

Annual Education Report

2008-2009

Arcadia Elementary School

932 Boswell Lane

Kalamazoo, MI 49006

Phone Number 269.337.0530 Fax Number 269.372.9874

VanErkelSK@kalamazoo.k12.mi.us



The mission of Arcadia School, an exemplary, diverse community of life-long learners, is to ensure the highest academic achievement and personal success for each individual by respecting individual worth; delivering effective instruction, discovering, developing and celebrating unique talents in a safe, nurturing environment characterized by high expectations, shared responsibility and a committed, compassionate staff in partnership with families and the community.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Ms. Sandra Van Erkel

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	91.8	A	82.5	B
English Language Arts	72.5	C	74.5	C
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	82.2	B	78.5	C
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	88	B	86	B
AYP Status	Met AYP -Y		Met AYP- Y	
Composite Grade	B		C	
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

- K-6 School of 337 students plus PEEP and ECDD.
- Our teachers continued to grow professionally, attending more than 1,000 hours of training and lead teacher development.
- We are a Kalamazoo Community in Schools (KCIS) partner, we have Community Mental Health counseling services on-site, we are a site for YMCA Primetime before and after-school daycare, we have in-classroom behavior and academic support.
- We focused on the Strategic Planning Expectations. Expectations for children and parents are shared in parent meetings and at Arcadia Parents Association (APA) meetings. The expectations for educators drive our professional conversations at professional development sessions.
- Expectations are posted in the hall by the main office for all to see.
- Arcadia has 0% teacher turnover.
- At sixth grade, targeted population improved substantially: Reading, 42% to 90%; Writing, 37% to 86%; Math, 47% to 68%
- AmeriCorps Vista gives on-going, full-time support for Arcadia programs.
- WMU students provide valuable one-on-one academic support to our at-risk students through America Reads. RSVP volunteer tutors provide round-the-year tutoring support.

2008–2009 Highlights (cont.)

- A Book Fair was held to increase an interest in books and reading.
- Share a Smile Foundation provided 250 winter coats to needy students.
- Portable Offsite Dental Service provided 74 students with dental care through the Kalamazoo County Health Department
- Girls on the Run, an after-school program offered by the Greater Kalamazoo Girls on the Run Council, for 3rd through 6th grade girls is a life-changing experiential learning program. It incorporates teamwork, esteem-building and importance of physical exercise in young girls.
- Winter Gear and Other Basic Needs, provided by Warm Kids, KCIS, as well as parents, staff and community members
- Provision of Free Eye Glasses to students in need, through KCIS partners
- Counseling services provided by Family & Children's Services, to students referred by teachers or parents. Girl Scouts is offered twice a week during lunch and recess, by the Girl Scouts of Glowing Embers Council

Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2008		Spring 2009	
	#	%	#	%
Arcadia	376	100	389	100

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.

Arcadia's Parent Involvement

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

Highly Qualified Staff

- 100% of the staff is teaching in their credential area of experience.
- No teachers with emergency or provision credentials are teaching in either the high or low poverty schools.
- No teachers are teaching in the classroom in either the high or low poverty schools that are not highly qualified.
- 1 Administrator with a Masters+30
- 26 teachers; 3 with a Bachelors Degree; 19 with a Masters Degree; and 4 with a Masters+30
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	All sixth grade students will be at state target or better.
Data to support goal selection:	Sixth grade African American and economically disadvantaged students are performing under state target of 56% for ELA. African American students are performing at 42% proficiency in reading and 42% ELA as determined by the MEAP.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	High reading achievement in all grades (whole groups and sub-groups) will be sustained through instructional programs/strategies currently in place. Increased reading performance of our students in early fifth grade will be addressed by targeted instructional strategies implemented in grade 4 and early grade 5. The teaching of writing will be a priority in building professional development, grade-level meeting content, strong writing instruction in the classrooms monitored through walk-throughs, observations.
Accomplishments:	Improved DIBELS scores as a result of grade level discussions and planned interventions. Sixth grade MEAP scores improved substantially. African American from 42% to 90%; Economically disadvantaged from 50% to 80%, exceeding the state target of 56%. Community partnership with a neighborhood church supported students academically and socially. Several student groups raised money for disadvantaged students in other countries. Fifth and Sixth grade students demonstrated responsibility by raising money to fund their camp experience and their end-of-year trip.
Implications for next year:	Communication within grade levels and across grade levels is essential for student success. Teachers need training and support to meet the needs of failing students. There was a greater percentage of kindergarten students who ended the year at benchmark on the DIBELS. Community partnerships will continue.
Writing	
Goal:	All sixth grade students will be at state target or better
Data to support goal selection:	Sixth grade African American and economically disadvantaged students are performing under state target of 56% for ELA writing. African American students are performing at 37% in writing and 42% ELA
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	High reading achievement in all grades (whole groups and sub-groups) will be sustained through instructional programs/strategies currently in place. Increased reading performance of our students in early fifth grade will be addressed by targeted instructional strategies implemented in grade 4 and early grade 5. The teaching of writing will be a priority in building professional development, grade-level meeting content, strong writing instruction in the classrooms monitored through walk-throughs, observations.
Accomplishments:	Publishing Center. Sixth grade published four separate booklets per student based on the writing focus. Students corresponded with students from other states and countries.
Implications for next year:	We will incorporate portfolios or a similar product for all grade levels.

