

Sturgis Public Schools

The mission of Sturgis Public Schools,
in partnership with parents and community,
is to ensure each student has the knowledge, skills and behavior necessary
for a successful transition to the next educational stage, ultimately leading to a productive and
satisfying life.

-Adopted December 13, 1999



Superintendent: Robert Olsen
Asst. Superintendent: Julie Evans
Director of Finance: Vicki Watson

2007-08 Board of Education

President: Kerri Millett
Vice President: Lee Ann McConnell
Secretary: Geoff Smith Treasurer: Tom Robertson
Trustees: Frank Kalasky, Scott Davidson, Ann Bird

I. Overview of School

Accreditation Status & Education YES! Grades

Accreditation is the process through which the staff, district personnel, parents and board of education commit to a set of universally accepted standards necessary to ensure adequate yearly progress for all students.

Each building in our district is fully Performance Accredited by the North Central Association, Commission on Accreditation and School Improvement.

In addition, the state of Michigan measures student achievement, using an accreditation system called Education YES. Specifically, the state uses MEAP scores to determine:

- › Achievement status
- › Achievement change
- › Achievement growth

In addition, school teams rank themselves on the indicators of School Performance, indicators that are based on research and best practice. The culmination of this accreditation process is a report card, with letter grades (see below):

Sturgis High School

Education Yes! Report Card	2006 – 2007		2007-08	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	73.2	C	74.1	C
English Language Arts	75.7	C	74.4	C
Science	79	C	80	B
Social Studies	76.4	C	72.6	C
Achievement Subtotal	76.1	C	75.3	C
Indicators of School Performance	95	A	100	A
Preliminary	82	B	84	B
AYP Status	Met AYP? yes		Met AYP? yes	
Composite Grade	B		B	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	yes		yes	
NCA Accreditation Status	yes		yes	

Sturgis Middle School

Education Yes! Report Card	2006 – 2007		2007-08	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	100	A	92.4	A
English Language Arts	84.8	B	73.9	C
Science	78.8	C	81.9	B
Social Studies	83.5	B	79	C
Achievement Subtotal	86.8	B	81.8	B
Indicators of School Performance	98	A	100	A
Preliminary	90	A	88	B
AYP Status	Met AYP? yes		Met AYP? yes	
Composite Grade	A		B	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Yes		yes	
NCA Accreditation Status	Yes		yes	

Eastwood School

Education Yes! Report Card	2006 – 2007		2007-08	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	87.6	B	88.6	B
English Language Arts	69.9	C	78.3	C
Achievement Subtotal	78.8	C	83.5	B
Indicators of School Performance	92	A	100	A
Preliminary	83	B	89	B
AYP Status	Met AYP? no		Met AYP? yes	
Composite Grade	B		B	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Yes		yes	
NCA Accreditation Status	Yes		yes	

Congress School

Education Yes! Report Card	2006 – 2007		2007-08	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	90.8	A	91.5	A
English Language Arts	77.5	C	78.6	C
Achievement Subtotal	84.2	B	85.1	B
Indicators of School Performance	90	A	100	A
Preliminary	86	B	90	A
AYP Status	Met AYP? yes		Met AYP? yes	
Composite Grade	B		A	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Yes		yes	
NCA Accreditation Status	Yes		yes	

Wall School

Education Yes! Report Card	2006 – 2007		2007-08	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	93.8	A	93.2	A
English Language Arts	76.6	C	79	C
Achievement Subtotal	85.2	B	86.1	B
Indicators of School Performance	90	A	100	A
Preliminary	87	B	91	A
AYP Status	Met AYP? yes		Met AYP? yes	
Composite Grade	B		A	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Yes		yes	
NCA Accreditation Status	Yes		yes	

Wenzel School

Education Yes! Report Card	2006 – 2007		2007-08	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	96.8	A	97.4	A
English Language Arts	79.9	B	84.7	B
Achievement Subtotal	88.4	B	91.1	A
Indicators of School Performance	90	A	100	A
Preliminary	89	B	94	
AYP Status	Met AYP? yes		Met AYP? yes	
Composite Grade	B		A	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Yes		yes	
NCA Accreditation Status	Yes		yes	

* 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.

K-12 Career Prep Program - Winner of Governor's Innovative Programs Award

The goals of the Career Prep program are to provide every student with the tools, guidance and opportunity to create and follow a career path, to assist students in transitions from school to work at all levels, and to provide curriculum and training for involved adults. Coordinating efforts with the St. Joseph County Intermediate School District and the Sturgis Area Chamber of Commerce enables the district to reach these goals much more effectively than they would be able to on their own. At each level, there are activities, curriculum, professional development, partnerships, and assessments, including skills acquisition and on-the-job learning. In conjunction with this, teachers continue to learn more about the career pathways concept and use it to develop career contextual learning opportunities for students in their classes.

All teachers are provided a copy of either the Career Start (K-6) or the Planning Your Future (7-12) curriculum for their grade level. It is an integrated curriculum written by local teachers, that include career development, planning and exploration activities designed to be integrated into classrooms and subject areas at each grade level. Each classroom also has a business partner who introduces students to many different careers and helps them see how they will use what they are learning in school as an adult. The high school partners act as mentors for the students in the class and provide them with real world experiences such as interviewing, filling out application forms, working on teams, etc. The partners also give students an appreciation of the local businesses and how they and their employees work together to create our community.

In addition to the curriculum, middle school students will also take the DAT test and receive and discuss the results, learn and use the MOIS program to do career research and resumes, and participate in programs like Career Day, college visits, CTE visits, and job shadowing.

Prior to the end of their eighth grade year, students and their parents will be invited to attend Freshman Orientation to learn how to write their first parent endorsed EDP. The EDP (Educational Development Plan) is the first step in long range planning and the introduction of Career Pathways. Students will design their EDP based on their interests and skills to include their class choices for the four years of high school as well as document their career prep activities including job shadowing, field experience, internships, externships, and apprenticeships. It is a working document, which should provide a focused high school education leading to a chosen career area. It is organized to prepare students for whatever their next step will be, including higher education, the military, or an entry-level job placement.

At the high school, in addition to their employability skills class, all students will have the opportunity to continue to use the MOIS program for resumes and career research as well as learn the modules containing post secondary information, owning a business, scholarships, and self-assessment tools. They will be encouraged to arrange and complete additional job shadow opportunities. They also are able to participate in the Career Technical Education Programs offered in conjunction with the St. Joseph County ISD listed in our Curriculum Guide. These include externships, internships, apprenticeships, and community classroom activities in addition to the regularly scheduled classes.

The culmination of the high school Career Preparation experience occurs prior to graduation. In order to meet graduation requirements, all seniors must successfully present their portfolios to a committee of two employers and a teacher. Each presentation lasts about thirty minutes, and the student must show evidence of skill acquisition and a plan for the future. Most of the students enjoy the presentation experience and all of the adults involved think it is excellent, both for the students and for themselves.

Retention Rates

Retention rate is defined in the State School Aid Act as the proportion of pupils who have not dropped out of school in the immediately preceding school year and is equal to one (1) minus the quotient of the number of pupils unaccounted for in the immediately preceding school year, as determined by the District Pupil Retention Report, divided by the pupils of the immediately preceding school year.

Retention Rates					
2005-06		2004-05		2003-04	
Class of:		Class of :		Class of:	
2009	98.92	2008	98.72	2007	98.74
2008	96.77	2007	97.03	2006	97.38
2007	95.98	2006	97.73	2005	95.85
2006	98.06	2005	94.48	2004	96.60

Graduation Rates

In order to comply with The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 and, as defined in The Michigan Department (MDE) Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, the state of Michigan must move to an accountability system for high schools in which a graduation rate includes only "on-time" graduates who earn diplomas in four years. This calculation aligns with the guidelines provided by the National Governors Association (NGA) Graduation Counts Compact. The "four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate" is calculated by tracking individual students from the time they were enrolled as first-time ninth-graders, with a four-year expected completion rate.

	2007 Cohort	On Track Graduated	Dropped	Off Track	Other	Exempt	Grad Rate
State	140,351	105,899	21,185	11,898	1,255	13,851	75.45%
District	274	204	58	6	5	32	74.45%
Sturgis High School	220	194	23	3	0	19	88.18%
Sturgis Adult Ed	18	5	8	2	3	0	N/A

II. School Improvement Plan

School Improvement Process

Sturgis school improvement efforts occur on several levels. Each building or administrative unit develops and implements school improvement plans specific to building needs. The district also has a plan which is based on data including:

- ✓ Analysis of MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program) results
- ✓ Analysis of MAP testing (NWEA)
- ✓ Analysis of SAT and ACT scores
- ✓ Analysis of MI Access scores
- ✓ Common assessments

School Improvement goals, strategies for implementation and evaluation of the results by building for the 2007-08 school year are:

High School

➤ English Language Arts goals:

- All students will become proficient in the area of writing.
- Increase the number of students who are proficient in reading.

Strategies/Interventions:

- Provide more ACT/MEAP prompt practice
- Offer ACT prep class
- Increase teacher familiarity with test
- Engage in more dialog with social studies department
- Align writing assignments at each grade level
- Engage in more dialog with ESL and with Special Education teachers

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

➤ **Math goal:** All students will increase their understanding of mathematics in all math classes.

Strategies/Interventions:

- All students will improve in the area of number, algebra, and analysis.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

➤ **Science goal:** Students will have increased exposure to Science MEAP-like questions.

Strategies/Interventions:

- ESL students will have access to ESL appropriate assistance when taking all tests.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

➤ **Social Studies goal:** All students will become proficient in the Social Studies section of the Michigan Merit Exam.

Strategies/Interventions:

- Using online resources through Prentice Hall (Phschool.com) for all Social Studies Classes
- Use best instructional and teaching strategies gathered from continuing professional development.
- Modify classroom assessments to meet the needs of ESL and Special Education students.
- Identify struggling students from data director based on the 9th Grade MEAP scores. Monitor student achievement of those students in their ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade social studies classes.
- Use office hours to work with struggling students
- Identify low performance strands based on the data located in data director. Review assessments and lessons for incorporation of those low strands and benchmarks.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

Middle School

- **English Language Arts goal: All students' ELA MEAP scores will increase by 3%.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Establish an exploratory class targeting specific writing skills for students in need of remediation.
- Concentrate after-school programming (EDLC) tutoring toward students who are performing below grade level in writing.
- Team teaching between regular, special education, and ESL staff members to better accommodate the needs of all students.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

Comments:

**Looking at 2007 MEAP scores and their increase for current 8th grade students, our strategies and implementation were highly successful.*

- **Math goal: All students will increase their understanding of Math concepts as evidenced by an increase of 5% proficient on the MEAP.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Make modifications to instruction, assignments, and completion time; allow students to retest
- The department will spend significant time throughout the year working on curriculum alignment using the ATLAS Curriculum alignment program.
- The department will begin to establish common assessments at each grade level
- Implement focus classes that are designed to focus on math skill development
- Establish after-school programming (EDLC) tutoring designed improve math skills

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

Comments: This is a continuous process since each group of students is new to that grade levels' GLCEs. 2007 – 2008 was our first year using CMP2 which has more mathematical content then CMP1. As a grade level of students progresses through CMP2 they should gain more mathematically then the previous group. Our entire seventh grade staff is also new to teaching 7th grade mathematics and one of our sixth grade staff is new to teaching mathematics.

