

Annual Education Report

2008-2009

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in Westwood

1100 Nichols Road

Kalamazoo, MI 49006

Phone Number: 269.337.0610 . Fax Number: 269.337.1624

darcangelisjb@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us

The mission of our school, a partnership of family, staff and community, is to ensure that each student develops an academic foundation and unique talents; students will become lifelong learners and responsible citizens through inspired, personalized, innovative instruction in a safe, creative and caring environment.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Ms. Judy D’Arcangelis

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	93.5	A	A	A
English Language Arts	82.1	B	B	B
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	87.8	B	B	B
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	A	A
Preliminary	92	A	A	A
AYP Status	Met AYP -Y		Met AYP -Y	
Composite Grade	A		A	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Accredited		Accredited	

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

2008–2009 Highlights

- High Academic Achievement
 - Sustained high performance in reading, mathematics, science
 - Improved student writing
- The *Reading Recovery* program
- The full-day kindergarten program continued for sixth year (district-wide for first time in 2008–09).
- Power Library concept
- *Guys Read* and *Reading Divas* (book clubs)
- *Reach Out and Read Open Library* after school program
- After school math tutoring program (Gr. 4–6)
- Community partners joined our visual art, vocal and instrumental music, and classroom teachers in providing arts learning experiences for all children.
- Kalamazoo Communities In Schools Full Service School
- Title 1 School/Community Resources Facilitator received CHAMPS Award from KCIS

2008–2009 Highlights (cont.)

- CHASE Publishing Center, ROARING WRITERS
- Elementary Track Meet, 5th & 6th graders
- Breakfast of Champions—6th grade boys
- Global Reading Challenge– 1 team in city finals
- Destination Imagination– 2 teams in state challenge
- Seven raised gardens built (funding from Kalamazoo Foundation)
- Positive Behavior Supports continue to build a culture of being respectful, orderly, attentive, and responsible.
- Two 6th graders implemented special project for YWCA’s Domestic Assault Center
- Co-ed sports teams; Girls on the Run.

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2008		Spring 2009	
	#	%	#	%
King-Westwood	608	98	597	98

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.

King Westwood’s Parent Involvement

Parents are encouraged to participate in the Parent Teacher 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; 1 with a Masters Degree; 1 with a Masters+30
- 36 teachers; 14 with a Bachelors Degree; 18 with a Masters Degree; and 4 with a Masters+30
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	Our goal was to increase the percentage of students at or exceeding expectations in reading as measured by MEAP in grades 3 through 6 (with particular focus on 4th grade reading achievement as measured in early 5th grade). It was our goal to reduce gaps in reading proficiency between economically disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students and between Black students and White students in all grades with specific focus on grade 4 instruction (as measured on the MEAP in the beginning of grade 5.) Students in grade 1 needed to improve in the areas of vocabulary and reading as measured on the <i>Iowa Test of Basic Skills</i> .
Data to support goal selection:	<p>The percentage of 5th grade students in the economically disadvantaged sub-group who met or exceeded expectations on the fall 2007 MEAP was lower than the district average (i.e., 59% vs. 60%). There is also a large gap in meeting or exceeding expectations between our 5th grade economically disadvantaged vs. non-economically disadvantaged students (i.e., 59% vs. 90%).</p> <p>Students in first grade were below the district average in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and total reading (39% school, 42% district at grade level in comprehension; 56% school, 58% comprehension; 48% school, 50% district total reading). The same kind of pattern was evident for the 1st grade students who were African-American, White, receiving free and reduced lunch, and not receiving free and reduced lunch.</p>
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Our school planned to sustain high reading achievement in all grades (whole groups and sub-groups) through instructional programs/strategies that were in place (including <i>Reading Recovery</i> in grade 1). Increased reading performance of our students as measured in fifth grade was to be addressed through increasing targeted intervention strategies implemented in grade 4 and 5. First grade classroom teachers were to increase emphasis on vocabulary and comprehension.
Accomplishments:	<p>Fall 2008 MEAP: All grades and subgroups measured met or exceeded the state target percentages. The achievement gap between African American and White students and the gap between free/reduced lunch students and paid lunch students is much smaller in 3rd grade than in subsequent grades. Fall 2009 MEAP data will be studied to gain further understanding of student reading strengths and needs in reading.</p> <p><i>Iowa Test of Basic Skills</i>: All 1st grade, 2nd grade, and 3rd grade subgroups met grade level equivalency (i.e., 1.7, 2.7, or 3.7 respectively) or better at time of testing except special education students in grades 2 and 3. Most 4th grade subgroups met the expectation of 4.7 grade level equivalency or better at time of testing too with the exception of African American students (4.3, free/reduced lunch students 4.2, and special education students 2.8).</p> <p><i>EdPerformance</i>: The total groups in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 exceeded district averages and expected grade level estimates on <i>EdPerformance</i>. White students and paid lunch students were above expectations in all grades as well. Free and reduced lunch students were below expected grade level estimates in grade 4 (4.2) and grade 5 (5.2). African American students were below grade level expectations in grade 3 (3.6), grade 4 (4.4), grade 5 (5.1), and grade 6 (5.7).</p> <p><i>Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)</i>: 99% of first grade students were at benchmark in May 2009. There were lower percentages of children at benchmark for reading fluency in grade 2 (72%), 3 (67%), 4 (60%), 5 (70%), and 6 (65%).</p>
Implications for next year:	Most students are learning to read well at our school. As groups, African American and economically disadvantaged students are doing less well than White and non-economically disadvantaged students. This gap becomes larger in grade 4. It is important that we continue development and implementation of effective interventions to use with struggling readers in all grades (with particular focus on children in grades 4 and 5). Students in grades 2 through 5 also need to improve in reading fluency.

