84	98	13	58	25	4

Student Group 8th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	62	55	75	93	6	56	25	13
	2008-09	73	60	77	94	17	56	22	5
African American	2007-08	49	40	55	94	2	46	31	20
	2008-09	63	46	58	93	8	55	29	8
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		70	70					
	2008-09			73					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	86					
	2008-09		100	88					
Hispanic	2007-08	50	47	63	93	7	43	29	21
	2008-09	65	52	67	87	10	55	35	0
White	2007-08	75	72	82	93	9	66	20	5
	2008-09	84	80	82	96	26	57	13	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	22	18	34	77	0	22	37	41
	2008-09	25	14	34	87	5	20	50	25
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	62	43	44	87	8	54	31	8
	2008-09	60	51	48	100	7	53	40	0
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	52	42	62	84	1	51	31	17
	2008-09	60	47	64	90	3	57	32	8
Migrant	2007-08			51					
	2008-09			56					
Male	2007-08	55	46	69	93	3	52	27	18
	2008-09	68	56	73	93	18	51	25	6
Female	2007-08	70	63	81	94	9	61	24	6
	2008-09	78	64	81	95	15	63	18	4

**Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: MATHEMATICS**

Student Group 7th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	71	51	73	92	37	34	24	5
	2008-09	72	65	83	99	42	30	23	5
African American	2007-08	59	38	48	92	19	40	34	7
	2008-09	61	54	63	100	22	39	32	7
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08			67					
	2008-09			79					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	88					
	2008-09	80	83	94	91	80	0	20	0
Hispanic	2007-08	63	43	61	84	31	31	31	6
	2008-09		67	75					
White	2007-08	83	71	80	95	54	29	14	3
	2008-09	82	79	88	98	59	24	14	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	21	10	32	69	4	17	50	29
	2008-09	32	31	46	100	7	25	39	29
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	57	42	50	74	21	36	36	7
	2008-09	38	61	66	100	38	0	54	8
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	52	36	58	92	15	37	39	9
	2008-09	59	57	72	97	21	38	34	7
Migrant	2007-08			56					
	2008-09			72					
Male	2007-08	68	51	71	89	37	31	24	8
	2008-09	67	64	81	100	42	25	25	7
Female	2007-08	74	51	74	96	37	37	24	2
	2008-09	76	66	84	98	41	35	21	3

Student Group 8th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	61	51	71	94	34	27	24	16
	2008-09	70	56	75	96	40	30	23	7
African American	2007-08	54	38	45	94	21	30	27	22
	2008-09	61	45	52	95	23	38	28	11
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		50	67					
	2008-09			72					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		92	89					
	2008-09	90	79	89	100	90	0	10	0
Hispanic	2007-08	29	36	59	93	14	14	36	36
	2008-09	59	46	64	96	23	36	32	9
White	2007-08	75	70	79	94	49	25	18	7
	2008-09	81	75	81	97	58	24	15	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	14	24	32	80	0	14	46	39
	2008-09	45	31	39	87	15	30	35	20
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	46	35	51	87	15	31	23	31
	2008-09	47	41	57	82	29	18	35	18
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	47	40	56	84	19	27	33	21
	2008-09	59	44	62	94	19	40	30	12
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			64					
Male	2007-08	57	52	71	94	28	28	25	18
	2008-09	75	59	75	96	43	32	17	8
Female	2007-08	66	51	72	94	41	25	2	12
	2008-09	64	53	74	97	36	28	30	7

**Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Science**

Student Group 8th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	70	58	79	93	27	43	22	8
	2008-09	72	54	76	94	34	38	19	10
African American	2007-08	54	42	54	92	15	40	33	12
	2008-09	56	37	51	92	18	38	28	16
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		60	78					
	2008-09			74					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		83	88					
	2008-09	90	93	87	90	60	30	0	10
Hispanic	2007-08	57	48	67	93	7	50	29	14
	2008-09	77	55	64	96	23	55	14	9
White	2007-08	86	79	87	95	41	45	10	4
	2008-09	85	76	84	96	51	34	11	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	25	19	48	80	4	21	32	43
	2008-09	37	19	42	83	21	16	26	37
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	62	42	49	87	0	62	23	15
	2008-09	65	50	48	82	6	59	18	18
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	56	44	65	84	13	44	32	12
	2008-09	57	39	62	91	12	45	26	17
Migrant	2007-08			54					
	2008-09			55					
Male	2007-08	67	57	79	93	27	40	24	9
	2008-09	72	54	75	94	40	32	15	14
Female	2007-08	73	60	80	94	26	47	19	7
	2008-09	72	53	77	94	27	44	23	5

## Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

### Achievement Targets in Relation to AYP Targets and Attendance Rate

	Reading/Language Arts						Mathematics						Additional Academic Indicator		
	Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Attendance Rate		
Student Group Middle School	Goal: 95%			Goal: 54%			Goal: 95%			Goal: 54%			Goal: 90%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	98	98	96	86	83		100	99	97	94	90		92	92	
African American	99	98	94	79	76		100	99	96	91	86		91	91	
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	N/A	N/A	94	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	95	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	100	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	100	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	N/A	99	96	N/A	85		N/A	101	98	N/A	91		N/A	93	
White	99	98	97	91	90		100	99	97	95	94		93	94	
Students with Disabilities	101	100		N/A	53		103	102		N/A	68		86	90	
Limited English Proficient	97	99		N/A	83		100	102		N/A	91		N/A	93	
Economically Disadvantaged	100	99		76	77		101	100		89	87		90	91	



# Core Curriculum

The purpose of the Kalamazoo Public Schools curriculum is to ensure that all students learn the same essential content based on the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) standards and expectations. The curriculum ensures that students will be able to access, evaluate, and use information in a technology-dependent world. The curriculum provides optimal learning opportunities for all students and is designed to ensure post-secondary success in institutions of higher education and the workplace.

## **The Process of Curriculum Development and Alignment**

As of 2007-2008, curriculum leaders, in conjunction with teachers, have integrated three major approaches to curriculum work in the development model. This model recognizes that creating curriculum guides alone does not enhance student achievement; it is merely the first step. Curriculum work must funnel down to classroom instruction, assessment, and instructional improvement based on data in order to maximize student achievement. As such, the model is focused on the work of Ainsworth, Marzano, Wiggins, and Tomlinson specifically as related to using standards for curriculum development, unit design, lesson design, instruction, differentiated instruction, and assessment (formative and summative). Our current process is indicated below:

- Unpack and prioritize Michigan Department of Education's grade level content standards (i.e., GLCEs and HSCEs).
- Unpack expectations using Ainsworth model of identifying verbs, nouns, concepts, skills, big ideas, essential questions, identify level of Bloom's Taxonomy for each expectation, create assessment items aligned to each prioritized standard
- Prioritize expectations
- Group expectations to create measurement topics
- Create end of course assessments
- Create assessment map
- Chunk
- Create course map and common formative assessments\*
- Train team in data analysis
- Create units of instruction using the Understanding by Design (UbD) model
- Implement, assess, reflect, modify for improvement

\*Common formative assessments are defined as periodic or interim assessments, collaboratively designed by grade-level or course teams of teachers and administered to all students in a grade level or course several times during the quarter, semester, trimester, or entire school year (Ainsworth, 2006).

The process of revising curriculum guides in the district involves teaches and curriculum leaders collaboratively conducting gap analyses using the following approach, in part, outlined by MDE:

- Standards and expectations published by MDE are identified and prioritized.
- Teams review existing documents to 1) determine whether GLCEs or HSCEs are taught in the curriculum and 2) identify the level of proficiency outcomes should be met.
- Pacing guides are reviewed to determine alignment along with corresponding resources.

Guides requiring revisions adhere to the cycle noted under *Process for Curriculum Development*.

