

Annual Education Report

2009-2010

Parkwood-Upjohn Elementary School

2321 South Park St.

Kalamazoo, MI 49001

Phone Number 269.337-0720 . Fax Number 269.337-1632

steinerch@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us



The mission of Parkwood-Upjohn Elementary School is to provide an excellent academic and socially equitable education in a safe and respectful environment.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Ms. Carol Steiner

2008-09 Board of Education

President: Ms. Patti Sholler-Barber

Vice-President: Ms. Mollie Peterson

Secretary: Ms. Liz Henderson

Treasurer: Mr. Eric Breisach

Trustee: Mr. Phillip W. Dietrich

Trustee: Ms. Marcy L. Peake

Trustee: Ms. Carol McGlenn



Kalamazoo Public Schools

Every child, every opportunity, every time!

Overview of School

Accreditation Status & Education YES! Grades

The chart below identifies our buildings accreditation status and grades as determined by Education YES!

Education Yes! Report Card	2008 – 2009		2007 – 2008	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	82	B	78.5	C
English Language Arts	67.7	D	70	C
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	74.9	C	74.3	C
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	83	B	83	B
AYP Status	Met AYP- Y		Met AYP-Y	
Composite Grade	B		B	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Accredited		Accredited	

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

2008–2009 Highlights

- Increased reading scores at every grade level
- Halloween Parade-each class chooses a book and makes costumes and posters that promote their chosen book. The parade is led by our band students.
- October is Mystery Month. Clues are given twice a week on 'Parkwood-Upjohn Mystery Theater'.
- Free books to all parents and children who attend conferences.
- December- Community Read: culminating with a special all-school event. Fundraising allows every family to own a copy of the selected book.
- March is reading month. Students prepared for and participated in 'The Global Reading Challenge', competing against other area schools. Classrooms compete to read the highest number of books. Culminating event hosted by Kalamazoo Valley Museum.
- Panther Power Hour accelerates individual learning with organized programs targeting students with needs ranging from below grade level to the academically talented.
- PTO actively supports science learning with 'Science in a Sack'; a program that sends a science experiment home four times a year to every family. Our spring conferences highlight science learning with displays from every classroom and guest scientists.
- Many community building family activities such as a Meet Your Teacher BBQ, First Day Tears and Cheers Coffee, HOOPLA, (a celebrity basketball game and silent auction), the Family Carnival, two book fairs, movie nights, and an end of year ice cream social.

2008–2009 Highlights (cont.)

- Spring Art Hop evening with student work displayed for the community.
- A paid drumming teacher leads drum circles twice a week during activity time thanks to a grant written by a parent. Spring Art Hop always includes an open drum circle
- An EFA grant allows Scarlett Vasquez to teach dance during activity three times a week for children from grades 1-5
- Federal funding to provide students reading below grade level with a year's subscription to either Big Back Yard or Ranger Rick magazine to increase interest in reading at home.
- Dr. Carol Hogan received a grant from State Farm for afterschool FINANCE CHILD SUCCESS and REAL MONEY targeting 2nd-5th grade
- YMCA Primetime program before and after school provides supervision and homework help.
- School-wide and individual classroom newsletters and invitations to parents, and have school-provided baby-sitting and food during PTO and SIT meetings.
- Parent Corps program that hires 3-4 parents of academically at-risk students to work in classrooms.
- PEEP site, a program for identified four-year-olds.

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2008		Spring 2009	
	#	%	#	%
Parkwood	511	95	491	89