Writing

<p>Goal:</p>	<p>Our goal was to improve student writing skills in all grades.</p> <p>Planned measurement of this goal: Students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 would meet or exceed the state ELA MEAP proficiency targets in writing (i.e., 60%, 59%, 57%, and 56% respectively), including all students; African-American and White students; free/reduced lunch students and non-free/reduced lunch students. Writing achievement improvements were especially needed in total group (grades 3 & 4), African-American subgroups (especially grade 4), and economically disadvantaged subgroups (all grades).</p>
<p>Data to support goal selection:</p>	<p><u>MEAP 2007 Results</u></p> <p>Low percentages of 4th grade students were writing successfully (i.e., the following percentages of 4th grade students met or exceeded state standards: 40% total population; 18% African-American students; 55% White students; 28% free/reduced lunch students; 49% non-free/reduced lunch students).</p> <p>In addition, the percentages of African-American students proficient on the MEAP writing assessment in grades 3, 5, and 6 were of concern: 47% (grade 3); 41% (grade 5); and 43% (grade 6). The percentages of free/reduced lunch students were of concern in grades, 3, 5, and 6: 42% (grade 3); 32% (grade 5); and 43% (grade 6).</p> <p>Large percentages of White and non-free/reduced lunch students did well in writing in Grades 3 (69%, 73%), 5 (77%, 80%) and 6th grades (88%, 84%).</p>
<p>Planned Strategies and Interventions:</p>	<p>The teaching of writing was to be a priority in building professional development, grade level meeting content, collaborative planning among grade level teachers, strong delivery of process writing instruction in the classroom, and monitoring by the principal and assistant principal. Better education of our parents about process writing and what to look for in homework assignments was also to be emphasized. A 30-45 minute writing block was implemented this year in all grades district-wide to better support the teaching and learning of writing.</p>
<p>Accomplishments:</p>	<p><u>MEAP 2008</u></p> <p>Our third grade students did relatively well (with total group, White students, and paid lunch students exceeding the state target percentage and African American and free/reduced lunch students (14% and 10% behind the target respectively).</p> <p>Our 4th grade students did not do well in writing (with no sub-group or total group meeting the state target). Especially concerning was that only 24% of African American 4th graders and 18% of free/reduced lunch 4th graders were proficient.</p> <p>There was some improvement in our 5th grade students' writing with 67% of white students and 65% of paid lunch students exceeding the state target. Our African American 5th grade students did not make the target (36%), nor did the free/reduced lunch students (41%) or total group (54%). There was some gain made over previous year in the African American and free/reduced lunch subgroups (as even a lower percentage than this year were proficient in their 4th grade years).</p> <p>There was significant gain in our 6th grade students' writing with all subgroups measured meeting or exceeding the state target except our free/reduced lunch students (44%).</p> <p>Instructional time was increased as planned during 2008-2009.</p>
<p>Implications for next year:</p>	<p>Writing instruction needs to strengthen with particular attention paid to providing extra support to our African American and free/reduced lunch students. Periodic student writing samples need to be studied, with targeted guidance in improving writing provided.</p> <p>[Note: The MEAP writing assessment will be in grade 4 only in 2009, which will make comparison with most of the data above impossible. Periodic assessments of writing samples will be important.</p>

