

Kalamazoo Public Schools

**P.A. 25 Annual Report & NCLB Report Card**  
(As Required by the No Child Left Behind Act)  
**2007-2008**



**Executive Leadership**

**Superintendent:** Michael F. Rice, Ph.D.

**Deputy Superintendent:** Gary Start

**Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning Services:** Patricia Coles-Chalmers

**Assistant Superintendent of Student Services/Special Education:** Cindy Green

**Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources:** Mary Weber

**2007-2008 Board of Education**

**President:** Patti Sholler-Barber

**Vice President:** Mollie Peterson

**Secretary:** Philip W. Dietrich

**Treasurer:** Tim Bartik

**Trustee:** Eric Breisach

**Trustee:** Polly Freer

**Trustee:** Liz Henderson

***The Kalamazoo Public Schools will educate every child, at every opportunity, every time***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS</b>	
• District AYP Status & Accreditation Status.....	3
• State Ed Yes! Performance Indicators.....	4
• District Results – Number of schools in Each Phase.....	4
• Schools Identified for Improvement.....	5
• Levels of Education Degree.....	5
• Teacher Qualification in High/Low Poverty Schools.....	5
• Teacher Mentoring Program.....	5
• Attracting High Quality Teachers to AYP Schools.....	5
• Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals.....	5
• Professional Development Board Policy.....	6
• Professional Development Requirements.....	6
• District-wide Targeted Professional Development.....	6
<b>CURRICULUM</b>	
• Development, Alignment & Implementation.....	7
• Data Used in Curriculum Review & Alignment.....	7
• Core Curriculum & School Improvement Plan.....	7
• Board Program Approvals.....	8
• Specialized Schools.....	8
• Students Ensured Enrollment.....	8
• Variances.....	9
• College Equivalent Courses Offered.....	9
• Dual Enrollment.....	9
• Students Enrolled in College Equivalent Courses.....	9
• Number Taking College Equivalent Exams.....	9
• Number Receiving College Credit.....	9
<b>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT</b>	
• School Improvement Process.....	10
• School Improvement Plan.....	10
• Evaluation Process.....	10
<b>DATA &amp; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT</b>	
• Graduation Statistics.....	10
• Attendance Rates by Percent.....	11
• Retention Rates.....	11
• MEAP Analysis.....	12
• IOWA Analysis.....	18
<b>PARENT INVOLVEMENT</b>	
• Board Policy on Parent Participation.....	20
• Parent/Teacher Conferences.....	20
• District Survey(s).....	20
<b>INDIVIDUAL BUILDING P.A. 25 ANNUAL REPORTS &amp; NCLB REPORT CARDS</b>	

## Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data Michigan Annual AYP Results 2007- 2008

### District AYP Status & Accreditation Status

Grade Level	AYP Status English Language Arts	AYP Status Mathematics	AYP Status
Elementary (3-5)	Yes	Yes	Meet AYP
Middle School (6-8)	Yes	Yes	Meet AYP
High School (11)	No	No	Did Not Meet AYP

### Elementary

Student Group	AYP Status English Language Arts	AYP Status Mathematics
<b>ALL STUDENTS</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
African American	Yes	Yes
American Indian	*	*
Asian American	*	*
Hispanic/Latino	Yes	Yes
White	Yes	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	Yes	Yes
Limited English Proficient	Yes	Yes
Economically Disadvantaged	Yes	Yes

\* Under NCLB there are too few students in the category to count for AYP purposes.

### Middle School

Student Group	AYP Status English Language Arts	AYP Status Mathematics
<b>ALL STUDENTS</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
African American	Yes	Yes
American Indian	*	*
Asian American	*	*
Hispanic/Latino	Yes	Yes
White	Yes	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	Yes	Yes
Limited English Proficient	Yes	Yes
Economically Disadvantaged	Yes	Yes

\* Under NCLB there are too few students in the category to count for AYP purposes.

### High School

Student Group	AYP Status English Language Arts	AYP Status Mathematics
<b>ALL STUDENTS</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
African American	No	No
Asian American	*	*
Hispanic/Latino	*	*
White	No	No
Students w/ Disabilities	*	*
Limited English Proficient	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	No	No

\* Under NCLB there are too few students in the category to count for AYP purposes.

