

# Annual Education Report

2008-2009

## Prairie Ridge Elementary School

2294 S. Ninth Street

Kalamazoo, MI 49009

Phone Number: 269.337.0630 . Fax Number: 269.337.1640

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



The mission of Prairie Ridge Elementary School, a nurturing PreK-5 learning environment with an emphasis on academic excellence and responsible citizenship, is to ensure that each student becomes a life-long learner who achieves maximum academic and personal success, while strengthening each student's unique talents through the use of individualized instructional strategies and a comprehensive curriculum enhanced with technology, guided by a dedicated and knowledgeable staff in partnership with families and the community.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Ms. Jillian George

### 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

## 2008–2009 Highlights (cont.)

### 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	97.2	A	81.1	B
English Language Arts	78.8	C	77.2	C
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	88	B	79.2	C
Indicators of School	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	92	A	86	B
AYP Status	Met AYP- Y		Met AYP- Y	
Composite Grade	A		B	
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

We achieved AYP.

Over 90% daily attendance

Two Title I Parent Events. In the fall, we held a Title I evening for parents to share the importance of Title I services. In the late winter, we held a combined educational evening for students and parents. Support for these events was well managed by Title I staff/tutors and Mrs. Sullivan, parent liaison for KCIS.

98% fall and 99% spring parent attendance for parent teacher conferences.

Over 300 parents in attendance at both winter and spring concerts.

The first annual Prairie Ridge Carnival

Book fairs and PTO book swaps throughout the school year.

Monthly Pride Assemblies for citizenship and life skills.

Children viewed United Streaming which improved self-esteem and behavior through character building videos.

Girls- on- the-Run. All our fifth graders went skiing in the winter thanks to PTO.

The girls' and boys' basketball teams showed exemplary sportsmanship during their very successful seasons.

Sherman Lake Camp attended by the sixth grade in April.

Annual track and field meet

A lending library for Title I families was heavily used. Books, educational games, software and alpha smarts were available for use.

To support literacy over winter, spring and summer break books and parent kits were sent home to ensure that learning continued.

Parent Corps participation

Pilot program of Young Authors by Prairie Ridge parent.

Chess Club piloted by Prairie Ridge parent.

The process by which students are assigned to district schools is as follows:

Students can attend their home school based on specific attendance areas.

Students can attend a magnet school. There are seven elementary magnet schools and two middle school magnet schools from which to choose.

Students can attend any other district school as long as the district is not required to provide transportation.

Enrollment will depend on the existence of adequate space within the building and grade level.

Empty Bowls Community Event-Students and staff made clay bowls which were auctioned off at a soup and salad dinner. \$1,500 was raised to support Loaves and Fishes.

Second and third grade students performed at a local nursing home.

Local veterans and family members joined Prairie Ridge students in honoring Veteran's Day.

Ohnstemo Rotary supported Prairie Ridge by focusing on literacy. Members read to kindergarten and first grade students and donated Dr. Seuss books to every student in kindergarten and first grade.

### Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2008		Spring 2009	
	#	%	#	%
Prairie Ridge	520	98	472	99

### Parent Involvement Policy

#### District Policy

*The District will consistently work, in a variety of ways, to strengthen meaningful family participation in the education of their children.*

#### Prairie Ridge Parent Involvement

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

### 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.
- 1 Administrator with a Masters+30
- 19 teachers; 5 with a Bachelors Degree; 13 with a Masters Degree; and 1 with a Masters+30
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