Parent Involvement Policy

District Policy

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

Parkwood-Upjohn Parent Involvement

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

Highly Qualified Staff

- 100% of the staff is teaching in their credential area of experience.
- No teachers with emergency or provision credentials are teaching in either the high or low poverty schools.
- No teachers are teaching in the classroom in either the high or low poverty schools that are not highly qualified.
- 2 Administrators with a Masters Degree
- 33 teachers; 13 with a Bachelors Degree; 2 with a Masters Degree; 1 with a Masters+30; and 1 with a Doctorate Degree
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	All student subgroups will meet or exceed state achievement targets for Reading.
Data to support goal selection:	African American subgroup is achieving an average of 29% less than White students in grades 3-6 in Reading. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup is achieving less than Non-Economically Disadvantaged students in fourth and sixth grades.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<p>Provide additional tutoring support for below grade level learners</p> <p>Use Gates, PALS, Saxon phonics, Read Naturally, Connected Reading, and Rewards programs as center activities with hourly tutors as supplement in grades k-5</p> <p>Align services provided by tutors and others to assure students receive targeted help with minimum of disruption; 'Power Hour'</p> <p>Motivate upper grades boys and girls with low reading scores with 'Guys Read' or 'Girls Read' club</p> <p>Inc</p> <p>Kindergarten students attend extended day kindergarten program</p> <p>Coordinate a Reading Buddies program across grade levels</p> <p>Help children select library books in targeted zone determined by STAR and DIBELS. Children will earn points by reading, then computer testing to earn rewards.</p> <p>Give away books to parents and children who attend parent events</p> <p>Mail Ranger Rick and Big Backyard magazines to all families whose children are below grade level in reading</p>
Accomplishments:	<p>MEAP reading scores overall are up an average of over 8% from 07-08 to 08-09.</p> <p>MEAP reading scores for African American sub-group increased nearly 7% school-wide</p> <p>MEAP writing scores overall are up nearly 9% from 07-08 to 08-09</p>
Implications for next year:	Increasing focus on strong core curriculum, especially in grades four and five, plus coordinated reading interventions in fourth and fifth grade should continue to increase reading proficiency for African American students. We must increase our focus on vocabulary acquisition.
Math	
Goal:	All student subgroups at each grade level will meet expectations on the MEAP Math test as set by the state of Michigan.
Data to support goal selection:	African American students overall trail White students by 27% at every grade level in Math
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<p>Use identified software and on-line resources and provide technology-rich assistance to below grade level learners to supplement classroom.</p> <p>Provide training in new math district adoption during school lesson studies, after school and during release time</p> <p>Provide additional assistance to students identified as below grade level by last year's MEAP with in-class tutors and volunteers</p> <p>Provide high-interest Math activities during Lunch and Learn activity time. Identify students who should attend</p>
Accomplishments:	<p>MEAP math scores overall are up an average of nearly 5% from 07-08 to 08-09</p> <p>MEAP math scores for African American sub-group increased 3.5% schoolwide</p>
Implications for next year:	New district math curriculum implementation along with professional development and targeted math interventions should continue to increase math proficiency for African American students. We must increase our focus on vocabulary acquisition.

Writing

Goal:	All student subgroups will meet or exceed state achievement targets for Writing
Data to support goal selection:	African American subgroup is achieving an average of 39% less than White students in grades 3-6 in Writing. Economically Disadvantaged subgroup is achieving below the Non-Economically Disadvantaged subgroup.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	<p>Continue to utilize a Publishing Center to increase student ability to edit and write fluently using technology in grades 2-5.</p> <p>Publish current student writing by posting work from every student in the hallway, along with an accompanying 6+1 Traits rubric</p> <p>Create a new writing unit focused on writing on demand to standards</p> <p>Cross-group for fifth grade writing instruction</p> <p>Kindergarten students attend extended day kindergarten program to allow additional time for writing</p>
Accomplishments:	<p>Kalamazoo Communities in Schools funded Publishing Center organized in an upstairs room</p> <p>Children's writing is posted outside all classrooms</p> <p>All fifth grade classes cross group for writing instruction</p> <p>Additional units in grades 2 and up focus on writing on demand</p> <p>Extended day kindergarten allows more time to focus on all core subjects, including writing</p>
Implications for next year:	<p>Increasing focus on strong core curriculum plus additional lessons focused on writing on demand should continue to increase writing ability for African American and Economically Disadvantaged students. We must increase our focus writing fluency, vocabulary usage and organization.</p>