- **Science goal: All students will increase their understanding of Science concepts as evidenced by an increase of 5% proficient on the MEAP.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Make modifications to instruction, assignments, and completion time; allow students to retest
- The department will spend significant time throughout the year working on curriculum alignment using the ATLAS Curriculum alignment program.
- The department will begin to establish common assessments at each grade level
- Begin to develop common assessments at each grade level

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

*Comments: Our scores rose by more than 5% so we met our overall goal. In review of our performance we have identified some weak areas. We have selected **photosynthesis** as our goal for the 2008 – 2009 school year due to the number of kids scoring poorly in that area.*

➤ **Social Studies goal: Improve our overall MEAP scores by 5%.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Make modifications to instruction, assignments, and completion time; allow students to retest
- The department will spend significant time throughout the year working on curriculum alignment using the ATLAS Curriculum alignment program.
- The department will begin to establish common assessments at each grade level
- Begin to develop common assessments at each grade level
- Begin to develop an after-school program (EDLC) that focuses on social studies concept review

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

Comments: Our scores dropped by more than 5% on the 9th grade MEAP test from 80% in 2006 to 75% in 2007.

Eastwood School

- **English Language Arts goals: All students will improve their proficiency in the writing process. All students will improve their reading skills**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Increase the amount of time students spend writing using the writing process and in writing across the curriculum
- Provide students with additional opportunities for instruction/writing practice in 3rd and 4th grade
- Tighten the alignment between curriculum and instruction in reading, writing, spelling
- Provide before and after school assistance for 3rd-5th graders

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

Comments: Strategies are in process of evolving and developing. Title support has shifted from classroom to literacy enrichment.

- **Math goal: All students will improve their math knowledge and reasoning skills.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Increase the amount of time students spend on problem solving and multi-step problems
- Tighten the alignment between curriculum and instruction in math with new materials
- Provide before and after school assistance for 3rd-5th graders

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

Comments: **We adopted a new math curriculum, and teachers need time to become familiar with it.**

- **Science goal: All students will increase their knowledge of science concepts.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Improve vocabulary building throughout Eastwood.
- Add supplemental text to Science Kits.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time!

Comments:

The Special Education Science MEAP scores increased by 11% from 2006 to 2007. Continue support for our ELL students.

- **Social Studies goal: All students will demonstrate their understanding of knowledge of concepts through constructed responses.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Extended Day Program : Review, Practice and Mastery of Expectations,
- Reviewing Test Taking Skills.
- Extended Day Program that focuses on vocabulary.
- Students in classroom during Social Studies.
- Have other special pull outs work with SS vocabulary.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

Comments:

- Extended Day Program seems to target Math and Reading only, it needs to focus on content vocabulary and test taking skills
- ESL students and 5th grade special education students were in the classroom for all Social Studies content. We see this as strength.

Congress School

- **English Language Arts goals: All students will improve in reading. All students will improve their proficiency in the writing process.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Teachers will provide daily writing across the curriculum.
- Teacher will implement Pals and Read Naturally for students needing extra support
- Students needing remediation in reading will be provided extensive support.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No *Need more time*

Comments: We will continue to refine our expertise in teaching writing.

- **Math goal: All students will improve their math knowledge and reasoning skills.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- District grade level math assessment will be used to identify strengths/weaknesses.
- The school will provide extensive support for students needing remediation.
- All students, T-1 to second, will receive 1 hour of math instruction per day.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No *Need more time*

- **Science goal: All students will increase their knowledge of science concepts.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Teacher identified science vocabulary for each grade level.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No *Need more time*

Comments: Science vocabulary will be reevaluated next year to match state GLCES.

- **Social Studies goal: All students will demonstrate their understanding of knowledge of concepts through constructed responses.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Provide retelling strategies in class.
- Provide practice for expository pieces.
- Use research based techniques for vocabulary acquisition.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No *Need more time*

Comments: Science vocabulary will be reevaluated next year to match state GLCES.

Wall School

➤ **Reading: All students will improve in reading fluency and comprehension.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- All teachers will use Text Talk to strengthen vocabulary.
- 2nd grade teachers will use Genre Units and Toolbox to model higher level thinking skills and comprehension strategies.
- Select 1st and 2nd grade students will participate in Read Naturally to increase fluency and comprehension.
- All student will participate in daily Guided Reading groups at their instructional reading level.
- “Push-in” ESL and Special Education support allowing more time for Core instruction and to better support all students.
- After school support for identified 1st and 2nd grade students

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2006-07, did the strategy work?

After examining our student achievement data, we believe that the chosen strategies are working. While it is our observation that the strategies of profundity and Text Talk are making a difference, we still feel we the need for more time so that we can fully evaluate their effectiveness (how well students do on the 3rd grade MEAP).

All students will improve their proficiency in the writing process.

Strategies/Interventions:

- Kdg – Letter talk, interactive writing and Lucy Calkins writing template.
- 1st grade – Model 1st three MEAP prototypes beginning 2nd semester.
- 2nd Grade – Implement Genre Units 1, 2 and 3.
- Parent meetings to address “at-home” topics like Letter Talk. Newsletter tips for parents.
- Reinforce letter talk and interactive writing in the SE classroom.
- Train special education teacher using Lucy Calkins.
- Quick writes for the genre units.
- Small moment discussions.
- Improve Vocab Acquisition thru Text Talk.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2006-07, did the strategy work?

We believe that the chosen strategies in the area of writing are working; however our district common assessment does not seem to be a good predictor of student success on the MEAP. We are prepared to give these strategies more time in order to better access their effectiveness.

➤ **Math goal: All students will improve their math knowledge and reasoning skills.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Use Common math assessments to identify strengths/weaknesses
- Use Math Groups to provide support for students needing remediation.
- Supplement with Otter Creek Math
- Vocabulary development using 6 step vocab. Acquisition strategies – Marzano
- All students receive 1 hour of math instruction

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2006-07, did the strategy work?

Our school improvement team believes strongly that the math improvement strategies above are working. Our assessments support this belief.

➤ **Science goal: All students will increase their knowledge of science concepts.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Super Science “Fun Days”
- Identify and teach content vocabulary, using Marzano’s 6 step vocabulary acquisition strategies and vocabulary lists
- Record and submit assessment scores for accountability
- Provide remedial reading opportunities using informational text. Read Naturally
- Special Ed teachers will review science vocabulary and science concepts as part of informational reading instruction
- Provide content information to ESL staff so that instruction can be reinforced in Spanish if necessary.
- Staff training on gender differences

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2006-07, did the strategy work?

We believe our selected strategies are working, however we feel we need more time in order to see how our students perform on the 5th grade MEAP Science Assessment.

➤ **Social Studies goal: All students will demonstrate their understanding of knowledge of concepts through constructed responses.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Provide retelling strategies in class.
- Provide practice for expository pieces.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes **No** Need more time

Comments:

The strategies were in place and there is evidence of improvement. However, the goal was not clearly aligned with the strategies and needs to be revised to reflect our vision.

Wenzel School

➤ **English Language Arts goals: All students will improve in reading comprehension.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Students will be taught to use graphic organizers and text features to understand text, and profundity.
- Teacher will use poetry more frequently to increase fluency and comprehension.
- Pals, Read Naturally, Genre Units (Gr. 2), Teacher Toolbox (Gr. 2) and Road to the Code (K-1) will be used.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

All students will improve their narrative writing.

Strategies/Interventions:

- Use poetry more frequently in class reading and writing.
- Use graphic organizers and text features to understand text and write effectively.
- Use shared and interactive writing weekly
- Parent Meetings to address “at home” topics like Letter Talk & newsletter articles.
- Use techniques for vocabulary acquisition based on Marzano’s book, “What Works for ELL Students.”

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

➤ **Math goal: All students will improve their math computation skills and understanding of math vocabulary.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Increase students’ computations skills and fluency of math facts.
- Increase students’ understanding and use of math vocabulary
- Math Vocabulary Development
- Otter Creek Program for (1st and 2nd grade)

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

➤ **Science goal: All students will increase their knowledge of informational text.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Make connections through reading and writing using text features and journaling.
- Build student vocabulary through informational text.
- Use Big Books to identify text features
- Model reading informational text.

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes No Need more time

➤ **Social Studies goal: All students will demonstrate their understanding of informational text.**

Strategies/Interventions:

- Use activities and writing to record student experiences with Core Democratic Values and vocabulary.
- Use universal themes on a monthly basis with Profundity.
- All students will experience Core Democratic Values, Voting, and Universal Themes using Profundity.
-

Based on analysis of assessments given in the year 2007-08, did the strategy work?

Yes

No

Need more time

III. Student Assessment Data

MME Aggregate and Disaggregated Student Achievement Data – High School

SUBJECT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING)									
<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 11	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	56	56	52		2	53	37	8
	2006-07	55	55	51		1	55	32	13
	2007-08	53	53	52		1	52	34	13
Hispanic	2005-06	20	20	35		0	20	73	7
	2006-07	6	6	32		0	6	38	56
	2007-08	20	20	30		0	20	53	27
White	2005-06	59	59	57		3	57	33	8
	2006-07	61	61	57		1	61	31	8
	2007-08	58	58	59		1	57	31	11
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	0	0	10		0	0	22	78
	2006-07	6	6	11		0	6	35	59
	2007-08	0	0	11		0	0	7	93
Limited English Proficient	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	47	47	33		0	47	42	11
	2006-07	33	33	29		0	33	41	8
	2007-08	42	42	31		1	41	37	21
Male	2005-06	53	53	46		2	51	39	9
	2006-07	49	49	47		1	48	32	19
	2007-08	49	49	48		0	49	36	16
Female	2005-06	59	59	58		2	56	34	7
	2006-07	61	61	55		0	61	32	8
	2007-08	57	57	57		2	56	32	10