Math

<p>Goal:</p>	<p>It is our goal to improve mathematics achievement in all grades (total groups and subgroups). Our African-American and economically disadvantaged students are especially needing to improve. 1st grade students also need to improve on their mathematics performance.</p> <p>Measurable goals: a) African-American students and economically disadvantaged students at our school will meet or exceed the state proficiency targets on the math MEAP (i.e., Grade 3 – 67%; Grade 4 – 65%; Grade 5 – 62%; and Grade 6 – 60%). B) First grade students will increase their performance on the IOWA mathematics assessment to a grade equivalency of 2.0 (beyond the minimum 1.7 expectation for time of testing).</p>
<p>Data to support goal selection:</p>	<p><u>Fall 2007 MEAP Results</u></p> <p>Our total grade level groups and subgroups met or exceeded the MEAP state targets except 6th grade African-American students. Our economically disadvantaged students just made the targets in grades 4, 5, and 6.</p> <p>Our 1st grade students have had grade equivalents of 1.8, 1.7, and 1.8 for the past three years on the IOWA Mathematics Test. Students in grades 2, 3, and 4 are scoring at or above grade level on the IOWA mathematics tests.</p> <p><u>Fall 2008 MEAP Results</u></p> <p>MEAP data indicate that all groups and sub-groups in grades 3, 4, and 6 met state targets in mathematics (i.e., 67%, 65%, and 60% respectively). African American and free/reduced lunch students in 5th grade did not meet the target with 53% and 57% proficient. In addition there are gaps between African American students and White students and free/reduced lunch students and paid lunch students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 with particularly large ones in 5th grade (i.e., 34% gap between African American students and White students; 26% gap between free/reduced lunch students and paid lunch students).</p> <p><u>Iowa Test of Basic Skills</u></p> <p>Our 1st grade students had grade equivalents of 1.8, 1.7, and 1.8 for the prior three years on the IOWA Mathematics Test. (1.7 grade level equivalency expected). Students in grades 2, 3, and 4 scored above grade level on the IOWA mathematics tests.</p>
<p>Planned Strategies and Interventions:</p>	<p>Strategies planned included targeted interventions to support improved mathematics performance of our African-American students, our disadvantaged students, and our 1st grade students as a whole group. <i>Accelerated Mathematics</i> tutoring was offered to below grade level 4th and 6th grade students after school. A few 5th grade students were also invited to the after school tutoring program.</p>
<p>Accomplishments:</p>	<p>Fall 2008 MEAP data indicated that all groups and sub-groups in grades 3, 4, and 6 met state targets in mathematics (i.e., 67%, 65%, and 60% respectively). African American and free/reduced lunch students in 5th grade did not meet the target of (62%) with 53% and 57% proficient. Examination of Fall 2009 MEAP data when available will help in further analysis of mathematics progress in 2008-09.</p> <p><i>Spring 2009 IOWA Test of Basic Skills:</i> Many 1st through 4th grade sub-groups were at or above expected grade equivalency of 1.7, 2.7, 3.7, and 4.7 respectively. They included male students, White students, paid lunch students, and non-special education students in all grades; female students in grades 1, 3, and 4; Hispanic students in grades 2, 3, and 4.</p> <p><i>Spring 2009 IOWA Test of Basic Skills:</i> African American students were below expected grade equivalency in grades 1 through 4: 1.5, 2.4, 3.6, and 4.6 respectively. Free/reduced lunch students were below expected grade equivalency in grades 1 through 4 as well: 1.4, 2.4, 3.6, and 4.4. Special education students were more than a year below grade level in grades 2, 3, and 4: 1.5, 2.1, and 3.2. Hispanic students in grade 1 were slightly below grade level equivalency (1.6). Female students in grade 2 were slightly below grade level equivalency (2.6).</p> <p><i>EdPerformance:</i> The total group in grade 3 exceeded district averages and expected grade level estimates. Paid lunch students and White students exceeded expected grade level estimates in all tested grades (i.e., 3, 4, 5, and 6). African American students and free/reduced lunch student subgroups did not meet expected grade level estimates in all tested grades (i.e., 3, 4, 5, and 6).</p>
<p>Implications for next year:</p>	<p>Mathematics achievement is strong for many of our students. Our data sources indicate some mix in results, however; the conclusion one can make is that our economically disadvantaged students and African American students are doing less well in mathematics than White students and paid lunch students. Even where targets have been met, there is a gap in performance between these subgroups. Implementation of the new KPS Mathematics Curriculum Guide, newly adopted Scott Foresman <i>Mathematics</i> core program, greater parent understanding of the curriculum, and increased differentiation should help our school increase mathematics achievement for all students and decrease gaps.</p>