## State Ed Yes! Performance Indicators

1 = Getting Started

2 = Partially Implemented

3 = Implemented

4 = Exemplary

State Strands & Standards	Elementary		Middle School & Phoenix		District	
	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08
<b>Teaching for Learning</b>						
Curriculum	3	3	2	2	2	2
Instruction	3	3	2	2	2	2
Assessment	3	3	2	2	2	2
<b>Leadership</b>						
Instructional	3	3	2	3	2	3
Shared	3	3	2	2	2	2
Opportunities	3	3	3	2	3	2
<b>Personnel</b>						
Qualifications	3	3	3	3	3	3
Professional Development	3	3	2	2	2	2
<b>School &amp; Community Involvement</b>						
Involvement	3	3	2	2	2	2
Community Organizations	3	3	3	4	3	3
<b>Data Management</b>						
Management	3	3	2	2	2	2
Information Management	3	3	1	2	2	2

## State Ed Yes! Performance Indicators – NCA (Kalamazoo Central & Loy Norrix combined)

1= Little or no evidence exists

2 = Preliminary states of implementation of practice

3 = Implemented

4 = Full integration and effectively and consistently implemented

Standard	Score*
1. Vision and Purpose	3
2. Governance and Leadership	3
3. Teaching and Learning	3
4. Documenting and Using Results	3
5. Resource and Support Systems	3
6. Stakeholder Communications and Relationships	3
7. Commitment to Continuous Improvement	3

\*First year implemented at State level

## District Results – Number of Schools in Each Phase

- Phase 0 = Not Identified
- Phase I = Identified for School Improvement
- Phase II = Continuing to be Identified for School Improvement
- Phase III = Identified for Corrective Action
- Phase IV = Identified for Restructuring
- Phase V = Implement Restructuring

Year	Phase 0	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Phase V
04-05	15	0	2	1	1	2
05-06	17		3		1	
06-07	17			1	3	
07-08	16	1		1		3

## SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT

Kalamazoo Central High School.....	Phase V
Loy Norrix High School.....	Phase V
Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts.....	Phase V
Milwood Magnet School.....	Phase 1
Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet Center for the Arts.....	Phase III (on hold)

## Levels of Educational Degree

Kalamazoo Public Schools has 100% of the staff teaching credential areas of expertise. The District took a proactive approach long before this became a requirement of No Child Left Behind.

Level	Count	Bachelors		Masters		Masters +30		Doctorate		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
<b>Elementary</b>										
Administrators	21	na	na	10	47.6	9	42.9	2	9.5	
Teachers	436	197	45.2	195	44.7	43	9.9	1	0.2	
<b>Middle</b>										
Administrators	6	na	na	5	83.3	1	16.7	na	na	
Teachers	128	57	44.5	57	44.5	13	10.2	1	0.8	
<b>High</b>										
Administrators	11	na	na	6	54.5	5	45.5	na	na	
Teachers	188	81	43.1	77	41.0	29	15.4	1	0.5	
<b>District</b>										
Administrator	38	na	na	21	55.3	15	39.5	2	5.2	
Teacher	752	335	44.5	329	43.8	85	11.3	3	0.4	

## Teacher Qualifications in High/Low Poverty Schools

Percentage Category	High Poverty Schools	Low Poverty Schools
% of Teachers with Emergency or Provisional Credentials	0%	0%
% of Teachers in district classrooms that are not High Qualified	0%	0%

## New Teacher Training and Mentoring Program

The new teachers receive professional development before the school year begins. KPS continues to use the Teacher Mentoring Model that was implemented in 2004-05. Each mentor teacher is assigned to a cluster of new teachers. Each cluster (maximum of 10 new teachers) functions as a learning community, meeting with their mentor regularly for professional development and dialogue regarding individual/building level professional development.

## Attracting High Quality Teachers to AYP Schools

In 2005, the district and the teachers' union negotiated language that waived staffing by seniority for schools that were in AYP status of 3, 4, or 5. In that same year, language was added to extend the school year for additional training of persons in these AYP schools. This agreement also included language that reimbursed teachers for fees associated with becoming Highly Qualified for their assigned area. Prior to this agreement, the parties agreed to remove the experience cap on salaries for new hires, making employment with Kalamazoo Public Schools much more attractive to teachers with several years of experience.

## Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals

All Title I instructional paraprofessionals have met the NCLB requirements and standards.

### Professional Development Board Policy 8.3

The District will provide professional development and training to each employee group to improve staff effectiveness.

#### Specifics

1. The District encourages all employees to establish and periodically revise professional development goals.
2. The District will have a professional development plan for teachers and administrators that will facilitate accomplishment of the District's curriculum goals.
3. The District Professional Development plan for teachers and administrators should allow sufficient flexibility to meet the special themes or needs of each school.

### Professional Development Requirements

The state requires 30 hours of professional development and Kalamazoo Public Schools requires an average of 50 hours of professional development