SUBJECT: READING

<u>Student Group</u> <u>Grade: 11</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>District</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>State</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>Percent</u> <u>Tested OR</u> <u>Not Tested</u> <u>in Grade</u> <u>Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each</u> <u>Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanc</u> <u>ed</u> <u>Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient</u> <u>Level 2</u>	<u>Basic</u> <u>Level 3</u>	<u>Below</u> <u>Basic</u> <u>Level</u> <u>4</u>
All Students	2005-06	59	59	61		2	57	26	15
	2006-07	65	65	60		2	63	18	17
	2007-08	66	66	62		2	64	18	16
Hispanic	2005-06	40	40	44		0	40	27	33
	2006-07	13	13	44		0	13	25	63
	2007-08	30	30	43		0	30	33	37
White	2005-06	61	61	65		2	59	25	13
	2006-07	71	71	66		2	69	18	11
	2007-08	71	71	68		2	69	16	13
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	0	0	18		0	0	22	78
	2006-07	24	24	19		0	24	35	41
	2007-08	7	7	19		0	7	0	93
Limited English Proficient	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	53	53	44		0	53	30	17
	2006-07	47	47	40		2	45	24	29
	2007-08	55	55	43		3	53	19	26
Male	2005-06	59	59	57		2	56	26	16
	2006-07	60	60	56		1	59	20	20
	2007-08	65	65	58		1	64	19	16
Female	2005-06	60	60	64		2	58	26	14
	2006-07	68	68	64		2	66	17	14
	2007-08	66	66	66		2	64	17	17

SUBJECT: WRITING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 11	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	58	58	46		7	51	40	2
	2006-07	37	37	40		1	36	51	12
	2007-08	40	40	41		1	40	47	12
Hispanic	2005-06	20	20	34		0	20	73	7
	2006-07	6	6	21		0	6	35	59
	2007-08	7	7	20		0	7	80	13
White	2005-06	59	59	50		3	57	33	8
	2006-07	41	41	45		1	40	52	7
	2007-08	45	45	47		1	44	43	13
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	9	9	11		0	9	55	36
	2006-07	6	6	6		0	6	35	59
	2007-08	0	0	7		0	0	13	87
Limited English Proficient	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	47	47	30		0	47	42	11
	2006-07	16	16	19		0	16	59	24
	2007-08	23	23	21		1	22	59	18
Male	2005-06	53	53	37		2	51	39	9
	2006-07	28	28	36		1	27	57	16
	2007-08	33	33	36		0	33	50	18
Female	2005-06	59	59	55		2	56	34	7
	2006-07	45	45	44		0	45	47	9
	2007-08	47	47	46		2	45	45	8

SUBJECT: MATH

Student Group Grade: 11	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	56	56	46		15	42	14	30
	2006-07	52	52	46		6	46	11	37
	2007-08	53	53	46		8	46	18	29
Hispanic	2005-06	28	28	28		6	22	6	67
	2006-07	13	13	27		0	13	6	81
	2007-08	30	30	28		0	30	27	43
White	2005-06	59	59	52		15	44	14	27
	2006-07	56	56	53		6	49	12	33
	2007-08	56	56	53		8	48	17	27
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	6	6	9		0	6	22	72
	2006-07	6	6	9		0	6	0	94
	2007-08	0	0	8		0	0	0	100
Limited English Proficient	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	47	47	26		5	41	14	40
	2006-07	41	41	24		2	39	4	55
	2007-08	42	42	25		4	38	22	36
Male	2005-06	52	52	47		17	35	16	32
	2006-07	54	54	49		8	46	12	34
	2007-08	59	59	49		10	50	15	26
Female	2005-06	61	61	45		12	49	11	28
	2006-07	50	50	44		4	46	10	40
	2007-08	48	48	43		6	42	21	31

SUBJECT: SCIENCE

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 11	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> _____	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	63	63	52		6	57	15	22
	2006-07	62	62	56		3	59	13	25
	2007-08	61	61	57		4	56	14	25
Hispanic	2005-06	33	33	32		0	33	17	50
	2006-07	18	18	36		0	18	12	71
	2007-08	30	30	35		0	30	17	53
White	2005-06	68	68	59		7	61	15	17
	2006-07	67	67	63		3	64	14	19
	2007-08	66	66	64		5	61	14	21
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	22	22	17		0	22	11	67
	2006-07	6	6	15		0	6	24	71
	2007-08	0	0	17		0	0	7	93
Limited English Proficient	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	54	54	32		2	53	21	25
	2006-07	51	51	34		2	49	12	37
	2007-08	49	49	36		4	45	15	36
Male	2005-06	68	68	55		7	61	14	18
	2006-07	63	63	57		4	58	11	26
	2007-08	64	64	58		7	57	17	19
Female	2005-06	57	57	49		6	52	17	26
	2006-07	61	61	55		1	60	15	24
	2007-08	58	58	55		2	56	12	30

SUBJECT: SOCIAL STUDIES

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 11	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> ____	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	87	87	79		49	37	9	5
	2006-07	86	86	83		47	39	11	3
	2007-08	84	84	80		43	42	9	6
Hispanic	2005-06	89	89	70		11	78	0	11
	2006-07	47	47	73		18	29	41	12
	2007-08	67	67	69		20	47	20	13
White	2005-06	86	86	83		54	32	10	4
	2006-07	91	91	88		51	40	8	2
	2007-08	87	87	85		46	41	8	5
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	56	56	43		6	50	28	17
	2006-07	53	53	43		6	47	35	12
	2007-08	20	20	41		0	20	47	33
Limited English Proficient	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	84	84	67		39	45	7	9
	2006-07	73	73	70		31	43	18	8
	2007-08	74	74	65		31	44	14	12
Male	2005-06	87	87	77		52	35	6	7
	2006-07	88	88	82		48	40	10	2
	2007-08	88	88	80		44	45	6	6
Female	2005-06	86	86	82		47	40	11	2
	2006-07	85	85	85		47	38	12	3
	2007-08	81	81	80		42	40	12	6

MEAP Aggregate and Disaggregated Student Achievement Data – Middle School

<u>SUBJECT:</u> ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING)									
<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 6	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	79	79	77		13	66	16	5
	2006-07	78	78	78		9	69	17	4
	2007-08	84	84	80		14	70	15	1
Hispanic	2005-06	65	65	65		2	63	22	12
	2006-07	73	73	66		7	66	22	5
	2007-08	67	67	69		0	67	29	4
White	2005-06	82	82	83		15	67	15	3
	2006-07	79	79	84		10	69	16	4
	2007-08	88	88	86		18	70	11	1
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	29	29	38		0	29	43	29
	2006-07	33	33	39		0	33	42	25
	2007-08	27	27	41		0	27	67	7
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	18	18	58		0	18	59	24
	2006-07	45	45	55		0	45	45	9
	2007-08	35	35	53		0	35	59	6
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	72	72	63		3	69	20	7
	2006-07	68	68	65		6	62	25	7
	2007-08	75	75	67		6	69	23	2
Male	2005-06	74	74	71		8	66	20	7
	2006-07	75	75	74		9	66	20	5
	2007-08	79	79	76		11	68	19	2
Female	2005-06	84	84	82		18	66	12	3
	2006-07	82	82	82		10	72	14	4
	2007-08	88	88	83		17	71	12	1

SUBJECT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING)

Student Group Grade: 7	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	63	63	73		6	57	24	13
	2006-07	77	77	76		7	71	15	8
	2007-08	76	76	74		12	64	19	5
Hispanic	2005-06	38	38	61		2	37	35	27
	2006-07	64	64	62		0	64	22	14
	2007-08	69	69	62		3	66	24	7
White	2005-06	71	71	79		6	65	20	9
	2006-07	81	81	82		8	73	12	6
	2007-08	78	78	82		14	64	18	4
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	30	30	31		4	26	26	44
	2006-07	22	22	33		0	22	28	50
	2007-08	8	8	32		0	8	54	38
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	14	14	50		0	14	48	38
	2006-07	35	35	49		0	35	30	35
	2007-08	29	29	43		0	29	62	10
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	46	46	57		2	44	33	21
	2006-07	64	64	61		2	63	22	13
	2007-08	65	65	59		7	57	26	9
Male	2005-06	58	58	67		3	55	23	19
	2006-07	77	77	71		5	73	14	8
	2007-08	77	77	70		10	67	17	6
Female	2005-06	68	68	79		9	59	26	6
	2006-07	77	77	81		8	69	15	8
	2007-08	74	74	79		13	61	21	4

SUBJECT: READING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 6	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	79	79	80		25	54	16	5
	2006-07	81	81	83		26	55	12	7
	2007-08	85	85	82		29	55	12	3
Hispanic	2005-06	62	62	68		12	50	22	16
	2006-07	75	75	73		12	63	14	12
	2007-08	67	67	73		6	61	25	8
White	2005-06	83	83	85		27	55	15	2
	2006-07	83	83	88		30	53	11	6
	2007-08	90	90	87		36	53	8	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	48	48	44		5	43	33	19
	2006-07	31	31	49		0	31	31	38
	2007-08	27	27	47		0	27	67	7
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	11	11	59		0	11	56	33
	2006-07	41	41	62		0	41	32	27
	2007-08	41	41	58		0	41	47	12
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	72	72	67		12	60	19	9
	2006-07	72	72	73		15	57	17	11
	2007-08	77	77	71		18	59	19	4
Male	2005-06	74	74	76		22	52	21	6
	2006-07	81	81	80		27	54	13	6
	2007-08	83	83	79		28	55	11	6
Female	2005-06	84	84	84		28	56	12	4
	2006-07	81	81	86		24	57	11	8
	2007-08	87	87	85		31	56	13	1

SUBJECT: READING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 7	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	65	65	76		19	46	17	17
	2006-07	80	80	80		24	55	9	11
	2007-08	73	73	72		23	50	14	13
Hispanic	2005-06	42	42	64		8	33	22	37
	2006-07	67	67	68		10	57	17	16
	2007-08	69	69	60		7	62	16	16
White	2005-06	73	73	82		21	52	16	11
	2006-07	84	84	86		28	56	6	10
	2007-08	74	74	80		25	48	14	12
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	41	41	37		7	33	19	41
	2006-07	22	22	42		0	22	22	56
	2007-08	8	8	33		0	8	8	85
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	21	21	54		7	14	34	45
	2006-07	39	39	54		0	39	26	35
	2007-08	29	29	40		0	29	38	33
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	49	49	62		10	38	23	29
	2006-07	70	70	67		13	57	13	17
	2007-08	62	62	57		17	45	16	21
Male	2005-06	59	59	71		13	46	18	23
	2006-07	78	78	76		25	53	11	11
	2007-08	76	76	69		21	55	9	15
Female	2005-06	72	72	81		25	47	17	12
	2006-07	81	81	84		24	58	7	12
	2007-08	69	69	76		24	45	19	12