School Improvement Plan

Math	
Goal:	All fifth and sixth grade students will be at state target or better.
Data to support goal selection:	Fifth and Sixth grade African American students and economically disadvantaged students are performing under the state target as determined by the MEAP mathematics.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Fifth grade African American students will be at state target of 62%. Sixth grade African American and economically disadvantaged students will be at state target of 60%.
Accomplishments:	Sixth grade economically disadvantaged students (from 50% to 68%) and African American students (from 47% to 52%) increased their math proficiency.
Implications for next year:	Need to explore cross grouping and specific interventions for unsuccessful students. The District has adopted a new Math program which is very interactive and addresses the needs of many learning styles.

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All fifth grade students will improve test scores.
Data to support goal selection:	The gap between economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged students will be reduced by 5%. There is a 31% gap between economically disadvantaged (54%) and non-economically disadvantaged (85%) students.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Teachers will focus on differentiation and hands-on/exploratory activities in Science.
Accomplishments:	All Sixth grade students improved scores from 07-08 (40%) to 08-09 (63%). African American students increased scores from 21% to 48% and economically disadvantaged students increased scores from 31% to 54%.
Implications for next year:	Instruction needs to be differentiated, small group and hands-on in addition to whole group lecture.

Social Studies	
Goal:	All Sixth grade students will improve Social Studies scores by decreasing the gap in subgroups and will increase the percent proficient by 10%.
Data to support goal selection:	Males scored 70%. White females scored 58%, resulting in a 12% gap. African American students scored 48% while white students scored 87%, resulting in a gap of 39%. Economically disadvantaged students scored 54% while non-economically disadvantaged students scored 92%, resulting in a 38% gap.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	All 6th grade students and subgroups will reduce the gap. Male/Female 5%; African American/white, 10%; economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged, 10%.
Accomplishments:	All sixth grade students improved scores from 07-08 (40%) to 08-09 (63%). African American students increased scores from 21% to 48% and economically disadvantaged students increased scores from 31% to 54%.
Implications for next year:	Instruction needs to be differentiated, small group and hands-on, in addition to whole group lecture.



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	98	68	81	100	26	72	0	2
	2008-09	78	73	83	100	5	73	22	0
African American	2007-08	94	58	67	100	22	72	0	6
	2008-09	81	65	69	100	0	81	19	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	100	80	85	100	33	67	0	0
	2008-09	75	85	87	100	5	70	25	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		36	53					
	2008-09		47	55					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		61	63					
	2008-09		60	69					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	100	60	71	93	31	69	0	0
	2008-09	70	65	74	100	3	67	30	0
Migrant	2007-08			64					
	2008-09			64					
Male	2007-08	95	64	78	95	24	71	0	5
	2008-09	76	72	81	100	10	67	24	0
Female	2007-08	100	71	84	96	27	73	0	0
	2008-09	80	74	86	100	0	80	20	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	79	56	76	93	16	63	21	0
	2008-09	77	57	77	96	5	73	23	0
African American	2007-08	81	43	56	100	10	71	19	0
	2008-09	57	43	56	93	0	57	43	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		61	74					
	2008-09		46	73					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		80	86					
	2008-09		100	88					
Hispanic	2007-08		51	64					
	2008-09		48	64					
White	2007-08	74	73	82	100	26	47	26	0
	2008-09	86	76	83	92	9	77	14	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		30	43					
	2008-09		22	44					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		45	49					
	2008-09		51	50					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	67	45	63	90	7	59	33	0
	2008-09	59	46	64	85	0	59	41	0
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			51					
Male	2007-08	73	54	73	100	10	63	27	0
	2008-09	75	54	74	100	0	75	25	0
Female	2007-08	92	59	80	87	31	62	8	0
	2008-09	79	61	79	92	8	71	21	0