### District-wide Targeted Professional Development – 2007-2008

Group	Focus	Delivery
All Administrators	Phi Delta Kappa – Curriculum Audit <i>Annual Growth &amp; Catch Up Growth</i> Walk-Through Training	Reviewed process of curriculum audit and received findings and recommendations for improvement. Independent study and group discussion of key points of <i>Annual Growth &amp; Catch Up Growth</i> . Individualized training, group work to establish protocols, building-level procedures written for data collection using the Walk-Through method.
Elementary Teachers (including Special Ed)	Writing Curriculum (continuation)	Continue training in the implementation of district writing curriculum during district PD times and in building-level PD times delivered by teacher leaders.
Elementary Teachers (including Special Ed)	Reading (continuation)	Continue training and follow-up in Foundations, Teacher Reading Academies and Harcourt curriculum during district PD time and in grade-level meetings. Delivered by literacy coach where applicable.
Elementary Teachers (including Special Ed)	Mathematics (continuation)	Continue training in the implementation of Everyday Math curriculum during district PD times and in building-level PD times delivered by teacher leaders. Disaggregated data and identified corresponding interventions, big ideas, and suggested supplemental materials and interventions.
Elementary Teachers (including Special Ed)	Science (continuation)	Train teachers in use of Battle Creek Area Math and Science Kits to deliver the standards aligned curriculum.
Specials Teachers (K-12)	Curriculum Implementation and Improvement	Meet during district PD times to ensure consistent delivery of the KPS curriculum.
Secondary Teachers (including Special Ed)	By Content Areas	Meet during district PD times to ensure consistent delivery of the KPS curriculum that is aligned with State content expectations for grade levels and courses.
All Staff by Building	Positive Behavior Supports (PBS)	Use designated building PD times, staff meetings and grade-level meetings (elementary) delivered by building PBS teams.
Secondary Teachers	Pinnacle/6+1 Traits	Staff received training on the Pinnacle grade reporting software system and 6+1 Traits.
Secondary Teachers	Standards Based Grading	Staff received training on the Understanding by Design model for writing curriculum guides.

# CURRICULUM

## Process for Development, Alignment & Implementation of Curriculum

The process for development, alignment and implementation is outlined in the *Curriculum Framework* and is carried out by the following constituencies.

- Board of Education: Develops policies, approves the adoption of the curriculum as well as the budget to support implementation. The Board also has a representative on the Teaching and Learning Council.
- Superintendent: Implements curriculum policy, develops curriculum procedures and revisions, ensures commitment of districts' support for aspects of the curriculum process.
- Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning Services: Provides leadership to building-level instructional leaders and Teaching and Learning Services staff for curriculum work, assures the implementation of the curriculum, monitors the progress of the process and convenes the Teaching and Learning Council.
- Instructional Leadership: Provides leadership for the development and implementation of curriculum and instructional programs at the building and central office level and includes all administrators of the district.
- Content Advisory Committees: Serves in an advisory capacity and is comprised of, but not limited to, content area coordinators, department heads, technology staff, specialists, teachers, administrators, parents and community members. Membership is chosen to represent various grade levels and schools and is knowledgeable about the subject area for which they are responsible.
- District Advisory Committees: Serves in an advisory capacity for program areas such as: technology, assessment, professional development, alternative education, budget, Education for Employment, early childhood and other areas.
- Curriculum Teams: Researches, develops and refines curriculum. The team is recruited and convened by the Content Advisory Committee.
- Field Test Teams: Implements, evaluates and suggest revisions of proposed curriculum guides.
- Teaching and Learning Council: The Council provides leadership, fosters communication, discusses and addresses curriculum issues, provides input for the development and implementation of curriculum guides and monitors the progress of all advisory committees. The Council is comprised of a representative from the aforementioned groups and is convened by the assistant superintendent of Teaching and Learning Services.
  - Teacher Leader Teams: Research, write, refine, teach strategies and align standards and benchmarks to curriculum. These teacher leaders model strategies and provide professional development to schools and district staff.

## The Use of Data in Curriculum Review and Alignment

District and State assessments are used to evaluate curriculum objectives, instructional practices and resources as documented in the Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts, mathematics, social studies and science. Data is used to support curriculum alignment to the Michigan Curriculum Framework and the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations.

## Core Curriculum & School Improvement Plan

- The curriculum framework continues to provide a cycle for curriculum review, assessment, evaluation and professional development.
- A curriculum team continues to research best practices, study the Michigan Curriculum Framework and review state and local assessments as well as the district Literacy Plan.
- Current/proposed instructional systems are assessed by the use of data gathered from the above listed assessments, appraisal of related curriculum documents and review the conceptual map linking twelfth grade graduation goals with the K-12 content standards.
- Current/proposed instructional systems and curriculum are also reviewed for their alignment of the learning sequence with state and national standards.
- Curriculum is reviewed in its first year of implementation to identify gaps between desired and actual outcomes.

## **Board Program Approvals**

- Approved the adoption of 2007-2008 Resource Materials
- Approved a district strategic planning process recommendation
- Approve a recommendation to have a curriculum management audit
- Approved the eighth grade reproductive health curriculum recommendation
- Approved the recommendation for the 2008-2009 Course and Program Bulletin for grades 9-12
- Approved the following recommendations presented by the Teaching and Learning Council
  - Specific course requirements for graduation
  - Three, four, and five year graduation plans
  - Computer technology programs restructuring
  - Personal curriculum
- Approved two high school reform resolutions
- Approved a participation resolution for the 2007-2008 Michigan School Readiness Program
- Received the 2007 K-12 summer extended learning enrichment program report
- Approved high school grading and course incentives
- Endorsed the Fit MI 2008 program
- Approved the recommendation for the plan to populate the new elementary school
- Approved the recommendation to approve appointment of the Reproductive Health Curriculum Advisory Committee and its charge
- Received the annual report from Kalamazoo RESA's Education for Employment program
- Received the curriculum management audit report
- Approved the opening of a Dual Language School
- Approved the opening of an alternative learning program for middle school students

## **Specialized Schools**

Magnet schools provide choice for families that desire a theme-based approach to their children's education. These schools deliver the district curriculum through the focus of a theme. Seven elementary magnet schools and two middle school magnets were available to families in 2007-2008.