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All student subgroups at each grade level will meet or exceed MEAP Science expectations as determined by the state of Michigan.
Data to support goal selection:	African American subgroup trails white students by an average of 28% at Fifth grade level in Science
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Implement new district science curriculum at all grade levels Increase variety of active learner strategies to reach at-risk children including focus on vocabulary building and graphic organizers Cross group fifth grade science instruction
Accomplishments:	In the last four years overall MEAP science scores have remained at about 67%, but during the same time African American scores have increased from 43% to 50%
Implications for next year:	Overall scores are static, so attention to implementation of new science curriculum is needed. We must increase our focus on vocabulary acquisition. Schoolwide implementation of the district science curriculum during a dedicated block plus cross-grouping in fifth grade to insure tight focus on the objectives should continue to close the achievement gap between African American and White students.

Social Studies	
Goal:	All student subgroups at each grade level will meet or exceed MEAP Social Studies expectations as determined by the state of Michigan.
Data to support goal selection:	African American subgroup trails white students by an average of 45% at sixth grade in Social Studies
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Integrate Social Studies topics into Writing Curriculum Utilize Junior Achievement volunteers in every classroom to enrich instruction Increase variety of active learner strategies to reach at-risk children including focus on vocabulary building and graphic organizers Review Michigan Social Studies GLCE's in Social Studies Cross group fifth grade social studies instruction
Accomplishments:	MEAP scores increased 17% overall from 07-08 to 08-09 MEAP scores for African American students increased 11% from 07-08 to 08-09
Implications for next year:	We must increase our focus on social studies GLCE's, cross-group for fifth grade instruction, and reach out to Junior Achievement in the absence of an up-to-date social studies curriculum. We must increase our focus on vocabulary acquisition. Attention should be paid to active strategies that engage all sub-groups.



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Assessment Data

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

Student Group 3rd Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	69	68	81	94	20	49	22	9
	2008-09	84	73	83	100	16	68	16	0
African American	2007-08	50	58	67	96	4	46	33	17
	2008-09	71	65	69	100	3	68	29	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		64	79					
	2008-09		82	80					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		89	90					
	2008-09		83	92					
Hispanic	2007-08		60	71					
	2008-09		62	74					
White	2007-08	85	80	85	94	36	48	15	0
	2008-09	92	85	87	100	31	61	8	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	36	36	53	85	9	27	36	27
	2008-09	55	47	55	100	0	55	45	0
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		61	63					
	2008-09		60	69					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	56	60	71	98	2	54	29	15
	2008-09	74	65	74	93	3	71	26	0
Migrant	2007-08			64					
	2008-09			64					
Male	2007-08	67	64	78	91	10	57	23	10
	2008-09	81	72	81	100	16	66	19	0
Female	2007-08	71	71	84	97	29	43	20	9
	2008-09	86	74	86	100	17	69	14	0

Student Group 4th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	67	56	76	94	14	53	24	10
	2008-09	61	57	77	100	8	53	35	5
African American	2007-08	45	43	56	94	0	45	39	16
	2008-09	24	43	56	100	0	33	58	8
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		61	74					
	2008-09		46	73					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		80	86					
	2008-09		100	88					
Hispanic	2007-08		51	64					
	2008-09		48	64					
White	2007-08	80	73	82	95	29	51	14	6
	2008-09	81	76	83	100	14	68	16	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	36	30	43	85	9	27	36	27
	2008-09	0	22	44	100	0	0	92	8
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		45	49					
	2008-09		51	50					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	50	45	63	90	8	42	37	13
	2008-09	38	46	64	100	0	38	54	8
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			51					
Male	2007-08	71	54	73	89	18	53	18	12
	2008-09	44	54	74	100	0	44	48	7
Female	2007-08	63	59	80	95	11	53	29	8
	2008-09	72	61	79	100	13	59	26	3