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	88	64	78	95	40	48	6	6
	2008-09	70	59	78	97	16	54	27	3
African American	2007-08	88	49	58	89	29	58	13	0
	2008-09	67	46	58	100	11	56	33	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	73					
	2008-09		73	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		75	86					
	2008-09		94	89					
Hispanic	2007-08		61	63					
	2008-09		60	66					
White	2007-08	92	81	84	100	54	38	0	8
	2008-09	67	75	84	94	27	40	27	7
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		23	42					
	2008-09		25	42					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		54	44					
	2008-09		58	50					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	87	53	65	91	36	51	8	5
	2008-09	67	49	66	92	13	54	29	4
Migrant	2007-08			45					
	2008-09			54					
Male	2007-08	80	59	75	89	32	48	8	12
	2008-09	67	56	76	96	15	52	30	4
Female	2007-08	96	68	81	100	48	48	4	0
	2008-09	80	62	81	100	20	60	20	0

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	60	62	80	82	17	43	40	0
	2008-09	84	67	80	98	18	65	14	2
African American	2007-08	42	49	59	86	5	37	58	0
	2008-09	86	54	61	100	10	76	14	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	83	76	86	71	25	58	17	0
	2008-09	87	83	85	96	30	57	9	4
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		27	41					
	2008-09		21	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		46	53					
	2008-09		69	50					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	50	51	67	84	8	42	50	0
	2008-09	86	58	68	100	11	76	14	0
Migrant	2007-08			63					
	2008-09			58					
Male	2007-08	52	56	76	83	12	40	48	0
	2008-09	78	65	77	96	17	61	17	4
Female	2007-08	71	68	83	81	24	47	29	0
	2008-09	88	70	82	100	19	69	12	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	95	76	90	93	57	38	5	0
	2008-09	90	81	91	100	51	39	10	0
African American	2007-08	89	67	76	100	39	50	11	0
	2008-09	81	74	79	100	44	38	19	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	100	87	94	87	70	30	0	0
	2008-09	95	92	95	100	55	40	5	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		52	77					
	2008-09		71	55					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		73	83					
	2008-09		72	85					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	100	69	84	89	56	44	0	0
	2008-09	87	76	86	100	40	47	13	0
Migrant	2007-08			85					
	2008-09			80					
Male	2007-08	90	78	90	95	43	48	10	0
	2008-09	90	84	92	100	57	33	10	0
Female	2007-08	100	75	90	91	71	29	0	0
	2008-09	90	79	91	100	45	45	10	0

Student Group 4th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	86	66	86	91	52	33	14	0
	2008-09	82	69	88	98	38	44	18	0
African American	2007-08	81	53	69	100	52	29	19	0
	2008-09	71	57	74	93	29	43	29	0
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	89	84	91	100	56	33	11	0
	2008-09	87	84	92	96	43	43	13	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		49	65					
	2008-09		47	68					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		55	74					
	2008-09		64	76					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	77	55	77	87	38	38	23	0
	2008-09	78	59	80	88	22	57	22	0
Migrant	2007-08			81					
	2008-09			82					
Male	2007-08	83	67	86	94	38	45	17	0
	2008-09	75	70	88	100	30	45	25	0
Female	2007-08	92	64	86	87	85	8	8	0
	2008-09	88	68	88	96	44	44	12	0

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	75	59	74	95	60	15	21	4
	2008-09	61	54	77	100	34	26	37	3
African American	2007-08	58	42	51	89	42	17	38	4
	2008-09	56	41	55	100	22	33	39	6
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	92	78	81	100	77	15	8	0
	2008-09	69	75	83	100	50	19	31	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		33	44					
	2008-09		30	47					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		48	54					
	2008-09		42	61					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	72	48	60	91	56	15	26	3
	2008-09	52	45	64	96	24	28	44	4
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	68	61	75	89	52	16	28	4
	2008-09	61	57	78	100	36	25	36	4
Female	2007-08	81	58	73	100	67	15	15	4
	2008-09	60	51	76	100	30	30	40	0