### **Elementary**

- Edison Environmental Science Academy
- Lincoln International Studies School
- Northglade Montessori Magnet School
- Spring Valley Center for Exploration
- The Woodward School for Technology and Research
- Washington Writers' Academy
- Woods Lake School: A Magnet Center for the Arts

### **Middle School**

- Maple Street Magnet School for the Arts
- Milwood Magnet School: A Center for Mathematics and Technology

### **Specialized Secondary Schools**

- Kalamazoo Area Math and Science Center
- Phoenix High School
- Success for Teen Parents and Children
- Adult Education

## **Pupils Ensured Enrollment**

All students are ensured enrollment in the Kalamazoo Public Schools. To comply with our mission of educating every child, at every opportunity, every time, we examine disparities in student achievement, MEAP scores, attendance data, pupil retention, disciplinary actions and parent/teacher conferences. Where a significant difference exists, continued evaluation, implementation of education programs and extended learning opportunities as well as focusing on areas of need through the use of the Annual Yearly Program report will be used so that all students are ensured appropriate enrollment to enable them to reach their academic potential.

## **Variations**

All state curriculum documents are used in the implementation of the Kalamazoo Public Schools' Curriculum Framework.

## Specific High School Information

<b>COLLEGE EQUIVALENT COURSES</b>				
Course Level	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Number of Advanced Placement Courses	13	13	13	23
Number of Baccalaureate Courses	-	-	-	-
Number of College Equivalent Courses	19	20	20	68

<b>STUDENTS IN DUAL ENROLLMENT</b>			
Year	Total In District	# Dual Enrolled	% Dual Enrolled
<b>2004-2005</b>	3038	166*	5.5
<b>2005-2006</b>	3109	138	4.4
<b>2006-2007</b>	3339	95	2.8
<b>2007-2008</b>	3342	116	4.0

\* In 2004-2005, the district added a program that encouraged students from alternative education to participate in courses provided by Kalamazoo Valley Community College.

<b>STUDENTS ENROLLED IN COLLEGE EQUIVALENT COURSES BY GRADE LEVEL</b>				
Grade Level	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
9th	1	0	1	6
10 <sup>th</sup>	56	65	72	108
11 <sup>th</sup>	37	72	58	48
12th	116	139	116	144
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>306</b>

<b>STUDENTS IN PREVIOUS TABLE TAKING COLLEGE EQUIVALENCY EXAMS</b>				
Grade Level	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
9th	1	0	2	1
10 <sup>th</sup>	31	53	43	56
11 <sup>th</sup>	26	43	55	34
12th	61	56	96	94
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>185</b>

<b>STUDENTS TESTED WHO RECEIVED COLLEGE CREDIT</b>				
Grade Level	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
9th	0	0	2	0
10 <sup>th</sup>	19	33	23	35
11 <sup>th</sup>	10	35	33	29
12th	28	42	48	70
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>134</b>

## School Improvement

### District

It has been the practice to have the Board-Superintendent Team perform the work of goal development and measurement for the district using data provided by the coordinator of assessments and evaluation. The Superintendent-Administrative Team determines the process. The 2007-2008 school year was a transition period. The district welcomed a new superintendent. Below please find the elements of school improvement developed in the 2007-2008 school year for implementation in the 2008-2009 school year.

- Adoption of a nationally recognized pre-school curriculum, in collaboration with the county-run Head Start Program, New Genesis Pre-School Program, the YWCA Early Childhood Program, and the Vicksburg Schools.
- Expansion of full-day kindergarten from 176 students in 2007-2008 to approximately 900 in 2008-2009.
- Modification of the early elementary reading block from 120 minutes to 90 minutes for reading and 30 minutes for writing.
- With the involvement of 250 community and staff members, creation of a set of strategic plan expectations for students at every age of their development, 0 to 18, and for the adults that support children: parents, educators, support staff, and community. Expectations have been distributed broadly, to parents, faith-based organizations, and youth-serving organizations. These expectations are available on the district website and will help guide our activities to support children in the coming years.
- With the involvement of 400 community and staff members, completion of a Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) curriculum management audit, recommended by the superintendent and approved by the Board of Education. The audit identifies a number of recommendations to assist the district in improving its curriculum and instruction for children, with a special focus on curriculum alignment. The PDK curriculum audit is also available on the district website and will be an important tool for the improvement of the district in the ensuing several years.
- Creation of a K-5 dual language elementary school.
- Creation of a middle school alternative program.
- Application for and receipt of a \$9 million, three-year federal magnet school grant and the district's fifth four-year Even Start grant.
- Continuation and expansion of various elements of high school reform, including but not limited to the following for 2008-2009: creation of weighted grades for advanced courses, the addition of pluses and minuses in grading, the expansion of Advanced Placement (AP) courses, expansion of smaller learning communities to Loy Norrix High School, and the expansion of curriculum alignment activities into the 10<sup>th</sup> grade at the two comprehensive high schools.