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	A science goal was not included in our 2008-09 School Improvement Plan.
Data to support goal selection:	A science goal has been added to our 2009-2010 School Improvement Plan based on data described in the accomplishments section below. Our goal is that the percentages of 5th grade students increase in proficiency on the science MEAP to 80% (total group), 65% (African American), and 65% (free/reduced lunch status). A second goal is to increase grade level equivalent <i>EdPerformance</i> scores in science to 3.6, 4.6, and 5.6 in grades 3, 4, and 5 respectively (all sub-groups).
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Vocabulary and the scientific process are stressed. We are increasing reading in science to supplement the hands-on science learning in the BCMSC science kits. Full implementation of the BCMSC science kits will be completed in 2009-2010 as well.
Accomplishments:	1) Science is an area of strength in our school although we did see drops in all subgroups this year. (This may in part be due to the partial implementation of a new science program in 4 th grade last year.) Percentages proficient on the MEAP were total group (70%), male (69%), female (71%), African American (53%), White (87%), free/reduced lunch (52%), and paid lunch (87%). The same pattern of gaps between African American students and White students as well free/reduced lunch and paid lunch students is evident in our science data (34% and 35% respectively) as in other subject areas. 2) <i>EdPerformance</i> data indicate that 3rd and 4th grade White, paid lunch, and total groups of students exceed expectations for their grades. African American and free/reduced lunch students are below expectations.
Implications for next year:	Our African American students and free/reduced lunch students in all grades need to improve in science. The total group in grades 5 needs to improve in science as well. Full implementation of the Battle Creek Mathematics and Science Center curriculum in 2009-2010 with emphasis on vocabulary and the scientific process should help improve student achievement.
Social Studies	
Goal:	A social studies goal was not included in our 2008-09 School Improvement Plan.
Data to support goal selection:	A social studies goal has been added to our 2009-2010 School Improvement Plan based on data described in the accomplishments section below. Our goal is that the percentages of 6th grade students who attended school at King-Westwood increases to 75%(total group), 53% (African=American), and 58% (free/reduced lunch status).
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Increased emphasis on background knowledge, vocabulary, and current events will be done through class discussion and reading from a variety of sources. Integration of content areas into reading comprehension instruction will be increased as well.
Accomplishments:	Social Studies is a relative area of strength although there were drops in all subgroups this year. Percentages proficient on the MEAP were total group (65%), male (74%), female (58%), African American (43%), White (82%), free/reduced lunch (48%), and paid lunch (77%). The same pattern of gaps between African American students and White students as well free/reduced lunch and paid lunch students is evident in our social studies data (39% and 29% respectively) as in other areas of the curriculum.
Implications for next year:	Careful attention needs to be given to our African American and free/reduced lunch students as social studies' instruction is implemented. More emphasis on background knowledge and vocabulary may be needed.