## School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	Improve reading skills of African American students by reducing the gap at all grade levels.
Data to support goal selection:	According to the MEAP assessment there is a 25% gap between African American students and white students at 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade, 35% gap between African American and white students at 4 <sup>th</sup> grade, and 30% gap between African American and white students at 5 <sup>th</sup> grade. An analysis of the fall 2009 Ed Performance data indicates severe areas of concern in all grades for African American students who scored generally a year below grade level in reading. Economically disadvantaged students also scored generally a year below grade level in reading.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Continue implementation of Kindergarten extended day, Reading Recovery, continue ninety minute reading block that includes differentiated instruction to meet students' instructional needs, increase instructional time on task through proactive interventions, increase parental involvement through Title I parent meetings and reading packets for home use.
Accomplishments:	Economically disadvantaged 4th grade students exceeded state standards for proficiency.
Implications for next year:	Continue interventions for students scoring in the intensive range and increase interventions for students scoring in the strategic range.
Writing	
Goal:	All students in fourth and fifth grade will meet or exceed State achievement English Language Arts writing targets.
Data to support goal selection:	According to the MEAP assessment 40% of fourth grade students scored proficient while the State target is 59% and 45% of 5 <sup>th</sup> grade students scored proficient while the State target is 59%.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Increase instructional time spent on writing in 3rd-5th grades, continue professional development for Lucy Calkins writing and assessing student writing skills, continue Title I instructional support to identified students and increase instruction in peer editing and writing of varied genre.
Accomplishments:	6 <sup>th</sup> grade-Yes: 67% of economically disadvantaged students and 61% of African American students were proficient
Implications for next year:	Need to strengthen implementation of Lucy Calkins writing program with continued professional development opportunities and to provide professional development in assessing student writing samples in order to establish a common language and address specific student instructional needs.
Math	
Goal:	Improve the scores of 5 <sup>th</sup> grade African American students and economically disadvantaged students by reducing the gap between these students and other fifth grade students.
Data to support goal selection:	According to the MEAP assessment in fifth grade, there is a gap of 24% between African American and white students in mathematics; and a 23% gap between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students. An analysis of the fall 2009 Ed Performance data indicates severe areas of concern in all grades for African American students who scored generally a year below grade level in reading mathematics. Economically disadvantaged students also scored generally a year below grade level in mathematics.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Departmentalize 5th grade mathematics instruction and implement newly adopted District math program.
Accomplishments:	There was no gap between subgroups in third grade and the gap was narrowed in grades four and six.
Implications for next year:	Implement 5th grade mathematics departmentalism and utilize the newly adopted District math programs interventions.

## School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	Reduce the gap between female students and male students, African American students and white students and between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students.
Data to support goal selection:	According to the MEAP assessment 5 <sup>th</sup> grade students show a gap of 34% between female and male students, a 29% gap between African American and white students and an 18% gap between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students. An analysis of the fall 2009 Ed Performance data indicates severe areas of concern in all grades for African American students who scored generally a year below grade level in science. Economically disadvantaged students also scored generally a year below grade level in science.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Invite African American scientists to present to and work with students. Use Web Quest activities to teach science concepts.
Accomplishments:	Although there is a concern regarding the gap between male and female students, all other subgroups are scoring above district levels.
Implications for next year:	Broaden exposure to diverse scientists, support reading skills through science instruction.

Social Studies	
Goal:	Reduce the gap between African American students and white students and between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students.
Data to support goal selection:	According to the MEAP assessment there is a 41% gap between African American students and white students; and a gap of 26% between economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Use Web Quest activities to teach Social Studies concepts, increase support of Social Studies concepts through resources such as maps, globes and non-fiction reading materials.
Accomplishments:	All subgroups scored above the district on the Social Studies MEAP.
Implications for next year:	Reduce the gap between African American students and white students and between economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students.



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

## 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	87	68	81	100	23	64	13	0
	2008-09	86	73	83	99	14	71	14	0
African American	2007-08	82	58	67	100	9	73	18	0
	2008-09	72	65	69	96	0	72	28	0
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	86	80	85	100	24	62	14	0
	2008-09	97	85	87	97	26	71	3	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		36	53					
	2008-09		47	55					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		61	63					
	2008-09		60	69					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	76	60	71	95	5	71	24	0
	2008-09	81	65	74	100	5	76	19	0
Migrant	2007-08			64					
	2008-09			64					
Male	2007-08	85	64	78	100	20	65	15	0
	2008-09	87	72	81	95	16	71	13	0
Female	2007-08	89	71	84	100	26	63	11	0
	2008-09	84	74	86	100	13	72	16	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	65	56	76	84	7	59	35	0
	2008-09	72	57	77	98	10	62	27	2
African American	2007-08	47	43	56	85	0	47	53	0
	2008-09	42	43	56	100	0	42	53	5
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	73	73	82	79	5	68	27	0
	2008-09	82	76	83	100	12	71	18	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		30	43					
	2008-09		22	44					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		45	49					
	2008-09		51	50					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	57	45	63	88	4	54	43	0
	2008-09	60	46	64	97	7	53	37	3
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			51					
Male	2007-08	70	54	73	87	11	59	30	0
	2008-09	71	54	74	100	11	60	29	0
Female	2007-08	58	59	80	79	0	58	42	0
	2008-09	72	61	79	96	8	64	24	4