## Data & Information Management

### Individual Building Data Included in School Reports

#### Graduation Statistics

Student Groups	Kalamazoo Central High School			Loy Norrix High School			Phoenix High School			District		
	06	07	08	06	07	08	06	07	08	06	07	08
All Students	219	250	258	200	210	198	96	107	81	515	567	537
American Indian	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	0	5	5	4
Asian	4	8	6	3	7	6	0	1	0	7	16	12
African American/Black	77	116	116	60	67	65	57	72	58	194	255	239
Hispanic	12	6	10	21	14	11	3	4	3	35	24	24
White	124	118	123	115	121	115	34	28	20	173	267	258
Economically Disadvantaged	62	81	97	83	75	76	60	48	46	205	204	219
Students with Disabilities	11	11	10	13	9	8	40	27	0	64	47	40
Limited English Proficient	9	9	10	11	8	7	4	5	27	38	22	44
Male	110	126	135	101	89	93	60	53	40	271	290	268

Female	109	124	123	99	121	105	36	54	41	244	299	269
--------	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----

### Attendance Rates by Percent

Student Group	Elementary			Middle			Secondary		
	06	07	08	06	07	08	06	07	08
<b>All Students</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>85</b>
American Indian	92	90	92	86	93	93	80	93	84
Asian	93	94	96	93	95	97	95	98	95
African American/Black	93	92	93	88	87	87	86	92	82
Hispanic	93	93	94	90	90	90	85	94	86
White	94	94	94	91	91	91	92	96	89
Economically Disadvantaged	94	94	94	90	90	90	89	94	85
Students with Disabilities	92	84	92	83	82	82	86	91	77
Limited English Proficient	93	93	94	90	90	90	88	95	85
Male	93	93	94	88	87	89	88	94	85
Female	94	93	94	91	90	89	90	94	86

### 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. The State of Michigan calculates this rate. In the future, the state will use the Single Record Database (SRSD) for this purpose.

By the above definition, retention information is not available for elementary or middle school levels.

RETENTION RATE for HIGH SCHOOL				
Grade Level	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>All Students</b>	94.75	94.74	93.48	Not available at this time
American Indian	95.45	94.74	93.75	
Asian	100.00	97.62	93.75	
African American	93.80	93.83	92.1	
Hispanic	92.22	92.44	89.76	
White	95.87	95.93	95.82	
Economic Disadvantage	Not available	Not available	90.99	
Students with Disabilities	Not available	Not available	88.43	
Limited English Proficient	Not available	Not available	79.87	
Male	Not available	Not available	92.84	
Female	Not available	Not available	94.14	

## MEAP Aggregated Student Achievement Data

ELA – Grade 3						
State Standard	District 05-06	State 05-06	District 06-07	State 06-07	District 07-08	State 07-08
Level 1: Exceeded			11%	20%	13%	22%
Level 2: Met			50%	59%	55%	59%
Level 3: Basic			27%	16%	26%	16%
Level 4: Apprentice			12%	4%	4%	3%
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>915</b>	<b>116,204</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>114,792</b>
ELA – Grade 4						
Level 1: Exceeded	05%	08%	7%	13%	9%	16%
Level 2: Met	48%	68%	52%	65%	47%	60%
Level 3: Basic	39%	22%	36%	20%	37%	21%
Level 4: Apprentice	08%	03%	4%	2%	7%	3%
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>117,280</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>116,179</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>114,900</b>
ELA – Grade 5						
Level 1: Exceeded			7%	15%	17%	22%
Level 2: Met			49%	62%	46%	56%
Level 3: Basic			30%	18%	24%	17%
Level 4: Apprentice			14%	4%	12%	5%
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>837</b>	<b>117,000</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>114,705</b>
ELA – Grade 6						
Level 1: Exceeded			10%	15%	10%	15
Level 2: Met			51%	63%	52%	65
Level 3: Basic			28%	18%	34%	19
Level 4: Apprentice			11%	4%	4%	2
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>755</b>	<b>120,773</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>116,642</b>
ELA – Grade 7						
State Standard	District 05-06	State 05-06	District 06-07	State 06-07	District 07-08	State 07-08
Level 1: Exceeded	04%	7%	4%	9%	8%	15%
Level 2: Met	48%	66%	50%	66%	44%	59%
Level 3: Basic	28%	19%	27%	17%	28%	18%
Level 4: Apprentice	20%	8%	18%	7%	20%	7%
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>128,085</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>124,039</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>121,192</b>
ELA – Grade 8						
Level 1: Exceeded			8%	18%	6%	16%
Level 2: Met			42%	53%	48%	59%
Level 3: Basic			27%	19%	25%	18%
Level 4: Apprentice			23%	9%	20%	7%
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>788</b>	<b>126,169</b>	<b>777</b>	<b>122,261</b>
ELA – Grade 11*						
Level 1: Advanced	01%	01%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Level 2: Proficient	59%	60%	40%	67%	38%	50%
Level 3: Partially Proficient	22%	24%	42%	20%	39%	35%
Level 4: Not Proficient	18%	15%	14%	12%	22%	13%
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>104,302</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>116,435</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>112,506</b>