SUBJECT: READING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 8	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> _____	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	70	70	73		12	58	19	11
	2006-07	67	67	76		35	32	21	12
	2007-08	83	83	77		26	57	12	4
Hispanic	2005-06	60	60	58		16	44	18	22
	2006-07	42	42	64		8	34	36	23
	2007-08	71	71	65		7	64	19	10
White	2005-06	72	72	79		11	61	20	8
	2006-07	74	74	82		42	31	17	9
	2007-08	87	87	83		32	55	11	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	6	6	33		0	6	35	59
	2006-07	13	13	35		0	13	46	42
	2007-08	63	63	40		13	50	13	25
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	25	25	47		0	25	25	50
	2006-07	12	12	48		0	12	53	35
	2007-08	38	38	47		0	38	38	24
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	65	65	58		11	53	20	16
	2006-07	54	54	62		26	28	26	19
	2007-08	73	73	65		16	57	19	7
Male	2005-06	63	63	68		8	56	23	14
	2006-07	56	56	71		28	28	27	17
	2007-08	80	80	72		20	61	16	4
Female	2005-06	76	76	77		15	61	16	7
	2006-07	79	79	81		42	37	14	7
	2007-08	86	86	82		32	54	9	5

SUBJECT: WRITING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 6	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	75	75	75		10	65	22	3
	2006-07	77	77	74		4	74	18	5
	2007-08	76	76	73		5	71	22	2
Hispanic	2005-06	59	59	67		6	53	37	4
	2006-07	76	76	65		2	75	15	8
	2007-08	59	59	63		0	59	37	4
White	2005-06	79	79	80		10	69	18	2
	2006-07	76	76	78		4	72	20	4
	2007-08	80	80	78		7	74	18	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	29	29	42		0	29	52	19
	2006-07	25	25	41		0	25	50	25
	2007-08	20	20	33		0	20	53	27
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	24	24	63		0	24	65	12
	2006-07	59	59	58		0	59	27	14
	2007-08	24	24	49		0	24	65	12
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	68	68	64		2	66	29	3
	2006-07	68	68	63		1	67	23	9
	2007-08	67	67	60		1	66	29	4
Male	2005-06	71	71	68		8	63	26	3
	2006-07	74	74	69		5	69	20	7
	2007-08	71	71	66		2	69	26	3
Female	2005-06	79	79	82		12	67	18	3
	2006-07	81	81	79		3	78	16	3
	2007-08	80	80	79		8	72	18	2

SUBJECT: WRITING

Student Group Grade: 7	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	65	65	67		4	61	31	4
	2006-07	64	64	65		2	62	26	10
	2007-08	77	77	77		0	77	22	1
Hispanic	2005-06	45	45	56		0	45	45	10
	2006-07	47	47	54		2	45	33	21
	2007-08	69	69	66		0	69	31	0
White	2005-06	72	72	72		5	67	26	2
	2006-07	70	70	71		2	67	24	6
	2007-08	79	79	81		1	79	19	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	30	30	27		0	30	44	26
	2006-07	17	17	27		0	17	39	44
	2007-08	23	23	35		0	23	77	0
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	21	21	49		0	21	66	14
	2006-07	17	17	45		0	17	30	52
	2007-08	52	52	54		0	52	48	0
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	51	51	53		1	50	42	7
	2006-07	46	46	53		0	46	37	17
	2007-08	68	68	65		0	68	30	2
Male	2005-06	57	57	59		2	55	37	6
	2006-07	61	61	58		1	60	26	13
	2007-08	74	74	70		0	74	24	2
Female	2005-06	74	74	74		6	68	24	2
	2006-07	66	66	73		3	63	26	8
	2007-08	81	81	84		1	80	19	0

SUBJECT: WRITING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 8	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	62	62	65		6	55	31	8
	2006-07	67	67	67		7	60	19	14
	2007-08	75	75	70		4	71	21	4
Hispanic	2005-06	44	44	51		4	40	38	18
	2006-07	43	43	53		4	40	30	26
	2007-08	59	59	57		0	59	34	7
White	2005-06	66	66	70		7	59	28	5
	2006-07	74	74	73		7	66	16	10
	2007-08	80	80	76		5	75	17	3
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	12	12	23		0	12	29	59
	2006-07	8	8	24		0	8	33	58
	2007-08	19	19	28		0	19	50	31
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	8	8	45		0	8	58	33
	2006-07	35	35	39		0	35	29	35
	2007-08	29	29	42		0	29	57	14
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	51	51	50		1	50	39	10
	2006-07	52	52	52		3	50	26	21
	2007-08	63	63	56		1	62	30	7
Male	2005-06	48	48	55		4	43	41	11
	2006-07	54	54	59		3	51	27	19
	2007-08	69	69	62		0	69	27	4
Female	2005-06	75	75	74		8	67	21	4
	2006-07	82	82	75		11	71	9	9
	2007-08	81	81	77		8	73	15	4

SUBJECT: MATH

Student Group Grade: 6	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	71	71	65		32	40	16	13
	2006-07	70	70	69		32	37	28	2
	2007-08	76	76	73		45	31	18	6
Hispanic	2005-06	57	57	52		24	33	14	29
	2006-07	63	63	55		17	46	34	3
	2007-08	61	61	61		22	39	24	16
White	2005-06	76	76	74		34	42	18	6
	2006-07	73	73	77		36	36	26	2
	2007-08	79	79	80		52	28	17	3
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	38	38	29		19	19	24	38
	2006-07	56	56	33		19	38	44	0
	2007-08	27	27	35		13	13	47	27
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	11	11	48		0	11	21	68
	2006-07	23	23	50		0	23	68	9
	2007-08	29	29	51		12	18	47	24
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	61	61	47		22	38	20	19
	2006-07	61	61	53		22	39	36	3
	2007-08	69	69	58		31	39	21	10
Male	2005-06	70	70	64		32	38	16	14
	2006-07	70	70	69		39	31	29	2
	2007-08	77	77	72		46	31	14	9
Female	2005-06	73	73	66		32	41	16	11
	2006-07	69	69	69		25	45	28	2
	2007-08	75	75	73		44	31	22	3

SUBJECT: MATH

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 7	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	56	56	60		24	32	35	8
	2006-07	70	70	64		39	31	25	5
	2007-08	79	79	73		35	44	19	2
Hispanic	2005-06	28	28	42		5	23	55	17
	2006-07	59	59	50		21	38	31	10
	2007-08	76	76	61		31	46	20	3
White	2005-06	65	65	69		31	35	29	6
	2006-07	73	73	73		44	29	23	3
	2007-08	80	80	80		36	44	19	1
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	37	37	21		11	26	52	11
	2006-07	39	39	25		6	33	44	17
	2007-08	54	54	32		0	54	46	0
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	21	21	39		3	17	55	24
	2006-07	26	26	41		4	22	52	22
	2007-08	59	59	50		9	50	36	5
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	42	42	40		16	26	44	14
	2006-07	61	61	46		25	36	31	8
	2007-08	70	70	58		29	41	27	3
Male	2005-06	56	56	60		26	30	38	6
	2006-07	69	69	64		44	25	26	5
	2007-08	77	77	71		38	39	19	4
Female	2005-06	57	57	60		22	35	33	11
	2006-07	70	70	65		35	36	25	5
	2007-08	81	81	74		32	50	19	0

SUBJECT: MATH

Student Group Grade: 8	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	63	63	63		29	34	25	12
	2006-07	73	73	68		35	38	23	4
	2007-08	78	78	72		44	34	15	7
Hispanic	2005-06	46	46	47		7	39	39	15
	2006-07	58	58	54		8	51	36	6
	2007-08	57	57	59		31	26	29	14
White	2005-06	67	67	72		34	32	23	11
	2006-07	77	77	76		42	35	19	4
	2007-08	86	86	79		47	39	10	4
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	6	6	24		6	0	47	47
	2006-07	50	50	30		13	38	38	13
	2007-08	69	69	32		31	38	6	25
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	23	23	41		0	23	31	46
	2006-07	53	53	46		6	47	41	6
	2007-08	14	14	51		0	14	52	33
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	46	46	45		14	32	35	19
	2006-07	62	62	51		22	40	32	6
	2007-08	63	63	56		35	28	25	12
Male	2005-06	58	58	63		22	36	30	12
	2006-07	73	73	68		32	42	22	5
	2007-08	80	80	71		45	36	11	8
Female	2005-06	68	68	63		37	32	20	11
	2006-07	73	73	68		38	35	23	4
	2007-08	77	77	72		44	33	18	5

SUBJECT: SCIENCE

<u>Student Group</u> <u>Grade: 8</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>District</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>State</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>Percent</u> <u>Tested OR</u> <u>Not Tested</u> <u>in Grade</u> <u>Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each</u> <u>Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advance</u> <u>d</u> <u>Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient</u> <u>Level 2</u>	<u>Basic</u> <u>Level 3</u>	<u>Below</u> <u>Basic</u> <u>Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	77	77	77		30	47	17	6
	2006-07	76	76	75		35	40	17	7
	2007-08	83	83	79		42	41	14	3
Hispanic	2005-06	57	57	60		13	45	28	15
	2006-07	53	53	60		8	45	36	11
	2007-08	66	66	67		16	50	29	5
White	2005-06	82	82	85		34	48	15	4
	2006-07	82	82	84		43	39	13	5
	2007-08	88	88	87		49	40	10	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	37	37	45		5	32	37	26
	2006-07	58	58	41		8	50	29	13
	2007-08	71	71	48		18	53	29	0
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	15	15	48		0	15	38	46
	2006-07	41	41	43		0	41	47	12
	2007-08	19	19	49		0	19	67	14
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	70	70	62		23	47	18	13
	2006-07	67	67	58		24	43	26	7
	2007-08	72	72	65		27	46	23	5
Male	2005-06	75	75	77		34	41	16	9
	2006-07	77	77	74		36	41	17	6
	2007-08	83	83	79		41	43	15	2
Female	2005-06	79	79	77		26	53	19	2
	2006-07	74	74	75		34	40	18	8
	2007-08	83	83	80		43	40	14	3

SUBJECT: SOCIAL STUDIES

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 6	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	80	80	78		48	32	12	8
	2006-07	76	76	74		31	44	17	7
	2007-08	69	69	73		40	29	20	10
Hispanic	2005-06	65	65	67		31	33	18	18
	2006-07	71	71	59		15	56	19	10
	2007-08	47	47	59		18	29	29	24
White	2005-06	84	84	85		53	31	10	5
	2006-07	77	77	83		15	56	19	10
	2007-08	75	75	81		46	29	18	7
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	57	57	51		29	29	29	14
	2006-07	44	44	47		13	31	44	13
	2007-08	27	27	40		13	13	40	33
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	21	21	59		0	21	42	37
	2006-07	41	41	46		0	41	41	18
	2007-08	12	12	40		0	12	41	47
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	73	73	65		38	34	14	13
	2006-07	66	66	58		19	48	22	12
	2007-08	58	58	56		29	29	26	16
Male	2005-06	77	77	76		49	28	13	10
	2006-07	80	80	73		32	48	13	7
	2007-08	68	68	72		42	26	19	13
Female	2005-06	83	83	80		48	35	10	7
	2006-07	70	70	75		31	40	22	7
	2007-08	70	70	73		38	33	22	8