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	66	64	78	97	26	40	18	16
	2008-09	71	59	78	100	11	61	22	7
African American	2007-08	29	49	58	89	6	24	47	24
	2008-09	60	46	58	100	7	53	33	7
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	73					
	2008-09		73	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		75	86					
	2008-09		94	89					
Hispanic	2007-08		61	63					
	2008-09		60	66					
White	2007-08	79	81	84	98	38	41	8	13
	2008-09	84	75	84	100	16	68	11	5
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		23	42					
	2008-09	30	25	42	100	0	30	40	30
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		54	44					
	2008-09		58	50					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	44	53	65	94	6	38	28	28
	2008-09	59	49	66	95	5	54	34	7
Migrant	2007-08			45					
	2008-09			54					
Male	2007-08	64	59	75	97	24	39	18	18
	2008-09	71	56	76	100	11	61	24	5
Female	2007-08	69	68	81	97	28	41	17	14
	2008-09	71	62	81	100	11	61	21	8

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	66	62	80	93	9	56	30	5
	2008-09	70	67	80	100	23	47	28	2
African American	2007-08	43	49	59	96	9	35	48	9
	2008-09	53	54	61	100	0	53	47	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		73	78					
	2008-09		70	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		85	89					
	2008-09		92	89					
Hispanic	2007-08		58	69					
	2008-09		63	68					
White	2007-08	80	76	86	97	9	71	17	3
	2008-09	78	83	85	100	36	42	19	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		27	41					
	2008-09		21	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		46	53					
	2008-09		69	50					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	55	51	67	98	5	50	40	5
	2008-09	48	58	68	100	3	45	48	3
Migrant	2007-08			63					
	2008-09			58					
Male	2007-08	58	56	76	94	3	55	36	6
	2008-09	66	65	77	100	24	41	31	3
Female	2007-08	74	68	83	91	16	58	23	3
	2008-09	75	70	82	100	21	54	25	0

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: MATHEMATICS

Student Group 3rd Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	83	76	90	96	42	41	17	0
	2008-09	82	81	91	100	50	32	18	0
African American	2007-08	64	67	76	100	12	52	36	0
	2008-09	71	74	79	100	29	42	29	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		91	90					
	2008-09		82	92					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	97					
	2008-09		91	96					
Hispanic	2007-08		72	85					
	2008-09		74	87					
White	2007-08	94	87	94	94	67	27	6	0
	2008-09	92	92	95	100	75	17	8	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	67	52	77	92	17	50	33	0
	2008-09	55	71	55	100	18	36	45	0
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		73	83					
	2008-09		72	85					
Economically Disadvan- tagged	2007-08	74	69	84	100	19	55	26	0
	2008-09	71	76	86	93	29	42	29	0
Migrant	2007-08			85					
	2008-09			80					
Male	2007-08	97	78	90	91	43	53	3	0
	2008-09	81	84	92	100	53	28	19	0
Female	2007-08	72	75	90	100	42	31	28	0
	2008-09	83	79	91	100	48	36	17	0

Student Group 4th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	75	66	86	94	32	43	22	3
	2008-09	80	69	88	100	30	50	17	3
African American	2007-08	52	53	69	94	16	35	45	3
	2008-09	58	57	74	100	4	54	38	4
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		67	85					
	2008-09		62	87					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		81	95					
	2008-09		100	95					
Hispanic	2007-08		56	79					
	2008-09		67	81					
White	2007-08	91	84	91	95	43	49	6	3
	2008-09	95	84	92	100	46	49	5	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	82	49	65	85	27	55	18	0
	2008-09	50	47	68	100	8	42	42	8
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		55	74					
	2008-09		64	76					
Economically Disadvan- tagged	2007-08	61	55	77	90	21	39	34	5
	2008-09	68	59	80	100	8	59	27	5
Migrant	2007-08			81					
	2008-09			82					
Male	2007-08	76	67	86	89	35	41	21	3
	2008-09	78	70	88	100	11	67	22	0
Female	2007-08	74	64	86	95	29	45	24	3
	2008-09	82	68	88	100	44	38	13	5