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	64	55	73	82	31	33	17	19
	2008-09	73	68	80	98	45	29	18	8
African American	2007-08	47	39	48	86	16	32	32	21
	2008-09	52	53	61	100	29	24	33	14
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	75	73	80	71	33	42	0	25
	2008-09	91	83	85	96	65	26	4	4
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		28	35					
	2008-09		31	45					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		49	51					
	2008-09		72	62					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	50	42	58	84	15	35	19	31
	2008-09	68	59	69	100	41	27	22	11
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			73					
Male	2007-08	64	58	72	83	36	28	12	24
	2008-09	70	67	79	96	52	17	22	9
Female	2007-08	65	53	73	81	24	41	24	12
	2008-09	77	69	81	100	38	38	15	8

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	82	62	82	93	45	37	10	8
	2008-09	65	58	83	97	27	38	24	11
African American	2007-08	70	46	59	85	26	43	13	17
	2008-09	72	42	62	100	17	56	28	0
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	96	80	89	100	65	31	4	0
	2008-09	60	79	89	94	33	27	20	20
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		50	62					
	2008-09		47	64					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		51	53					
	2008-09		48	59					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	79	51	70	91	36	44	10	10
	2008-09	54	48	72	92	21	33	33	13
Migrant	2007-08			56					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	72	62	82	89	36	36	20	8
	2008-09	63	59	83	96	22	41	26	11
Female	2007-08	92	63	82	96	54	38	0	8
	2008-09	70	56	83	100	40	30	20	10

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	40	48	73	82	24	17	19	40
	2008-09	63	50	74	98	27	37	16	20
African American	2007-08	21	31	45	86	5	16	26	53
	2008-09	48	32	48	100	14	33	24	29
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	58	69	81	71	33	25	8	33
	2008-09	87	74	81	96	43	43	9	4
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		35	40					
	2008-09		31	40					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		23	40					
	2008-09		38	41					
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	31	33	56	84	12	19	19	50
	2008-09	54	39	59	100	19	35	22	24
Migrant	2007-08			48					
	2008-09			48					
Male	2007-08	40	49	72	83	28	12	20	40
	2008-09	70	52	74	96	26	43	13	17
Female	2007-08	41	46	73	81	18	24	18	41
	2008-09	58	49	73	100	27	31	19	23

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

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

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

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
First Grade				
African American	1.5	1.8	1.3	1.3
Hispanic	1.4	2.2	1.3	2.1
White	1.9	2.3	1.8	1.9
Economically Disadvantaged	1.4	1.8	1.3	1.5
Special Education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Second Grade				
African American	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Hispanic	2.1	2.5	2.6	2.4
White	2.9	3	2.7	2.9
Economically Disadvantaged	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.6
Special Education	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.5
Third Grade				
African American	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.6
Hispanic	4.6	3.7	4.7	3.8
White	4.3	3.9	4.4	3.7
Economically Disadvantaged	4	3.5	3.9	3.5
Special Education	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.5
Fourth Grade				
African American	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.4
Hispanic	4.5	5	4.6	5
White	5.1	5.4	5.1	5.6
Economically Disadvantaged	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4
Special Education	4	2.4	5.2	3
Fifth Grade				
African American	5.3		5.4	
Hispanic	3.3		4.9	
White	6.9		6.7	
Economically Disadvantaged	5.4		5.8	
Special Education	3.9		4.9	

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	2596	2703	2422	2399
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	2788	2644	2520	2451
Economically Disadvantaged	2626	2597	2437	2368



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	101	99	97	88	82		101	100	97	92	88			92	
African American	100	99	96	85	77		100	99	97	89	83			91	
American Indian/ Native Alaskan		N/A	96		N/A			N/A	97		N/A			N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander		N/A	99		N/A			N/A			N/A			N/A	
Hispanic		102	96		79			103	98		87			93	
White	101	99	97	88	89		101	100	97	96	94			94	
Students with Disabilities		99			57			100			77			90	
Limited English Proficient		99			79			101			85			93	
Economically Disadvantaged	98	101		85	77		99	102		90	85			91	



Core Curriculum

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

The Process of Curriculum Development and Alignment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Foundation of Core Courses

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

Teaching to Expectations (Units of Study)

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

English Language Arts

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

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

Math

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

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

Science

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

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

Social Studies

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

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

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

Variations

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