School Assessment Data

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

Student Group 3rd 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	80	68	81	95	25	55	20	0
	2008-09	87	73	83	100	26	61	11	1
African American	2007-08	81	58	67	94	13	69	19	0
	2008-09	79	65	69	100	13	67	17	4
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		64	79					
	2008-09		82	80					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		89	90					
	2008-09		83	92					
Hispanic	2007-08		60	71					
	2008-09		62	74					
White	2007-08	81	80	85	97	38	44	19	0
	2008-09	89	85	87	100	37	53	11	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		36	53					
	2008-09		47	55					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		61	63					
	2008-09		60	69					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	75	60	71	97	11	64	25	0
	2008-09	82	65	74	100	9	74	15	3
Migrant	2007-08			64					
	2008-09			64					
Male	2007-08	85	64	78	92	30	54	15	0
	2008-09	88	72	81	100	24	63	12	0
Female	2007-08	70	71	84	100	13	57	30	0
	2008-09	86	74	86	100	28	59	10	3

Student Group 4th 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	74	56	76	93	17	57	20	6
	2008-09	71	57	77	97	15	57	28	1
African American	2007-08	60	43	56	90	9	51	33	7
	2008-09	52	43	56	98	5	48	48	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		61	74					
	2008-09		46	73					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		80	86					
	2008-09		100	88					
Hispanic	2007-08		51	64					
	2008-09		48	64					
White	2007-08	84	73	82	97	23	61	13	4
	2008-09	85	76	83	98	22	63	14	2
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		30	43					
	2008-09		22	44					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		45	49					
	2008-09		51	50					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	54	45	63	87	20	35	35	11
	2008-09	49	46	64	100	2	47	49	2
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			51					
Male	2007-08	77	54	73	91	17	60	17	6
	2008-09	68	54	74	95	10	58	32	0
Female	2007-08	72	59	80	95	18	54	23	5
	2008-09	75	61	79	100	20	55	23	2

Student Group 5th 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	78	64	78	90	28	50	19	3
	2008-09	72	59	78	100	12	60	22	6
African American	2007-08	65	49	58	92	18	47	29	6
	2008-09	60	46	58	100	2	58	28	11
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	73					
	2008-09		73	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		75	86					
	2008-09		94	89					
Hispanic	2007-08		61	63					
	2008-09		60	66					
White	2007-08	87	81	84	91	34	52	13	0
	2008-09	81	75	84	100	21	60	19	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		23	42					
	2008-09		25	42					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		54	44					
	2008-09		58	50					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	56	53	65	81	15	41	35	9
	2008-09	57	49	66	100	9	48	31	11
Migrant	2007-08			45					
	2008-09			54					
Male	2007-08	76	59	75	86	31	45	20	4
	2008-09	69	56	76	100	12	57	26	5
Female	2007-08	79	68	81	95	25	55	19	2
	2008-09	75	62	81	100	13	63	18	7

Student Group 6th 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	83	62	80	94	23	60	16	1
	2008-09	75	67	80	97	20	55	22	3
African American	2007-08	68	49	59	92	11	57	30	2
	2008-09	66	54	61	95	12	54	32	2
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		73	78					
	2008-09		70	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		85	89					
	2008-09		92	89					
Hispanic	2007-08		58	69					
	2008-09		63	68					
White	2007-08	92	76	86	94	30	63	8	0
	2008-09	83	83	85	98	29	53	16	2
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		27	41					
	2008-09		21	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		46	53					
	2008-09		69	50					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	65	51	67	91	8	58	33	3
	2008-09	56	58	68	100	7	49	40	5
Migrant	2007-08			63					
	2008-09			58					
Male	2007-08	78	56	76	93	22	56	20	2
	2008-09	78	65	77	98	22	57	22	0
Female	2007-08	88	68	83	95	24	64	12	0
	2008-09	73	70	82	97	19	54	22	5