\* Michigan Merit Examination

Math – Grade 3						
State Standard	District 05-06	State 05-06	District 06-07	State 06-07	District 07-08	State 07-08
Level 1: Exceeded			30%	51%	34%	49%
Level 2: Met			41%	37%	42%	41%
Level 3: Basic			25%	11%	23%	10%
Level 4: Apprentice			3%	1%	1%	0%
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>925</b>	<b>117,088</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>115,560</b>
Math – Grade 4						
Level 1: Exceeded	22%	36%	24%	34%	22%	41%

Level 2: Met	40%	45%	46%	50%	44%	45%
Level 3: Basic	24%	14%	23%	13%	26%	12%
Level 4: Apprentice	14%	04%	8%	3%	8%	2%
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>777</b>	<b>118,200</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>117,078</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>115,702</b>
<b>Math – Grade 5</b>						
Level 1: Exceeded			22%	36%	29%	39%
Level 2: Met			33%	40%	30%	35%
Level 3: Basic			34%	20%	32%	21%
Level 4: Apprentice			10%	4%	9%	4%
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>845</b>	<b>117,827</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>116,046</b>
<b>Math – Grade 6</b>						
Level 1: Exceeded			23%	34%	30%	44%
Level 2: Met			27%	35%	26%	29%
Level 3: Basic			30%	23%	27%	20%
Level 4: Apprentice			20%	8%	17%	8%
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>760</b>	<b>121,506</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>117,925</b>
<b>Math – Grade 7</b>						
<b>State Standard</b>	<b>District 05-06</b>	<b>State 05-06</b>	<b>District 06-07</b>	<b>State 06-07</b>	<b>District 07-08</b>	<b>State 07-08</b>
Level 1: Exceeded			23%	34%	23%	41%
Level 2: Met			25%	30%	28%	32%
Level 3: Basic			37%	29%	38%	24%
Level 4: Apprentice			15%	7%	11%	4%
<b>Number Tested</b>			<b>782</b>	<b>124,763</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>121,763</b>
<b>Math – Grade 8</b>						
Level 1: Exceeded	19%	31%	16%	29%	25%	41%
Level 2: Met	24%	33%	34%	39%	27%	30%
Level 3: Basic	25%	23%	39%	25%	28%	19%
Level 4: Apprentice	31%	14%	11%	7%	21%	9%
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>129,659</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>126,803</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>122,797</b>
<b>Math – Grade 11*</b>						
Level 1: Advanced	14%	09%	9%	1%	7%	10%
Level 2: Proficient	34%	37%	32%	67%	28%	36%
Level 3: Partially Proficient	13%	16%	11%	20%	13%	16%
Level 4: Not Proficient	39%	38%	48%	12%	52%	38%
<b>Number Tested</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>105,295</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>116,435</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>113,234</b>

\* Michigan Merit Examination

### District Demographic Scores – Percent Proficient 2007-2008

(Individual Building Scores are included in the building annual report -Special Education students take either the MI Access or the MEAP)

<b>Grade 3- English Language Arts (ELA) – 60% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>-13</b>
American Indian	64	79	-15
Asian	89	90	-1
African American	58	67	-9
Hispanic	60	71	-11

<b>Grade 3- English Language Arts (ELA) – 60% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
White	80	85	-5
Economically Disadvantaged	60	71	-11
Special Education	36	53	-17
Limited English Proficient	61	63	-2

<b>Grade 4 –English Language Arts (ELA) – 59% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>-20</b>
American Indian	61	74	-13
Asian	80	86	-6
African American	43	56	-13
Hispanic	51	64	-13
White	73	82	-9
Economically Disadvantaged	45	63	-18
Special Education	30	43	-13
Limited English Proficient	45	49	-4

<b>Grade 5 –English Language Arts (ELA) –57% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>-14</b>
American Indian	54	73	-19
Asian	75	86	-11
African American	49	58	-9
Hispanic	61	63	-2
White	81	84	-3
Economically Disadvantaged	53	65	-12
Special Education	23	42	-19
Limited English Proficient	54	44	+10

<b>Grade 6–English Language Arts (ELA) – 56% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>-18</b>
American Indian	73	78	-5
Asian	85	89	-4
African American	49	59	-10
Hispanic	58	69	-11
White	76	86	-10
Economically Disadvantaged	51	67	-16
Special Education	27	41	-14
Limited English Proficient	46	53	-7