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	88	64	78	89	20	68	10	2
	2008-09	62	59	78	95	5	56	36	2
African American	2007-08	67	49	58	100	8	58	33	0
	2008-09	45	46	58	96	0	45	55	0
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	97	81	84	87	24	73	0	3
	2008-09	71	75	84	90	11	61	25	4
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		23	42					
	2008-09		25	42					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		54	44					
	2008-09		58	50					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	78	53	65	90	7	70	19	4
	2008-09	55	49	66	100	5	50	43	3
Migrant	2007-08			45					
	2008-09			54					
Male	2007-08	88	59	75	80	13	75	13	0
	2008-09	66	56	76	91	6	59	31	3
Female	2007-08	88	68	81	100	27	62	8	4
	2008-09	57	62	81	100	4	52	43	0

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	78	62	80	93	4	74	20	2
	2008-09	81	67	80	95	26	55	17	2
African American	2007-08	57	49	59	93	0	57	43	0
	2008-09	50	54	61	100	6	44	44	6
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	82	76	86	92	6	76	15	3
	2008-09	100	83	85	94	36	64	0	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		27	41					
	2008-09		21	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		46	53					
	2008-09		69	50					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	68	51	67	91	3	65	29	3
	2008-09	70	58	68	91	17	53	27	3
Migrant	2007-08			63					
	2008-09			58					
Male	2007-08	73	56	76	97	3	70	23	3
	2008-09	82	65	77	94	24	58	15	3
Female	2007-08	83	68	83	89	4	79	17	0
	2008-09	80	70	82	96	28	52	20	0

**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	92	76	90	100	56	36	8	0
	2008-09	96	81	91	99	64	31	4	0
African American	2007-08	91	67	76	100	45	45	9	0
	2008-09	96	74	79	96	36	60	4	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	90	87	94	100	57	33	10	0
	2008-09	95	92	95	97	82	13	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	86	69	84	95	38	48	14	0
	2008-09	95	76	86	100	62	33	5	0
Migrant	2007-08			85					
	2008-09			80					
Male	2007-08	100	78	90	100	65	35	0	0
	2008-09	97	84	92	95	68	29	3	0
Female	2007-08	84	75	90	100	47	37	16	0
	2008-09	94	79	91	100	59	34	6	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	83	66	86	84	26	57	15	2
	2008-09	89	69	88	100	49	39	7	5
African American	2007-08	76	53	69	85	0	76	24	0
	2008-09	84	57	74	100	37	47	11	5
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	91	84	91	79	41	50	9	0
	2008-09	91	84	92	100	50	41	3	6
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		49	65					
	2008-09	60	47	68	100	40	20	20	20
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		55	74					
	2008-09		64	76					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	75	55	77	88	18	57	21	4
	2008-09	77	59	80	100	32	45	13	10
Migrant	2007-08			81					
	2008-09			82					
Male	2007-08	85	67	86	87	44	41	11	4
	2008-09	91	70	88	100	49	43	6	3
Female	2007-08	79	64	86	79	0	79	21	0
	2008-09	85	68	88	100	50	35	8	8

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	88	59	74	91	67	22	8	4
	2008-09	71	54	77	97	46	25	27	2
African American	2007-08	75	42	51	100	50	25	17	8
	2008-09	59	41	55	96	23	36	41	0
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	94	78	81	89	76	18	3	3
	2008-09	83	75	83	94	62	21	14	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		33	44					
	2008-09		30	47					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		48	54					
	2008-09		42	61					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	81	48	60	90	56	26	15	4
	2008-09	65	45	64	100	40	25	33	3
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	88	61	75	83	80	8	4	8
	2008-09	82	57	78	94	58	24	15	3
Female	2007-08	88	58	73	100	54	35	12	0
	2008-09	57	51	76	100	30	26	43	0