MEAP Aggregate and Disaggregated Student Achievement Data – Eastwood School

SUBJECT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING)									
Student Group Grade: 3	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	74	74	78		10	65	20	5
	2006-07	71	71	79	100	11	61	23	6
	2007-08	81	81	81		17	64	15	4
African American	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Asian/Pacific Islander	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Hispanic	2005-06	63	63	65		2	61	31	6
	2006-07	49	49	66		0	49	43	8
	2007-08	78	78	71		5	73	20	2
White	2005-06	77	77	83		12	65	18	5
	2006-07	78	78	84		14	64	17	5
	2007-08	82	82	85		21	61	14	5
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	36	36	51		5	32	36	27
	2006-07	28	28	50		0	28	39	33
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	52	52	60		0	52	41	7
	2006-07	40	40	59		0	40	48	13
	2007-08	72	72	63		3	69	26	3
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	66	66	66		7	59	28	6
	2006-07	62	62	68		5	58	30	8
	2007-08	80	80	71		12	67	16	5
Migrant	2005-06								
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06	70	70	75		10	61	23	7
	2006-07	66	66	75		9	56	26	9
	2007-08	81	81	78		17	64	16	4
Female	2005-06	78	78	81		9	68	18	4
	2006-07	78	78	84		12	66	20	3
	2007-08	82	82	84		17	64	14	4

SUBJECT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING)

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 4	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	76	76	76	100	4	72	20	4
	2006-07	74	74	78		4	70	24	2
	2007-08	69	69	76		10	59	28	3
Hispanic	2005-06	58	58	62		0	58	35	7
	2006-07	65	65	66		0	65	35	0
	2007-08	55	55	64		3	52	42	3
White	2005-06	81	81	81		5	75	16	3
	2006-07	75	75	83		5	70	22	3
	2007-08	74	74	82		13	61	24	3
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	33	33	43		0	33	42	25
	2006-07	26	26	45		0	26	52	22
	2007-08	17	17	43		0	17	70	13
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	29	29	55		0	29	52	19
	2006-07	54	54	56		0	54	46	0
	2007-08	82	82	49		4	79	18	0
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	67	67	63		2	65	27	7
	2006-07	66	66	65		1	66	31	3
	2007-08	60	60	63		4	56	35	4
Male	2005-06	69	69	72		1	68	25	5
	2006-07	72	72	74		3	69	24	5
	2007-08	67	67	73		11	56	27	5
Female	2005-06	82	82	80		7	75	16	3
	2006-07	76	76	81		5	71	24	0
	2007-08	71	71	80		9	62	29	0

SUBJECT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING)

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 5	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	74	74	75		5	69	23	3
	2006-07	72	72	78	100	8	64	22	5
	2007-08	70	70	78		17	53	20	10
Hispanic	2005-06	75	75	63		2	74	18	7
	2006-07	57	57	65		2	55	32	11
	2007-08	57	57	63		2	55	29	14
White	2005-06	73	73	81		6	67	25	2
	2006-07	77	77	83		10	67	19	4
	2007-08	74	74	84		22	52	17	9
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	21	21	40		0	21	53	25
	2006-07	6	6	42		0	6	56	39
	2007-08	25	25	42		0	25	30	45
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	50	50	56		0	50	39	11
	2006-07	24	24	54		0	24	52	24
	2007-08	18	18	44		0	18	53	29
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	70	70	61		2	67	25	5
	2006-07	63	63	65		6	58	27	10
	2007-08	61	61	65		6	54	27	13
Male	2005-06	71	71	71		3	68	25	4
	2006-07	67	67	74		4	63	23	10
	2007-08	67	67	75		18	49	20	12
Female	2005-06	77	77	79		7	70	21	3
	2006-07	77	77	82		11	66	22	2
	2007-08	73	73	81		15	58	19	8

SUBJECT: READING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	86	86	87		27	58	12	3
	2006-07	80	80	87		38	43	16	3
	2007-08	85	85	86		38	46	12	3
Hispanic	2005-06	80	80	77		8	71	16	4
	2006-07	66	66	78		15	51	28	7
	2007-08	82	82	79		20	62	16	2
White	2005-06	87	87	91		33	54	11	2
	2006-07	85	85	91		46	39	13	2
	2007-08	85	85	90		45	41	11	4
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	50	50	65		5	45	36	14
	2006-07	39	39	65		6	33	39	22
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	70	70	72		4	67	22	7
	2006-07	60	60	72		10	50	30	10
	2007-08	78	78	73		7	71	20	2
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	82	82	78		19	63	15	3
	2006-07	74	74	80		27	47	19	6
	2007-08	85	85	79		33	52	12	4
Male	2005-06	81	81	85		28	53	14	5
	2006-07	77	77	85		35	41	20	4
	2007-08	85	85	84		38	47	12	3
Female	2005-06	90	90	89		27	63	9	1
	2006-07	85	85	90		40	44	13	3
	2007-08	84	84	89		38	46	12	4

SUBJECT: READING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 4	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	83	83	83		17	67	13	4
	2006-07	85	85	85		25	60	12	3
	2007-08	80	80	84		25	54	18	2
Hispanic	2005-06	69	69	73		5	64	24	7
	2006-07	88	88	76		8	80	10	2
	2007-08	73	73	76		9	64	25	1
White	2005-06	88	88	88		20	68	9	3
	2006-07	84	84	89		30	54	13	3
	2007-08	82	82	89		32	49	16	3
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	46	46	55		4	42	29	25
	2006-07	35	35	57		0	35	43	22
	2007-08	30	30	57		0	30	65	4
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	33	33	66		0	33	48	19
	2006-07	77	77	68		0	77	19	4
	2007-08	55	55	64		0	55	45	0
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	76	76	73		12	64	17	7
	2006-07	82	82	75		16	66	14	4
	2007-08	76	76	75		14	62	21	3
Male	2005-06	76	76	81		10	66	18	5
	2006-07	81	81	82		24	57	14	6
	2007-08	79	79	82		28	51	18	3
Female	2005-06	90	90	86		23	68	8	3
	2006-07	89	89	87		27	62	11	0
	2007-08	80	80	87		22	58	18	2

SUBJECT: READING

Student Group Grade: 5	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	83	83	80		16	67	12	5
	2006-07	81	81	84		27	54	13	7
	2007-08	77	77	82		36	41	12	11
Hispanic	2005-06	81	81	69		11	70	11	9
	2006-07	66	66	74		9	57	21	13
	2007-08	64	64	69		12	53	22	14
White	2005-06	83	83	85		18	65	12	5
	2006-07	85	85	88		34	51	10	5
	2007-08	80	80	87		43	37	9	10
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	21	21	49		0	21	47	32
	2006-07	33	33	54		0	33	28	39
	2007-08	29	29	49		0	29	19	52
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	61	61	61		0	61	17	22
	2006-07	29	29	63		0	29	43	29
	2007-08	33	33	52		0	33	33	33
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	78	78	68		10	67	14	8
	2006-07	73	73	74		20	53	15	12
	2007-08	70	70	71		25	45	17	13
Male	2005-06	83	83	77		13	70	10	6
	2006-07	77	77	81		24	52	12	12
	2007-08	75	75	79		37	37	11	15
Female	2005-06	82	82	83		19	63	13	4
	2006-07	84	84	87		30	54	14	2
	2007-08	79	79	84		34	44	14	8

SUBJECT: WRITING

Student Group Grade: 3	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advance d Level 1	Proficien t Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	46	46	52		5	41	42	12
	2006-07	45	45	52		0	45	39	16
	2007-08	62	62	57		0	61	33	6
Hispanic	2005-06	37	37	42		2	35	51	12
	2006-07	34	34	40		0	34	43	23
	2007-08	58	58	45		0	58	41	2
White	2005-06	49	49	54		5	44	38	12
	2006-07	49	49	56		0	49	38	13
	2007-08	64	64	62		1	63	29	7
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	27	27	32		0	27	41	32
	2006-07	11	11	26		0	11	39	50
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	22	22	42		0	22	63	15
	2006-07	25	25	37		0	25	45	30
	2007-08	49	49	41		0	49	49	3
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	40	40	42		2	37	46	15
	2006-07	37	37	40		0	37	42	22
	2007-08	56	56	45		0	56	37	7
Male	2005-06	42	42	46		4	38	42	16
	2006-07	37	37	45		0	37	41	22
	2007-08	56	56	53		0	56	38	6
Female	2005-06	49	49	57		5	44	42	9
	2006-07	55	55	59		0	55	36	9
	2007-08	68	68	62		1	67	27	5

SUBJECT: WRITING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 4	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	52	52	55		1	50	42	7
	2006-07	35	35	45		0	35	58	7
	2007-08	31	31	44		0	31	67	2
Hispanic	2005-06	36	36	43		2	35	51	13
	2006-07	27	27	36		0	27	69	4
	2007-08	15	15	31		0	15	84	1
White	2005-06	57	57	59		1	56	39	5
	2006-07	37	37	48		0	37	55	8
	2007-08	37	37	50		0	37	61	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	25	25	27		0	25	50	25
	2006-07	9	9	22		0	9	61	30
	2007-08	0	0	17		0	0	88	13
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	14	14	41		0	14	52	33
	2006-07	23	23	32		0	23	73	4
	2007-08	0	0	21		0	0	97	3
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	46	46	43		2	45	46	8
	2006-07	31	31	35		0	31	59	9
	2007-08	23	23	30		0	23	75	1
Male	2005-06	49	49	49		0	49	42	9
	2006-07	33	33	40		0	33	56	11
	2007-08	30	30	39		0	30	67	3
Female	2005-06	54	54	61		3	52	42	4
	2006-07	36	36	51		0	36	61	3
	2007-08	32	32	50		0	32	68	0

SUBJECT: WRITING

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 5	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	58	58	63		1	57	39	3
	2006-07	43	43	57		0	42	50	8
	2007-08	47	47	59		1	46	46	7
Hispanic	2005-06	61	61	56		2	62	33	5
	2006-07	36	36	48		0	36	52	13
	2007-08	35	35	43		0	35	53	12
White	2005-06	57	57	66		1	56	42	2
	2006-07	45	45	61		1	44	49	6
	2007-08	50	50	65		1	48	44	6
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	16	16	35		0	16	68	16
	2006-07	0	0	25		0	0	50	50
	2007-08	10	10	24		0	10	65	25
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	50	50	55		0	50	44	6
	2006-07	14	14	41		0	14	52	33
	2007-08	6	6	27		0	6	65	29
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	51	51	53		1	51	45	4
	2006-07	37	37	45		0	37	53	11
	2007-08	35	35	44		0	35	55	10
Male	2005-06	56	56	56		1	55	40	4
	2006-07	28	28	50		0	28	59	13
	2007-08	40	40	54		1	39	52	8
Female	2005-06	61	61	70		2	59	38	1
	2006-07	54	54	64		1	54	42	4
	2007-08	54	54	64		1	53	39	7