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	63	59	74	97	29	34	31	6
	2008-09	57	54	77	100	41	16	37	7
African American	2007-08	29	42	51	89	6	24	59	12
	2008-09	43	41	55	100	23	20	50	7
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	68					
	2008-09		47	72					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		62	90					
	2008-09		88	92					
Hispanic	2007-08		57	62					
	2008-09		41	66					
White	2007-08	77	78	81	98	44	33	18	5
	2008-09	70	75	83	100	59	11	24	5
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		33	44					
	2008-09	30	30	47	100	0	30	30	40
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		48	54					
	2008-09		42	61					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	38	48	60	94	6	31	53	9
	2008-09	39	45	64	95	22	17	51	10
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	64	61	75	97	30	33	30	6
	2008-09	61	57	78	100	50	11	34	5
Female	2007-08	62	58	73	97	28	34	31	7
	2008-09	53	51	76	100	32	21	39	8

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	53	55	73	93	27	27	25	22
	2008-09	74	68	80	100	46	28	25	2
African American	2007-08	26	39	48	96	9	17	35	39
	2008-09	40	53	61	100	13	27	53	7
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		73	69					
	2008-09		80	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		85	90					
	2008-09		92	93					
Hispanic	2007-08		58	61					
	2008-09		74	71					
White	2007-08	63	73	80	97	34	29	23	14
	2008-09	86	83	85	100	61	25	14	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		28	35					
	2008-09		31	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		49	51					
	2008-09		72	62					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	38	42	58	98	8	30	30	33
	2008-09	52	59	69	100	21	31	45	3
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			73					
Male	2007-08	58	58	72	94	21	36	18	24
	2008-09	72	67	79	100	52	21	28	0
Female	2007-08	48	53	73	91	32	16	32	19
	2008-09	75	69	81	100	39	36	21	4

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Science

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	71	62	82	97	35	35	18	11
	2008-09	64	58	83	100	36	29	24	12
African American	2007-08	47	46	59	89	6	41	35	18
	2008-09	50	42	62	100	13	37	30	20
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	81					
	2008-09		67	84					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		77	89					
	2008-09		88	91					
Hispanic	2007-08		60	69					
	2008-09		52	73					
White	2007-08	79	80	89	98	49	31	10	10
	2008-09	78	79	89	100	57	22	19	3
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		50	62					
	2008-09	30	47	64	100	0	30	30	40
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		51	53					
	2008-09		48	59					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	56	51	70	94	16	41	25	19
	2008-09	51	48	72	95	17	34	32	17
Migrant	2007-08			56					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	73	62	82	97	36	36	15	12
	2008-09	68	59	83	100	45	24	21	11
Female	2007-08	69	63	82	97	34	34	21	10
	2008-09	61	56	83	100	26	34	26	13

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Social Studies

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	50	48	73	93	25	25	17	33
	2008-09	67	50	74	100	40	26	12	21
African American	2007-08	22	31	45	96	9	13	17	61
	2008-09	33	32	48	100	7	27	20	47
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		64	71					
	2008-09		50	71					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		75	84					
	2008-09		69	84					
Hispanic	2007-08		35	59					
	2008-09		42	59					
White	2007-08	66	69	81	97	37	29	17	17
	2008-09	78	74	81	100	58	19	11	11
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		35	40					
	2008-09		31	40					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		23	40					
	2008-09		38	41					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	33	33	56	98	5	28	23	45
	2008-09	41	39	59	100	10	31	17	41
Migrant	2007-08			48					
	2008-09			48					
Male	2007-08	48	49	72	94	21	27	12	39
	2008-09	59	52	74	100	38	21	21	21
Female	2007-08	52	46	73	91	29	23	23	26
	2008-09	75	49	73	100	43	32	4	21