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: MATHEMATICS

Student Group 3rd 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	86	76	90	96	46	40	14	0
	2008-09	93	81	91	100	63	30	7	0
African American	2007-08	88	67	76	94	31	56	13	0
	2008-09	92	74	79	100	42	50	8	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		91	90					
	2008-09		82	92					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	97					
	2008-09		91	96					
Hispanic	2007-08		72	85					
	2008-09		74	87					
White	2007-08	88	87	94	97	63	25	13	0
	2008-09	95	92	95	100	74	21	5	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		52	77					
	2008-09		71	55					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		73	83					
	2008-09		72	85					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	81	69	84	97	28	53	19	0
	2008-09	91	76	86	100	47	44	9	0
Migrant	2007-08			85					
	2008-09			80					
Male	2007-08	89	78	90	94	47	43	11	0
	2008-09	95	84	92	100	68	27	5	0
Female	2007-08	78	75	90	100	43	35	22	0
	2008-09	90	79	91	100	55	34	10	0

Student Group 4th 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	82	66	86	93	43	39	15	4
	2008-09	86	69	88	97	47	39	13	1
African American	2007-08	67	53	69	90	16	51	27	7
	2008-09	76	57	74	98	29	48	21	2
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		67	85					
	2008-09		62	87					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		81	95					
	2008-09		100	95					
Hispanic	2007-08		56	79					
	2008-09		67	81					
White	2007-08	93	84	91	97	61	32	5	2
	2008-09	92	84	92	98	58	34	8	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		49	65					
	2008-09		47	68					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		55	74					
	2008-09		64	76					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	65	55	77	87	28	37	28	7
	2008-09	73	59	80	100	24	49	24	2
Migrant	2007-08			81					
	2008-09			82					
Male	2007-08	81	67	86	91	50	31	15	4
	2008-09	86	70	88	95	49	37	12	2
Female	2007-08	82	64	86	95	37	46	14	4
	2008-09	86	68	88	100	45	41	14	0

Student Group 5th 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	78	59	74	90	53	25	20	2
	2008-09	71	54	77	100	44	27	21	8
African American	2007-08	71	42	51	92	35	35	29	0
	2008-09	53	41	55	100	21	32	32	15
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	68					
	2008-09		47	72					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		62	90					
	2008-09		88	92					
Hispanic	2007-08		57	62					
	2008-09		41	66					
White	2007-08	85	78	81	91	66	20	11	3
	2008-09	87	75	83	100	65	21	12	2
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		33	44					
	2008-09		30	47					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		48	54					
	2008-09		42	61					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	62	48	60	81	26	35	38	0
	2008-09	57	45	64	100	31	26	26	17
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	78	61	75	86	55	24	22	0
	2008-09	76	57	78	100	52	24	16	9
Female	2007-08	77	58	73	95	51	26	19	4
	2008-09	66	51	76	100	36	30	27	7

Student Group 6th 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	80	55	73	95	60	20	13	7
	2008-09	82	68	80	97	50	32	15	3
African American	2007-08	59	39	48	92	36	23	25	16
	2008-09	76	53	61	95	37	39	20	5
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		73	69					
	2008-09		80	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		85	90					
	2008-09		92	93					
Hispanic	2007-08		58	61					
	2008-09		74	71					
White	2007-08	92	73	80	96	72	20	6	2
	2008-09	88	83	85	98	62	26	10	2
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		28	35					
	2008-09		31	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		49	51					
	2008-09		72	62					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	60	42	58	91	45	15	25	15
	2008-09	70	59	69	100	23	47	23	7
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			73					
Male	2007-08	80	58	72	95	57	23	13	7
	2008-09	82	67	79	98	57	25	14	4
Female	2007-08	79	53	73	95	62	17	14	7
	2008-09	81	69	81	97	44	37	17	2