SUBJECT: MATH

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	92	92	87	100	54	38	7	0
	2006-07	89	89	88		54	35	10	1
	2007-08	93	93	90		53	41	6	0
Hispanic	2005-06	90	90	79		40	50	8	2
	2006-07	77	77	80		29	48	19	3
	2007-08	90	90	85		33	57	10	0
White	2005-06	93	93	92		58	35	7	0
	2006-07	93	93	92		64	30	6	1
	2007-08	94	94	94		60	34	5	1
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	73	73	72		14	59	23	5
	2006-07	50	50	73		28	22	33	17
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	86	86	78		32	54	11	4
	2006-07	71	71	78		17	54	24	5
	2007-08	85	85	83		22	63	15	0
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	89	89	79		45	45	10	1
	2006-07	84	84	80		46	38	13	2
	2007-08	91	91	84		45	46	9	1
Male	2005-06	90	90	87		57	32	10	1
	2006-07	88	88	88		53	34	11	2
	2007-08	95	95	90		55	40	4	1
Female	2005-06	95	95	87		51	44	5	0
	2006-07	91	91	88		55	36	8	1
	2007-08	91	91	90		50	41	9	0

SUBJECT: MATH

Student Group Grade: 4	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advance d Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	83	83	82	100	41	43	15	2
	2006-07	82	82	85		28	55	17	0
	2007-08	88	88	86		34	54	11	1
Hispanic	2005-06	75	75	71		18	56	24	2
	2006-07	76	76	76		12	63	22	2
	2007-08	82	82	79		21	62	16	1
White	2005-06	86	86	88		48	38	12	2
	2006-07	84	84	90		30	53	16	0
	2007-08	90	90	91		39	50	10	1
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	46	46	59		25	21	50	4
	2006-07	48	48	64		9	39	48	4
	2007-08	75	75	65		13	63	21	4
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	57	57	68		0	57	38	5
	2006-07	65	65	69		8	58	31	4
	2007-08	75	75	74		0	75	25	0
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	77	77	70		31	45	20	3
	2006-07	78	78	75		21	57	22	1
	2007-08	82	82	77		24	58	17	1
Male	2005-06	81	81	82		36	45	17	2
	2006-07	81	81	85		33	48	18	1
	2007-08	88	88	86		35	53	10	2
Female	2005-06	86	86	82		45	41	13	2
	2006-07	84	84	85		23	61	16	0
	2007-08	87	87	86		32	55	13	0

SUBJECT: MATH

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 5	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	76	76	73	100	32	43	22	3
	2006-07	73	73	76		29	44	25	2
	2007-08	75	75	74		27	48	21	4
Hispanic	2005-06	68	68	61		19	49	28	4
	2006-07	61	61	64		9	52	39	0
	2007-08	63	63	62		15	47	31	7
White	2005-06	78	78	81		36	42	20	2
	2006-07	78	78	83		37	41	20	2
	2007-08	79	79	81		30	49	18	3
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	37	37	46		16	21	42	21
	2006-07	28	28	46		6	22	67	6
	2007-08	48	48	44		5	43	43	10
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	44	44	60		6	39	44	11
	2006-07	33	33	57		0	33	67	0
	2007-08	39	39	54		6	33	50	11
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	68	68	59		25	43	28	4
	2006-07	61	61	62		22	39	37	3
	2007-08	65	65	60		16	49	28	7
Male	2005-06	76	76	74		34	42	21	3
	2006-07	70	70	77		27	43	27	3
	2007-08	79	79	75		33	46	16	5
Female	2005-06	75	75	73		30	45	23	2
	2006-07	76	76	75		31	45	23	1
	2007-08	72	72	73		22	50	25	3

SUBJECT: SCIENCE

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 5	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	76	76	77		24	52	22	2
	2006-07	83	83	83		31	52	15	2
	2007-08	81	81	82		31	50	16	3
Hispanic	2005-06	68	68	62		9	59	30	2
	2006-07	61	61	71		9	52	39	0
	2007-08	69	69	69		10	59	27	3
White	2005-06	78	78	85		27	51	20	1
	2006-07	78	78	89		37	41	20	2
	2007-08	85	85	89		37	47	13	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06	37	37	60		16	21	58	5
	2006-07	44	44	67		11	33	50	6
	2007-08	68	68	62		23	45	27	5
Limited English Proficient	2005-06	39	39	54		0	39	61	0
	2006-07	52	52	60		5	48	48	0
	2007-08	44	44	53		0	44	60	6
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06	66	66	62		18	48	32	2
	2006-07	75	75	71		22	53	22	3
	2007-08	72	72	70		13	60	24	4
Male	2005-06	79	79	78		28	50	19	2
	2006-07	79	79	83		38	41	18	3
	2007-08	86	86	82		38	48	11	3
Female	2005-06	73	73	76		19	54	26	1
	2006-07	86	86	83		25	62	12	2
	2007-08	76	76	82		24	53	21	3

MEAP Aggregate and Disaggregated Student Achievement Data – Congress

SUBJECT: READING Congress School									
<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	86	86	87		40	46	11	3
	2006-07	75	80	87		46	29	17	8
	2007-08	83	85	86		36	47	14	3
Hispanic	2005-06		80	77					
	2006-07		66	78					
	2007-08	69	82	79		19	50	25	6
White	2005-06		87	91					
	2006-07		85	91					
	2007-08	87	85	90		40	47	11	2
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		50	65					
	2006-07		39	65					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		70	72					
	2006-07		60	72					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		82	78					
	2006-07		74	80					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		81	85					
	2006-07		77	85					
	2007-08	92	85	84		42	50	8	0
Female	2005-06		90	89					
	2006-07		85	90					
	2007-08	77	84	89		32	45	18	5

SUBJECT: WRITING Congress School

Student Group Grade: 3	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	50	46	52		7	43	37	13
	2006-07	48	45	52		0	48	27	25
	2007-08	54	62	57		2	52	40	6
Hispanic	2005-06		37	42					
	2006-07		34	40					
	2007-08	27	58	45		0	27	67	7
White	2005-06		49	54					
	2006-07		49	56					
	2007-08	64	64	62		2	62	30	6
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		27	32					
	2006-07		11	26					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		22	42					
	2006-07		25	37					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		40	42					
	2006-07		37	40					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		42	46					
	2006-07		37	45					
	2007-08	50	56	53		0	50	46	4
Female	2005-06		49	57					
	2006-07		55	59					
	2007-08	57	68	62		3	54	35	8

SUBJECT: MATH Congress School

Student Group Grade: 3	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advance d Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	91	92	87		60	31	7	1
	2006-07	79	89	88		54	25	17	3
	2007-08	92	95	90		56	36	8	0
Hispanic	2005-06		90	79					
	2006-07		77	80					
	2007-08	82	90	85		44	38	19	0
White	2005-06		93	92					
	2006-07		93	92					
	2007-08	96	94	94		62	34	4	0
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		73	72					
	2006-07		50	73					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		86	78					
	2006-07		71	78					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		89	79					
	2006-07		84	80					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		90	87					
	2006-07		88	88					
	2007-08	96				65	31	4	0
Female	2005-06		95	87					
	2006-07		91	88					
	2007-08	89				50	39	11	0

MEAP Aggregate and Disaggregated Student Achievement Data – Wall School

<u>SUBJECT:</u> ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING Wall School									
<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>District</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>State</u> <u>Percent of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Proficient</u> <u>&</u> <u>Advanced</u>	<u>Percent</u> <u>Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each</u> <u>Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced</u> <u>Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient</u> <u>Level 2</u>	<u>Basic</u> <u>Level 3</u>	<u>Below</u> <u>Basic</u> <u>Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	72	74	78		9	63	22	6
	2006-07	80	71	79		8	61	28	3
	2007-08	84	81	81		18	66	13	3
Hispanic	2005-06		63	65					
	2006-07		49	66					
	2007-08	88	78	71		0	88	12	0
White	2005-06		77	83					
	2006-07		78	84					
	2007-08	83	82	85		28	55	13	4
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		36	51					
	2006-07		28	50					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		52	60					
	2006-07		40	59					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		66	66					
	2006-07		62	68					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		70	75					
	2006-07		66	75					
	2007-08	81	81	78		17	64	14	5
Female	2005-06		78	81					
	2006-07		78	84					
	2007-08	88	82	84		20	68	11	0

SUBJECT: READING Wall School

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	85	86	87		27	58	10	5
	2006-07	80	80	87		34	46	18	2
	2007-08	87	85	86		39	48	11	3
Hispanic	2005-06		80	77					
	2006-07		66	78					
	2007-08	91	82	79		15	76	9	0
White	2005-06		87	91					
	2006-07		85	91					
	2007-08	84	85	90		51	33	12	4
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		50	65					
	2006-07		39	65					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		70	72					
	2006-07		60	72					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		82	78					
	2006-07		74	80					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		81	85					
	2006-07		77	85					
	2007-08	85	85	84		34	51	12	3
Female	2005-06		90	89					
	2006-07		85	90					
	2007-08	88	84	89		45	43	9	2

SUBJECT: WRITING Wall School

Student Group Grade: 3	School Year	School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced	Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span —	Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced Level 1	Proficient Level 2	Basic Level 3	Below Basic Level 4
All Students	2005-06	44	46	52		5	40	44	12
	2006-07	43	45	52		0	43	45	12
	2007-08	66	62	57		0	66	29	5
Hispanic	2005-06		37	42					
	2006-07		34	40					
	2007-08	61	58	45		0	61	39	0
White	2005-06		49	54					
	2006-07		49	56					
	2007-08	70	64	62		0	70	23	7
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		27	32					
	2006-07		11	26					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		22	42					
	2006-07		25	37					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		40	42					
	2006-07		37	40					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		42	46					
	2006-07		37	45					
	2007-08	56	56	53		0	56	37	7
Female	2005-06		49	57					
	2006-07		55	59					
	2007-08	80	68	62		0	80	18	2

SUBJECT: MATH Wall School

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	93	92	87		56	36	7	0
	2006-07	93	89	88		52	41	7	0
	2007-08	95	93	90		50	45	5	1
Hispanic	2005-06		90	79					
	2006-07		77	80					
	2007-08	88	90	85		15	73	12	0
White	2005-06		93	92					
	2006-07		93	92					
	2007-08	97	94	94		65	32	1	1
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		73	72					
	2006-07		50	73					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		86	78					
	2006-07		71	78					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		89	79					
	2006-07		84	80					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		90	87					
	2006-07		88	88					
	2007-08	93	95	90		51	42	5	2
Female	2005-06		95	87					
	2006-07		91	88					
	2007-08	96	91	90		48	48	5	0