<b>Grade 7–English Language Arts (ELA) – 54% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>-22</b>
American Indian	<	70	<
Asian	100	85	+15
African American	37	49	-12
Hispanic	48	62	-14
White	73	82	-9
Economically Disadvantaged	37	59	-22
Special Education	14	32	-18
Limited English Proficient	46	43	+3

<b>Grade 8–English Language Arts (ELA) – 53% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>-20</b>
American Indian	70	70	0
Asian	100	86	+14
African American	40	55	-5
Hispanic	47	63	-16
White	72	82	-10
Economically Disadvantaged	42	62	-20
Special Education	18	34	-16
Limited English Proficient	43	44	-1

<b>Grade 11 – ELA 61% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MME State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>-13</b>
American Indian	<	46	<
Asian	<	63	-27
African American	19	23	-4
Hispanic	18	30	-12
White	65	59	+6
Economically Disadvantaged	20	31	-11
Special Education	5	11	-6
Limited English Proficient	5	12	-7

<b>Grade 3 – Math – 67% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>-14</b>
American Indian	91	90	+1
Asian	100	97	+3
African American	67	76	-9
Hispanic	72	85	-13
White	87	94	-7
Economically Disadvantaged	69	84	-15
Special Education	52	77	-25
Limited English Proficient	73	83	-10

<b>Grade 4 – Math – 65% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>-20</b>
American Indian	67	85	-18
Asian	81	95	-14
African American	53	69	-16
Hispanic	56	79	-23
White	84	91	-7
Economically Disadvantaged	55	77	-22
Special Education	49	65	-16
Limited English Proficient	55	74	-19

<b>Grade 5 – Math – 62% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>-15</b>
American Indian	54	68	-14
Asian	62	90	-28
African American	42	51	-9
Hispanic	57	62	-5
White	78	81	-3
Economically Disadvantaged	48	60	-12
Special Education	33	44	-11
Limited English Proficient	48	54	-6

<b>Grade 6 – Math – 60% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>-18</b>
American Indian	73	69	+4
Asian	85	90	-5
African American	39	48	-9
Hispanic	58	61	-3
White	73	80	-7
Economically Disadvantaged	42	58	-16
Special Education	28	35	-7
Limited English Proficient	49	51	-2

<b>Grade 7 – Math – 57% State Target</b>			
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>% 07-08 MEAP District</b>	<b>%07-08 MEAP State</b>	<b>Difference From State</b>
<b>All Students</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>-22</b>
American Indian	<	67	<
Asian	100	88	+12
African American	38	48	-10
Hispanic	43	61	-18
White	71	80	-9
Economically Disadvantaged	36	56	-20
Special Education	10	32	-22
Limited English Proficient	42	50	-8

Grade 8 – Math – 54% State Target			
Student Group	% 07-08 MEAP District	%07-08 MEAP State	Difference From State
<b>All Students</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>-21</b>
American Indian	50	67	-17
Asian	92	89	+3
African American	38	45	-7
Hispanic	36	59	-23
White	70	79	-9
Economically Disadvantaged	40	56	-16
Special Education	24	32	-8
Limited English Proficient	35	51	-16

Grade 11 – Math – 55% State Target			
Student Group	% 07-08 MME District	% 07-08 MME State	Difference From State
<b>All Students</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>-11</b>
American Indian	<	35	<
Asian	45	67	<
African American	15	13	+2
Hispanic	17	28	-11
White	57	53	+4
Economically Disadvantaged	17	25	-8
Special Education	7	8	-1
Limited English Proficient	6	19	-12

### Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) Spring 2008 – Grades 1-6

The Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) as a national comparison for our student results in both reading and math. Students in grades K-4 participated in the testing. In the chart, the grade level equivalents and percent of students at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile are used to describe student achievement levels. The grade equivalent is the average grade and month achievement level – for example a grade level equivalent of 1.7 on the 1<sup>st</sup> grade ITBS reading test means the average reading level of all 1<sup>st</sup> grade students in Kalamazoo Public Schools was equal to a student in the 7<sup>th</sup> month of 1<sup>st</sup> grade.