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

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

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

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
First Grade				
African American	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.2
Hispanic	2.7	2.2	2.2	1.9
White	2.3	2.6	2	2.1
Economically Disadvantaged	1.7	1.9	1.6	1.4
Special Education	1.9	1.1	1.6	1
Second Grade				
African American	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.1
Hispanic	4.1	3.8	3.3	3.2
White	4.1	3.6	3.5	2.9
Economically Disadvantaged	2.6	2.8	2.2	2.3
Special Education	2.4	2	2.2	1.7
Third Grade				
African American	3.4	3.1	3.2	3
Hispanic	3.9	3.4	3.6	3.7
White	4.3	4.9	4.2	4.1
Economically Disadvantaged	3.4	3.2	3.3	3
Special Education	2.7	2.8	2.7	3
Fourth Grade				
African American	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.6
Hispanic	5.3	3.1	4.9	3.6
White	6	6	5.4	5.3
Economically Disadvantaged	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.9
Special Education	3.9	3	4.3	3.4

Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Performance Series

EdPerformance				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
Fifth Grade				
African American	2517	2571	2306	2368
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	2786	2842	2503	2576
Economically Disadvantaged	2542	2583	2306	2382



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Achievement Targets in Relation to AYP Targets and Attendance Rate

	Reading/Language Arts						Mathematics						Additional Academic Indicator		
	Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Attendance Rate		
Student Group Elementary School	Goal: 95%			Goal: %			Goal: 95%			Goal: %			Goal: 90%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	100	99	97	88	82		100	100	97	90	88		95	92	
African American	100	99	96	84	77		100	99	97	85	83		94	91	
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	N/A	N/A	96	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	97	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	99	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	100	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	N/A	102	96	N/A	79		N/A	103	98	N/A	87		N/A	93	
White	100	99	97	90	89		100	100	97	92	94		95	94	
Students with Disabilities	105	99		57	57		105	100		66	77		93	90	
Limited English Proficient	N/A	99		N/A	79		N/A	101		N/A	85		N/A	93	
Economically Disadvantaged	107	101		82	77		107	102		84	85		94	91	



Parkwood-Upjohn Elementary School

Excellence in education for 85 years.

A tradition for generations

Core Curriculum

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

The Process of Curriculum Development and Alignment

As of 2007-2009, curriculum leaders, in conjunction with teachers, have integrated three major approaches to curriculum work in the development model. This model recognizes that creating curriculum guides alone does not enhance student achievement; it is merely the first step. Curriculum work must funnel down to classroom instruction, assessment, and instructional improvement based on data in order to maximize student achievement. As such, the model is focused on the work of Ainsworth, Marzano, Wiggins, and Tomlinson specifically as related to using standards for curriculum development, unit design, lesson design, instruction, differentiated instruction, and assessment (formative and summative). Our current process is indicated below:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Foundation of Core Courses

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

Teaching to Expectations (Units of Study)

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

English Language Arts

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

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

Math

A representative group of elementary teachers assembled in fall 2008 to explore options for new resources aligned with state expectations and based on best practices for grades K-5. Following the scheduled resource pilot in January 2009, mathematics leadership team members will identify and recommended a new series in March 2009. Professional development activities were scheduled for late summer and fall 2009 that provided assistance to classroom teachers with using guides and new textbook series to teach grade-level content expectations. During 2008-2010, the curriculum writing team, along with classroom teachers, convened periodically to report on the quality of guides and offered recommendations for improvement. The implementation began in fall 2009 and will be provided with ongoing opportunities for improving guide components and professional development.

With respect to middle school mathematics, the leadership team will review resources during 2009-2010 to investigate quality, relevance in meeting state expectations, and unification of format and content with the K-5 program. Based on findings, the adoption and curriculum development process may occur in 2010-2011 with scheduled professional development in fall 2011. In the meantime, to focus instruction on grade-level content expectations and support instructional practices, mathematics writing teams will assemble in winter 2009 to strengthen currently used guides. In winter 2009, high school curriculum writing teams collaborated with teachers to complete guides drafted during 2007-2008. In fall 2009, teachers received drafts guides and are expected to fully implement the program during 2009-2010. Plans to conduct resource audits for specific elective courses will occur 2010-2011. Revisions in state course expectations will direct future curriculum writing efforts during 2010-2011 and 2011-2012