MEAP Aggregate and Disaggregated Student Achievement Data – Wenzel School

SUBJECT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (INCLUDES READING AND WRITING) Wenzel School									
<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	74	74	78		8	67	23	3
	2006-07	80	71	79		11	70	15	4
	2007-08	92	81	81		16	76	8	0
Hispanic	2005-06		63	65					
	2006-07		49	66					
	2007-08	92	78	71		15	77	8	0
White	2005-06		77	83					
	2006-07		78	84					
	2007-08	91	82	85		13	78	9	0
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		36	51					
	2006-07		28	50					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		52	60					
	2006-07		40	59					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		66	66					
	2006-07		62	68					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		70	75					
	2006-07		66	75					
	2007-08	95	81	78		20	75	5	0
Female	2005-06		78	81					
	2006-07		78	84					
	2007-08	88	82	84		12	76	12	0

SUBJECT: READING Wenzel School

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> ____	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	90	86	87		13	77	10	0
	2006-07	89	80	87		46	43	9	2
	2007-08	90	85	86		45	45	8	3
Hispanic	2005-06		80	77					
	2006-07		66	78					
	2007-08	86	82	79		36	50	14	0
White	2005-06		87	91					
	2006-07		85	91					
	2007-08	91	85	90		48	43	4	4
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		50	65					
	2006-07		39	65					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		70	72					
	2006-07		60	72					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		82	78					
	2006-07		74	80					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		81	85					
	2006-07		77	85					
	2007-08	90	85	84		52	38	10	0
Female	2005-06		90	89					
	2006-07		85	90					
	2007-08	88	84	89		35	53	6	6

SUBJECT: WRITING Wenzel School

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested OR Not Tested in Grade Span</u> —	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	44	46	52		3	41	46	10
	2006-07	48	45	52		0	48	39	13
	2007-08	76	62	57		0	76	24	0
Hispanic	2005-06		37	42					
	2006-07		34	40					
	2007-08	85	58	45		0	84	25	0
White	2005-06		49	54					
	2006-07		49	56					
	2007-08	70	64	62		0	70	30	0
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		27	32					
	2006-07		11	26					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		22	42					
	2006-07		25	37					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		40	42					
	2006-07		37	40					
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		42	46					
	2006-07		37	45					
	2007-08	75	56	53		0	75	25	0
Female	2005-06		49	57					
	2006-07		55	59					
	2007-08	76	68	62		0	76	24	0

SUBJECT: MATH Wenzel School

<u>Student Group</u> Grade: 3	<u>School Year</u>	<u>School Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>District Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>State Percent of Student Proficient & Advanced</u>	<u>Percent Tested</u>	<u>Percent of Student in School at Each Achievement Level</u>			
						<u>Advanced Level 1</u>	<u>Proficient Level 2</u>	<u>Basic Level 3</u>	<u>Below Basic Level 4</u>
All Students	2005-06	95	92	87		49	46	5	0
	2006-07	98	89	88		72	26	0	2
	2007-08	98				66	32	3	0
Hispanic	2005-06		90	79					
	2006-07		77	80					
	2007-08	100				64	36	0	0
White	2005-06		93	92					
	2006-07		93	92					
	2007-08	95				65	30	4	0
Students with Disabilities	2005-06		73	72					
	2006-07		50	73					
	2007-08								
Limited English Proficient	2005-06		86	78					
	2006-07		71	78					
	2007-08								
Economically Disadvantaged	2005-06		89	79					
	2006-07								
	2007-08								
Male	2005-06		90	87					
	2006-07		88	88					
	2007-08	100				67	33	0	0
Female	2005-06		95	87					
	2006-07		91	88					
	2007-08	94				65	29	6	0

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

We assess all of our 2nd through 8th graders annually with the Measures of Academic Progress to determine skill levels in mathematics and English Language Arts. Spring 08 scores:

Reading

Grade	Overall RIT Score	Percentile	Lexile	Word Recognition	Narrative	Information	Comprehension
2	191	55	439	188	194	189	193
3	199	51	579	197	200	199	199
4	202	43	636	200	203	202	203
5	210	47	775	208	211	210	210
6	210	40	782	210	209	210	210
7	214	41	847	213	214	214	213
8	219	45	941	219	219	218	219

Language Usage

Grade	Overall RIT Score	Percentile	Genre	Process	Grammar	Punctuation/Capitalization	Spelling
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	197	43	197	196	198	197	197
4	202	39	203	202	202	201	201
5	208	40	209	209	208	208	208
6	211	39	212	212	211	211	211
7	213	40	215	214	212	211	213
8	217	42	218	218	216	215	218

Math

Grade	Overall RIT Score	Percentile	Numbers & Operation	Algebra	Measurement	Geometry	Data & Probability
2	195	62	192	195	194	198	197
3	202	52	200	203	202	202	202
4	207	44	203	209	207	208	209
5	215	43	214	216	213	216	217
6	220	44	219	219	219	222	222
7	221	38	218	220	220	223	224
8	228	42	226	230	227	229	229

IV. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

Sturgis High School

Student Group (if N ≥ 30)	English Language Arts				Mathematics				Science				Additional Academic Indicators			
	Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Graduation Rate 2005-06		Graduation Rate 2006-07	
	Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal 80%		Goal 80%	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	97.4	N/A	70.3	N/A	97.8	N/A	70.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	61	N/A	90.1	N/A	88.18	N/A
Hispanic	96.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	96.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	N/A	68.2	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	97.5	N/A	74.7	N/A	98	N/A	72.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	66	N/A	92.6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	100	N/A	60.6	N/A	100	N/A	62	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Middle School

Student Group (if N ≥ 30)	English Language Arts				Mathematics				Science				Additional Academic Indicators			
	Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Attendance Rate 2005-06		Attendance Rate 2006-07	
	Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal 85%		Goal 85%	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	100		91	74	100		90.6	73	N/A		83	79	N/A	N/A	95.4	N/A
Hispanic	100		86.7	63	100		86.7	60	N/A		66	67	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	100		92.6	82	100		92	80	N/A		88	87	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	98.3		47.2	33	98.3		66.7	32	N/A		71	48	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	98.4		70.5	44	100		70.5	50	N/A		19	49	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	99.2		83.5	60	99.2		84.8	57	N/A		72	65	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Eastwood

Student Group (if N ≥ 30)	English Language Arts				Mathematics				Science				Additional Academic Indicators			
	Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Attendance Rate 2005-06		Attendance Rate 2006-07	
	Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal 85%		Goal 85%	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	100		87.5	78	100		93.3	78	N/A		81	82	N/A	N/A	96.2	N/A
Hispanic	100		79.9	65	100		87.4	68	N/A		69	69	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	100		89.8	84	100		95.2	84	N/A		85	89	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	100		46.6	42	100		76.3	50	N/A		68	62	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	99		60	49	100		82	63	N/A		44	53	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	100		83.7	65	100		89.9	66	N/A		72	70	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Congress

Student Group (if N ≥ 30)	English Language Arts				Mathematics				Science				Additional Academic Indicators			
	Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Attendance Rate 2005-06		Attendance Rate 2006-07	
	Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal 85%		Goal 85%	
	District	State	School	State	District	State	School	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	N/A	N/A	88.2	81	N/A	N/A	97.1	90	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	N/A	N/A	94.2	85	N/A	N/A	98.1	94	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	85.7	71	N/A	N/A	94.4	84	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Wall

Student Group (if N ≥ 30)	English Language Arts				Mathematics				Science				Additional Academic Indicators			
	Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Attendance Rate 2005-06		Attendance Rate 2006-07	
	Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal 85%		Goal 85%	
	District	State	School	State	District	State	School	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	N/A	N/A	94.5	81	N/A	N/A	95.4	90	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	95.8	N/A
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	97.1	71	N/A	N/A	88.6	85	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	N/A	N/A	93.1	85	N/A	N/A	98.6	94	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	92.2	71	N/A	N/A	92.2	84	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Wenzel

Student Group (if N ≥ 30)	English Language Arts				Mathematics				Science				Additional Academic Indicators			
	Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Percent Tested		Percent Proficient & Advanced		Attendance Rate 2005-06		Attendance Rate 2006-07	
	Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal: 100%		Goal: %		Goal 85%		Goal 85%	
	District	State	School	State	District	State	School	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
All Students	N/A	N/A	97.4	81	N/A	N/A	97.4	90	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	95.9	N/A

V. Parent Involvement

Parent Teacher Conference

Insert graphic displays of the number and percent of parents/guardians attending parent/teacher conferences for this year and the previous year.

School Name	Year	Fall	
		#	%
High School	2007-08	961	100%
	2006-07	933	100%
Middle School	2007-08	723	100%
	2006-07	758	100%
Eastwood	2007-08	712	100%
	2006-07	691	97%
Congress	2007-08	260	100%
	2006-07	257	100%
Wall	2007-08	407	100%
	2006-07	400	100%
Wenzel	2007-08	168	100%
	2006-07	164	100%

Parent Involvement Policy

The Board of Education believes that the education of children is a joint responsibility, one it shares with the parents of the school community. To ensure that the best interests of the child are served in this process, a strong program of communication between home and school must be maintained.

The parents have the right to participate in the education of their children as well as the ultimate responsibility for their children's in-school behavior, including the behavior of students who have reached the legal age of majority, but are still, for all practical purposes, under parental authority.

In accordance with Board Policy 2240 and AG 2240 (Opt-Out), Policy 2413/Policy 2414 and AG 2413/AG 2414 (Health/Sex Education), and Policy 9150 and AG 9150 (School Visitors), the District shall provide the opportunity for parents to review curriculum and instructional materials and to visit the school to observe the instructional process.

With regard to student behavior, during school hours, the Board, through its designated administrators, acts in loco parentis or in place of the parents.

The Board recommends that the following activities be implemented to encourage parent-school cooperation:

- › parent-teacher conferences to permit two-way communication between home and school
- › meetings of staff members and groups of parents of those students having special abilities, disabilities, needs, or problems
- › special events of a cultural, ethnic, or topical nature which are initiated by parent groups, involve the cooperative effort of students and parents, and are of general interest to the schools or community
- › open houses in District schools to provide parents with the opportunity to see the school facilities, meet the faculty, and sample the program on a first hand basis
- › Each school in the District shall hold an open house at least annually.

For the benefit of children, the Board believes that parents have a responsibility to encourage their child's career in school by:

- › supporting the schools in requiring that the children observe all school rules and regulations, and by accepting their own responsibility for children's willful in-school behavior;
- › sending children to school with proper attention to their health, personal cleanliness, and dress;
- › maintaining an active interest in the student's daily work and making it possible for the student to complete assigned homework by providing a quiet place and suitable conditions for study;
- › reading all communications from the school, signing, and returning them promptly when required;
- › cooperating with the school in attending conferences set up for the exchange of information of the child's progress in school.