### ITBS Reading Testing Results, 2006-2008

Grade Level	# Included	# At or Above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	% At or Above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	Average Grade Equivalent
<b>First Grade</b>				
Reading Total				
	06 863	370	42.9	1.8
	07 971	419	43.1	1.8
	08 988	468	47.4	1.8
Math Total				
	06 856	297	34.7	1.5
	07 962	319	33.1	1.5
	08 974	347	35.7	1.6

Grade Level	# Included	# At or Above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	% At or Above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	Average Grade Equivalent
<b>Second Grade</b>				
Reading Total				
06	835	273	32.6	2.6
07	903	385	42.6	2.8
08	939	420	44.7	2.8
Math Total				
06	818	289	35.3	2.5
07	887	340	38.4	2.6
08	914	325	35.5	2.5
<b>Third Grade</b>				
Reading Total				
06	791	328	41.5	3.6
07	901	346	38.4	3.5
08	870	399	45.8	3.7
Math Total				
06	756	256	33.9	3.4
07	869	281	32.3	3.3
08	838	316	37.8	3.5
<b>Fourth Grade</b>				
Reading Total				
06	778	312	40.1	4.4
07	850	371	43.6	4.7
08	892	377	42.3	4.6
Math Total				
06	746	260	34.8	4.3
07	834	303	36.3	4.4
08	870	288	33.2	4.3
<b>Fifth Grade</b>				
Reading Total				
06	*	*	*	*
07	838	335	40.0	5.4
08	847	385	45.4	5.6
Math Total				
06	*	*	*	*
07	828	285	34.4	5.3
08	834	334	40.0	5.4
<b>Sixth Grade</b>				
Reading Total				
06	730	235	32.2	5.8
07	733	240	32.8	6.0
08	798	300	37.5	6.1
Math Total				
06	715	248	34.7	6.2
07	692	236	34.1	6.2
08	786	281	35.8	6.2

\* Fifth grade students were not tested in 2005-2006.

### Average Grade Equivalent by Sub-Groups

Sub-group	Reading Grade Equivalent			Math Grade Equivalent		
	05-06	06-07	07-08	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>First Grade</b>						
African American	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.3
Hispanic	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.6
White	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.8
Economically Disadvantaged	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.4
Special Education	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.0	1.2
<b>Second Grade</b>						
African American	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.2
Hispanic	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4
White	3.0	3.1	3.4	2.9	3.0	3.1
Economically Disadvantaged	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3
Special Education	1.8	1.8	2.3	1.8	1.7	2.2
<b>Third Grade</b>						
African American	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.1
Hispanic	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.3
White	4.2	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.9	4.0
Economically Disadvantaged	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.2
Special Education	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.7
<b>Fourth Grade</b>						
African American	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9
Hispanic	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
White	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.0	5.0	5.1
Economically Disadvantaged	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.9
Special Education	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.9
<b>Fifth Grade</b>						
African American	*	4.6	4.8	*	4.6	4.8
Hispanic	*	4.8	5.1	*	5.0	5.1
White	*	6.4	6.7	*	6.2	6.3
Economically Disadvantaged	*	4.8	5.0	*	4.7	5.0
Special Education	*	4.0	3.4	*	4.3	4.0
<b>Sixth Grade</b>						
African American	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.4	5.3	5.3
Hispanic	5.0	5.4	5.7	5.5	5.8	5.9
White	6.8	7.3	7.3	7.0	7.5	7.3
Economically Disadvantaged	5.0	5.0	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.4
Special Education	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.7

\* Fifth grade students were not tested in 2005-2006.

## Parent Involvement

### Board Policy on Family Involvement, Community Involvement and Disclosure of Information

- **Policy 6.1 Family Involvement:** The District will consistently work, in a variety of ways, to strengthen meaningful family participation in the education of their children.
- **6.2 Community Involvement:** The District will involve members of the community at all levels of the district in as many capacities as possible.
- **3.4 Welcoming Atmosphere and Appearance:** All district facilities will maintain an atmosphere that is uplifting, courteous, self-disciplined and respectful and be welcoming and well cared for in appearance.
- **3.13 Customer Care and Service:** It is the expectation of the Board that all District staff will provide outstanding customer services.

### Parents, Legal Guardians or Persons in *Loco Parentis* Participating in Parent/Teacher Conferences

Building Level	Number and Percent											
	Fall 2005		Spring 2006		Fall 2006		Spring 2007		Fall 2007		Spring 2008	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Elementary	5252	94	5360	92	5740	94	5719	92	6179	94	6034	92
Middle School	1095	63	776	44	1045	57	839	47	842	50	678	41
High School	753	28	559	22	1037	37	800	29	1146	39	631	23
<b>District Totals</b>	<b>7100</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>6695</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>7822</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>7358</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>8167</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>7343</b>	<b>67</b>

### District Survey(s)

All elementary schools perform an annual survey of customer satisfaction which is sent to parents, staff and where appropriate students. Surveys and evaluations were completed in relationship to the GEAR-UP program, Reading Recovery®, parents interested in a Dual Language School, Kalamazoo Communities in Schools, and the Kalamazoo Promise.

Informal assessment of the district is gleaned through the number of parents and community members who actively serve on various committees within the district. Approximately 200 people participated in the setting of the strategic planning expectations and community members as well as staff participated in the curriculum audit. Other areas of participation include the district's Parent Advisory Council, Teacher Advisory Council, Student Advisory Council, Key Communicators, Teaching and Learning Council and other committees as deemed necessary, such as the committees formed to explore the dual language school and alternative programs.

In 2008-2009, plans are underway to survey parents regarding participation in the district's magnet schools and a parent satisfaction survey.