Science

During the 2007-2008, the district adopted a K-6 science program developed by Battle Creek Area Mathematics and Science Center (BCAMSC) in Battle Creek, Michigan. BCAMSC curriculum guides contain instructional units aligned with grade level content expectations for life, earth, and physical science strands. On a yearly basis, BCAMSC provides teachers with updated unit activities and curriculum guides (components), includes resources to address realignment needs indicated by MDE, and offers professional development. Over the past two years, the district has phased in units by specific grade levels. In accordance with the final phase of implementation plan, 3rd through 6th grade teacher received the newly realigned science units with curriculum guides and training in fall 2009. consistent with the elementary direction and based on the results of an resource audit conducted in 2007, the science leadership teams will consider piloting BCAMSC units along with other resource options for 7th and 8th grades in spring 2010. Upon approval, the leadership team will deliver professional development sessions during 2010-2011. In the meantime, the 7th grade curriculum writing team assembled in winter 2009 to draft pacing guides and identify supplementary materials for use in fall 2009. Similarly, the 8th grade curriculum writing team assembled in winter 2009 to continue writing pacing guides previously drafted in 2007-2008. Seventh and eighth grade teachers received draft pacing guides in fall 2009 with supporting professional development. Full implementation of the 7th and 8th grade science curriculum guides will occur 2010-2011.

In 2010-2011, curriculum writing teams will implement secondary science guides drafted during 2008-2009. Curriculum teams worked during the summer in writing these guides to provide teachers with drafts and professional development in the fall 2009. Teachers will fully implement revised guides in 2011 with opportunities for improving guide components and professional development. Curriculum writing teams will assemble during 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 to investigate alignment between high school content expectations and currently used textbooks in honors and elective courses. Based on findings, recommendations for adoptions and the subsequent revision of curriculum guides will occur in winter 2010 with professional development during 2010-2011.

Social Studies

To address MDE revisions at the elementary level curriculum writing teams conducted K-5 resource audits to ensure alignment to the grade level content expectations. Teachers will receive draft guides in fall 2010 with supporting professional development. Full implementation of guides is expected fall 2011. At the middle school level, 6th grade recently underwent a textbook adoption and as a result, curriculum writing teams assembled draft curriculum guides that provide direction in implementing the newly adopted series in the fall of 2009. Teachers engaged in professional development in fall 2009 and will continue the work during the year. Full implementation of the revised guide is scheduled fall 2010.

During 2009-10, the middle school social studies curriculum writing team will review grade level content expectations and resources to determine cohesiveness of the 6th and 7th grade courses. Recommendations to shift or redistribute partial content in 7th grade to 6th may occur based on breadth of current MDE social studies topics. This decision will assist with ensuring vertical articulation between courses. Based on resource needs, the curriculum writing team may recommend an adoption during 2009-2010. The 7th grade curriculum writing team will continue drafting curriculum pacing guides during 2009-2010 with full implementation in 2011. In 8th grade, a textbook adoption committee convened in 2007-2008 to conduct a resource audit and pilot selected resources. As a result of the pilot, committee members recommended a new textbook series for adoption in winter 2010. In the meantime, the curriculum writing team will complete 8th grade previously drafted in 2008-2009. Teachers received draft guides in fall 2009 with scheduled professional development. Full implementation of the 8th grade guides with new resources is scheduled 2011.

High school social studies curriculum guides drafted in 2007-2008 are scheduled for full implementation in 2010-2011. To meet timelines, curriculum teams have assembled this year to continue writing guides. Several of these guides will undergo major revisions due to new MDE high school content expectations. Teachers received draft guides in fall 2009 along with professional development. With respect to elective courses, curriculum writing teams will conduct resource audits during 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Curriculum writing teams may offer recommendations for adoptions based on findings. Writing teams will complete related work with developing curriculum guides between 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Variations

All schools use Kalamazoo Public School's curriculum guides that are aligned to MDE expectations and standards. Magnet schools and schools with special themes integrate their specialized areas into the KPS curriculum.