Summary of Parent Involvement

Sturgis Public Schools places a high priority on parent involvement, as evidenced by the funding of the Family Connection Program. Traditionally, parent involvement is high in the lower grades and tends to drop off as children get older. The Family Connection encourages and facilitates continuing parent involvement at Eastwood, Middle School and High School, serving all students and families in grades 3-12.

The Family Connection maintains a volunteer-staffed office at each building. Parents are encouraged to call with general questions and often work on projects for staff and teachers. A volunteer form goes out in our back-to-school mailings, offering at least 20 ways to stay involved at each building. The Family Connection Office continues to strive to increase parent involvement on all levels from “volunteers” to “partners”. As an example, each volunteer form offers the option to serve on a school committee during the year. Administrators have drawn from that list many times this year, including soliciting parent input on updating the student policy manual at SHS. 19 parents attended different meetings and played a major part of the decision making process.

Sturgis Public Schools emphasize school to home communication via many forms, including:

Written communication is by regular building newsletters and our local newspaper. The Sturgis Journal now employs an Education Reporter working with all school districts in the county. In addition, we provide information on special student achievements and activities in a weekly “Chalk Talk” column. Many informational and reminder flyers are sent home with students. Individual “Good News” postcards are mailed home with personal notes from teachers. Emphasis is placed on making the first communication with parents positive.

Face-to-face opportunities are Open Houses and “Back to School” nights. This year we were successful in increasing attendance at school functions by “piggybacking” events. The idea is to give busy parents more than one reason to attend. For instance, PAC meetings and book fairs were held in conjunction with fall open houses. Attendance at Eastwood Elementary first PAC meeting of the year was increased by 8x normal attendance when held immediately after “Meet the Teacher” night. Informal “Family Nights” are offered for grades K-8 to encourage personal contact between staff and parents. Orientation meetings are held in the spring for parents and students to help prepare those students who will make a transition to a new building in the fall.

Telephone lines are maintained for Family Connection Offices with recorded information on upcoming events, plus the opportunity to leave messages with any questions. With district technology upgrades, there are now phones in every classroom, so phone contact between parents and teachers is improved.

Computer technology has improved communication for those with internet access. Power School is a valuable tool for monitoring their child’s attendance and work habits, along with the opportunity to e-mail teachers immediately with any questions. School calendars and daily announcements are also available from the Sturgis Public Schools web-site. A new addition to our “Parent Resources” section on the site for 2006-07 is Skills Tutor, offering homework help for students (and parents) working at all levels. This year the Family Connection maintained a page on the web-site offering a “news” page that was updated frequently, along with links to information for each building, parent calendars, and current volunteer options. Our News page currently features summer hours for school libraries and computer labs, along with a link to local “Summer Fun and Learning Opportunities”.

Volunteer hours are logged at each Family Connection Office. Every effort is made to identify active volunteers, but there are areas such as individual field trips where volunteer hours are difficult to determine and are not included in the following.

Eastwood: Volunteers logged a total of 1,465 hours during the 2007-08 school year. Activities included service in the Family Connection Office during the school day, head lice checks, working at book fairs, family nights, tutoring, spelling bee and with the Eastwood Advisory Council parent group. In addition, many volunteers chaperoned field trips, 5th Grade Outdoor Education and other out-of-school events.

Middle School: Volunteers logged a total of 430 hours during the school year, including preparing copies of the current GLCEs for each parent to take home from fall conferences, helping in the school library and Family Connection Office, preparing newsletters for mailing, chaperoning dances and activity nights, and staffing a volunteer information table for Open Houses and Orientations.

High School: Volunteers logged 1825 hours including working for the Athletic Boosters in the concession stand at home events, newsletter preparation, and staffing the family connection office. Sturgis Youth and Family Office, assisted by the Family Connection Office, sponsors several drug and alcohol free functions each year including a Progressive Party, Powder-puff Football party and Grad Bash. Hours were also counted in support of the Freshman Alcohol Awareness Conference, Sophomore Leadership Workshops and the Junior / Senior Prom. At the high school, so many activities take place after school hours that it is difficult to document all volunteers. Many volunteers assisted with the Music Boosters, homecoming float assembly, school dances and senior portfolio presentations.

VII. Required High School Criteria for Current Year and Previous Year

Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate/College Equivalent

Describe the Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate or College Equivalent courses available through your school this year and the previous year.

School Year	# of Courses	Course Title(s)
2007-08	1	AP Biology
	1	AP Calculus
	1	AP US History
	1	AP Government
	1	AP Eng/Lit
2006-07	1	AP Biology
	1	AP Calculus
	1	AP US History
	1	AP Government
	1	AP Eng/Lit

Enrollment/Passing Rate

State the number and percentage of pupils ENROLLED in college level equivalent courses (i.e., AP courses), disaggregated by grade for this year and the previous year. State the passing rate.

College Equivalent Courses by Grade Level	# of Enrolled Students 2006-07	% of Enrolled Students 2006-07	Passing Rate % 2006-07	# of Enrolled Students 2007-08	% of Enrolled Students 2007-08	Passing Rate % 2007-08
9th Grade	0	0	0	0	0	0
10th Grade	3	1.12%	33%	0	0	0
11th Grade	7	3.40%	60%	26	2.70%	50%
12 th Grade	34	16.20%	72.70%	55	5.80%	67.30%

College Credit/Dual Enrollment

State the number and percentage of students who received college credit through dual enrollment for this year and the previous year.

State the number and percentage of pupils who took a college level equivalency exam (i.e., AP courses) and those who achieved a score to receive college credit this year and the previous year.

	2007-2008		2006-2007	
	# Students	% of Students	# Students	% of Students
Students Receiving College Credit through Dual Enrollment	256	26.90%	51	5.9%
Students Who Enrolled in College Courses and Took Exam	91	9.60%	97	11.2%
Students Who Achieved a Score to Receive College Credit	253	26.60%	95	10.9%

VIII. Core Curriculum

Process For Development/Alignment of English/Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies:

Once every 6 years every core area receives a complete curriculum review and rewrite. A district team is assembled with K-12 representation including classroom, Title I, Talent Development, ESL and Special Education teachers, assessment, instructional technology personnel, and administration. The team reviews all available data, which is collected from MEAP testing and the curriculum mapping process, along with recent research and best practices information. Assessment trends, gaps and overlaps are noted and the rewrite process begins. Our curriculum is fully aligned with State of Michigan and or National Benchmarks. The team uses a rubric to review all potential support materials and selects those items best suited to delivering the new curriculum. Through out the process team members interact regularly with ALL district staff responsible for delivering the new curriculum. The team's final recommendations are presented to the Curriculum Planning Council along with recommendations for Professional Development. With Council approval, the recommendations are presented to the Board of Education. Public input is invited for the required thirty-day review period prior to formal approval by the Board.

English Language Arts

ELA curriculum will be reviewed in the 2008-09 school year.

Math

Math curriculum was reviewed in the 2006-07 school year. Maps were revised and textbook selections were made: K-2 will use an updated version of Everyday Math, 3-5 selected Harcourt Brace, 6-8 will use an updated Connected Math and 9-12 selected materials from Prentice Hall.

Science

Science curriculum was reviewed in the 2005-06 school year.

Social Studies

Social Studies curriculum was reviewed in the 2006-07 school year. Maps were revised and textbook selections were made: K-5 supplemented existing materials; the only new materials were adopted in 3rd grade for curriculum regarding Michigan. 6-12 selected materials from Prentice Hall.

Equitable access to appropriate instruction in the core academic curriculum:

The SPS curriculum is required for all students, including special education and LEP students. Through ongoing professional development and regular special education meetings, teachers are taught strategies for differentiation of curriculum ensuring that all students receive the same curriculum. Ongoing efforts to design curriculum maps will continue to refine the process.

Variations

There are no variations from the Michigan Curriculum Framework.

IX. Teacher Qualification

Under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), districts and buildings are required to publish the professional qualification of its teachers. Names of individual teachers do not need to be shared in the Annual Education Report. Complete the tables below to provide required information about teacher certificates and advanced degrees, emergency or provisional credentials, and teacher status.

HIGH SCHOOL	B.A.	M.A.
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	51%	49%
Percentage of Teachers in the School who are Highly Qualified	100%	
Percentage of Teachers in the School with Emergency Credentials	0%	
Percentage of Core Academic Subject classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers *	0%	

MIDDLE SCHOOL	B.A.	M.A.
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	64%	36%
Percentage of Teachers in the School who are Highly Qualified	100%	
Percentage of Teachers in the School with Emergency Credentials	0%	
Percentage of Core Academic Subject classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers *	0%	

EASTWOOD SCHOOL	B.A.	M.A.
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	45%	55%
Percentage of Teachers in the School who are Highly Qualified	100%	
Percentage of Teachers in the School with Emergency Credentials	0%	
Percentage of Core Academic Subject classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers *	0%	

CONGRESS SCHOOL	B.A.	M.A.
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	33%	67%
Percentage of Teachers in the School who are Highly Qualified	100%	
Percentage of Teachers in the School with Emergency Credentials	0%	
Percentage of Core Academic Subject classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers *	0%	

WALL SCHOOL	B.A.	M.A.
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	52%	48%
Percentage of Teachers in the School who are Highly Qualified	100%	
Percentage of Teachers in the School with Emergency Credentials	0%	
Percentage of Core Academic Subject classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers *	0%	

WENZEL SCHOOL	B.A.	M.A.
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School		100%
Percentage of Teachers in the School who are Highly Qualified	100%	
Percentage of Teachers in the School with Emergency Credentials	0%	
Percentage of Core Academic Subject classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers *	0%	

Highly Qualified Progress Plan

Sturgis Public Schools held informational meetings in buildings to explain the NCLB qualifications to teachers. Teachers who are not highly qualified elect different options to become highly qualified, including testing and a portfolio process. For those who elect testing, the school district reimburses teachers for the cost of the MTTC exam.

Parent Notification & Point of Contact

Parents in the Sturgis Public Schools received the following notification via building newsletters and the Sturgis Public Schools website.

Sturgis Public School has always worked to provide our students with a positive educational experience.

Our district receives funding from many resources, one of which is Title I, Part A, a grant provided by the federal government through the recent legislation, No Child Left Behind. As a requirement for receiving funds under this program, each school must meet the guidelines for “highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals” in each subject area using a system approved by the Michigan Board of Education.

You, as a parent, may request information on your child’s teacher(s) qualifications:

- Certification for grade level and subject,
- Emergency or provisional status,
- BA major and graduate degrees, and
- Whether your child is provided services by paraprofessionals.

Also, the district will notify you when your child is being taught for four (4) consecutive weeks by teachers NOT highly qualified.

If you would like to receive this information, please put your request in writing to Julie Evans, 107 W. West St., Sturgis, MI or email jevans@sturgisps.org. A response to your request for information will be provided in five business days.