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	77	55	73	91	40	38	17	6
	2008-09	86	68	80	97	64	22	14	0
African American	2007-08	57	39	48	93	14	43	43	0
	2008-09	78	53	61	100	44	33	22	0
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	88	73	80	89	53	34	6	6
	2008-09	91	83	85	94	76	15	9	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		28	35					
	2008-09		31	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		49	51					
	2008-09		72	62					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	67	42	58	88	27	40	27	7
	2008-09	77	59	69	91	53	23	23	0
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			73					
Male	2007-08	80	58	72	97	47	33	13	7
	2008-09	85	67	79	97	59	26	15	0
Female	2007-08	74	53	73	85	30	43	22	4
	2008-09	88	69	81	96	72	16	12	0

**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	86	62	82	89	36	50	6	8
	2008-09	68	58	83	97	23	45	25	7
African American	2007-08	67	46	59	100	25	42	17	17
	2008-09	50	42	62	96	9	41	32	18
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	94	80	89	87	45	48	3	3
	2008-09	79	79	89	94	31	48	21	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		50	62					
	2008-09		47	64					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		51	53					
	2008-09		48	59					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	74	51	70	90	15	59	11	15
	2008-09	63	48	72	100	23	40	28	10
Migrant	2007-08			56					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	88	62	82	80	33	54	4	8
	2008-09	82	59	83	94	30	52	12	6
Female	2007-08	85	63	82	100	38	46	8	8
	2008-09	48	56	83	100	13	35	43	9

**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	65	48	73	90	23	42	13	21
	2008-09	72	50	74	95	47	26	12	16
African American	2007-08	43	31	45	93	7	36	21	36
	2008-09	50	32	48	100	22	28	11	39
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	74	69	81	86	32	42	10	16
	2008-09	91	74	81	94	61	30	6	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		35	40					
	2008-09		31	40					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		23	40					
	2008-09		38	41					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	47	33	56	88	13	33	23	30
	2008-09	60	39	59	91	27	33	17	23
Migrant	2007-08			48					
	2008-09			48					
Male	2007-08	63	49	72	97	30	33	10	27
	2008-09	73	52	74	94	52	21	9	18
Female	2007-08	68	46	73	81	14	55	18	14
	2008-09	72	49	73	96	40	32	16	12

## School Assessment Data

### Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

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

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

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
<b>First Grade</b>				
African American	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.1
Hispanic	1.7	1.7	1.3	1.6
White	1.7	1.9	1.7	1.9
Economically Disadvantaged	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.5
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Second Grade</b>				
African American	2.5	2.8	2.5	2.4
Hispanic	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8
White	3.3	3	3.2	3.2
Economically Disadvantaged	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.7
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Third Grade</b>				
African American	3.2	3.3	3.8	3.2
Hispanic	4.2	3.7	3.5	3.5
White	4.1	4.6	4.3	4.2
Economically Disadvantaged	3.4	3.9	3.8	3.7
Special Education	N/A	2.8	N/A	3.1
<b>Fourth Grade</b>				
African American	4.3	4	4.2	4.2
Hispanic	4.8	5.3	4.4	5.3
White	5	5.4	5.4	5.7
Economically Disadvantaged	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.3
Special Education	6	3.5	4.8	3.1

### Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Performance Series

EdPerformance				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
<b>Fifth Grade</b>				
African American	2653	2504	2473	2333
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	2785	2678	2604	2492
Economically Disadvantaged	2661	2613	2496	2428



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

## 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 Elementary School	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	98	99	97	91	82		99	100	97	96	88		94	92	
African American	99	99	96	82	77		99	99	97	95	83		94	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	97	99	97	94	89		98	100	97	96	94		95	94	
Students with Disabilities	N/A	99		N/A	57		N/A	100		N/A	77		N/A	90	
Limited English Proficient	N/A	99		N/A	79		N/A	101		N/A	85		N/A	93	
Economically Disadvantaged	104	101		86	77		105	102		95	85		93	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.