All curriculum guides in the district are based on state standards and expectations. Serving as *living documents*, curriculum guides are reviewed annually to ensure alignment to state expectations and to incorporate needed revisions based on student data, research on best practices, and feedback from all stakeholders. In an effort to increase student achievement and effectively implement the curriculum, teachers across content areas engage in ongoing professional development. The sessions are designed to assist teachers in developing their capacity to a) further study and develop strategies to implement the GLCEs and HSCEs, b) use data to drive instruction, and c) identify areas of interest to strengthen classroom instruction. The district offers a variety of professional growth opportunities: differentiated professional development that allows teachers to develop in areas of interest; grade level/department sessions; school and district-wide sessions based on curriculum, data, and school improvement plans; training for group facilitators and content leaders representing their respective buildings; and voluntary after school sessions to further support instruction.

Several data warehousing systems are accessed to plan and evaluate professional development (building and district level), evaluate the impact of curriculum and instruction on student achievement, and support the development of school improvement plans. At the building level, staff members further align classroom instruction based on results from item analyses, disaggregated data based on subgroups, and noted trends over a period of time. At the district level, both aggregate and disaggregated data are used to establish academic goals, identify programming needs, and plan meaningful and relevant professional development.

## **The Foundation of Core Courses**

All core courses (English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) are based on GLCEs or HSCEs. Students have access to courses across levels with opportunities for differentiated instruction. Resources are aligned to curriculum guides based on state expectations and offer activities to meet diverse learning styles and needs. Classes plan for small and whole group differentiated instruction to ensure that all students have equal and equitable access to appropriate core outcomes. Student data (formative and context-bound) is also used to guide decision making and select appropriate resources. Special education teachers receive core curriculum guides and participate in training to interpret expectations for areas under study. Special education teachers also have the opportunity to work with building teams in identifying best practices for reaching struggling learners. Professional development opportunities with corresponding resources are offered to all teachers in the district

### **Teaching to Expectations (Units of Study)**

Curriculum documents are designed to teach the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs) to all students. The units of study are divided into three stages based on the genres to be explicitly taught at each grade level. **Stage 1** of each unit identifies the desired results for all students in a specific grade level. Stage 1 specifies what each student should know, understand, and be able to do at the end of the unit. The “desired results” designates the content worthy of understanding, what enduring understandings are desired, and what essential questions will be explored. Stage 1 calls for clarity about the priorities of the unit. **Stage 2** of each unit determines the acceptable evidence from the desired understandings and content of the unit of study. Stage 2 provides diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment to allow educators to know when students have achieved the desired results of the unit. This stage describes the acceptable evidence of a student’s understanding and proficiency. The assessment evidence reflects the desired results of Stage 1. **Stage 3** of each unit is the instructional plan. Stage 3 suggests the activities, sequence, and resources which are best suited to accomplish the goals established in Stage 1. This stage focuses on the knowledge and skills students need to perform effectively to achieve the desired results. The goal is to make teaching engaging and effective for learners, while always keeping the end in mind.

### **English Language Arts**

The kindergarten through third grade curriculum writing teams drafted reading guides winter 2009. All elementary teachers received draft guides and professional development fall 2009 and 2010. Full implementation of guides in classrooms is scheduled fall 2010.

In the area of writing at the elementary level, teams will assemble during the 2009-2010 school year to review resources. The outcome of the review will drive development of K-5 writing curriculum guides during 2010-2011 with full implementation and professional development in 2011-2012. Serving as living documents, writing teams will review guides yearly to a) incorporate diagnostic assessments, b) adjust expectations for learning experiences based on data, c) include scaffolding and reference materials, and d) strengthen units of study. At the secondary level, teams assembled fall 2009 to review resources and write guides for targeted courses. English curriculum guides drafted in 2007-2008 were scheduled for full implementation during 2009-2010 or 2010-2011. Professional development activities occurred fall 2009 and will in fall 2010. Plans to conduct resources audits for specific elective English courses will occur during 2011-2012 with possible adoption recommendations and curriculum development work in 2012-2013.

### **Math**

A representative group of elementary teachers assembled in fall 2008 to explore options for new resources aligned with state expectations and based on best practices for grades K-5. Following the scheduled resource pilot in January 2009, mathematics leadership team members will identify and recommended a new series in March 2009. Professional development activities were scheduled for late summer and fall 2009 that provided assistance to classroom teachers with using guides and new textbook series to teach grade-level content expectations. During 2008-2010, 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.