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Science

Student Group 5th 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	85	62	82	90	39	45	9	7
	2008-09	70	58	83	100	33	37	17	13
African American	2007-08	74	46	59	92	15	59	12	15
	2008-09	53	42	62	100	11	42	28	19
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	81					
	2008-09		67	84					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		77	89					
	2008-09		88	91					
Hispanic	2007-08		60	69					
	2008-09		52	73					
White	2007-08	90	80	89	91	52	38	7	3
	2008-09	87	79	89	100	54	33	8	6
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		50	62					
	2008-09		47	64					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		51	53					
	2008-09		48	59					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	68	51	70	81	18	50	15	18
	2008-09	52	48	72	100	20	31	26	22
Migrant	2007-08			56					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	88	62	82	86	43	45	8	4
	2008-09	69	59	83	100	40	29	16	16
Female	2007-08	81	63	82	95	36	45	9	9
	2008-09	71	56	83	100	27	45	18	11

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Social Studies

Student Group 6th 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	75	48	73	96	47	28	12	13
	2008-09	65	50	74	97	36	29	19	15
African American	2007-08	53	31	45	94	22	31	22	24
	2008-09	43	32	48	98	19	24	31	26
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		64	71					
	2008-09		50	71					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		75	84					
	2008-09		69	84					
Hispanic	2007-08		35	59					
	2008-09		42	59					
White	2007-08	88	69	81	96	62	26	6	6
	2008-09	82	74	81	97	51	32	9	9
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		35	40					
	2008-09		31	40					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		23	40					
	2008-09		38	41					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	52	33	56	95	21	31	24	24
	2008-09	48	39	59	100	14	34	23	30
Migrant	2007-08			48					
	2008-09			48					
Male	2007-08	75	49	72	95	48	27	11	14
	2008-09	74	52	74	96	42	32	16	10
Female	2007-08	75	46	73	97	46	29	14	12
	2008-09	58	49	73	98	32	27	22	20

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

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

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

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
First Grade				
African American	1.5	1.9	1.4	1.5
Hispanic	1.7	2	1.4	1.6
White	2	2.3	1.7	1.9
Economically Disadvantaged	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.4
Special Education	1.5	n/a	1.3	n/a
Second Grade				
African American	2.8	2.8	2.4	2.4
Hispanic	3	2.8	2.3	2.8
White	3.9	3.5	3.1	3
Economically Disadvantaged	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.4
Special Education	3.1	2.3	2.9	1.5
Third Grade				
African American	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.6
Hispanic	3.3	4.5	3.2	3.9
White	4.6	4.7	4.2	4.2
Economically Disadvantaged	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.6
Special Education	3.6	2.8	3.3	2.1
Fourth Grade				
African American	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.6
Hispanic	4.5	5	5.1	4.9
White	6.1	6	5.9	5.6
Economically Disadvantaged	4.7	4.2	4.6	4.4
Special Education	4.3	2.8	4.8	3.2

Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Performance Series

Performance Series				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
Fifth Grade				
African American	2624	2571	2434	2395
Hispanic	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
White	2797	2853	2567	2603
Economically Disadvantaged	2583	2584	2418	2423



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Achievement Targets in Relation to AYP Targets and Attendance Rate

Student Group Elementary School	Reading/Language Arts						Mathematics						Additional Academic Indicator		
	Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Attendance Rate		
	Goal: 95%			Goal: %			Goal: 95%			Goal: %			Goal: 90%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	100	99	97	90	82		100	100	97	95	88		96	92	
African American	100	99	96	85	77		100	99	97	88	83		95	91	
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	N/A	N/A	96	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	97	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	99	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	100	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	N/A	102	96	N/A	79		N/A	103	98	N/A	87		N/A	93	
White	100	99	97	93	89		100	100	97	99	94		96	94	
Students with Disabilities	97	99		71	57		97	100		85	77		94	90	
Limited English Proficient	N/A	99		N/A	79		N/A	101		N/A	85		N/A	93	
Economically Disadvantaged	107	101		82	77		107	102		90	85		95	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 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.