

# Annual Education Report

2008–2009

## Milwood Magnet School—A Center for Math, Science and Technology

2916 Konkle Street

Kalamazoo, MI 49001

Phone Number: 269.337.0670 Fax Number: 269.337.1628



The Milwood Magnet will engage a community of learners in technology rich and academically rigorous learning experiences that foster a healthy sense of self-esteem and a desire for life-long learning.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Mr. Kevin Campbell

### 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 building's accreditation status and grades as determined by Education YES!

Education Yes! Report Card	2008 – 2009		2007 – 2008	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	64.2	D	71.5	C
English Language Arts	50	F	55.7	F
Science	59.8	D	60.7	D
Social Studies	65	D	69.2	D
Achievement Subtotal	59.8	D	64.3	D
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	73	C	76	C
AYP Status	Met AYP- N		Met AYP- N	
Composite Grade	C		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

## Specialized School

Our school is a Math, Science and Technology Magnet.

## 2008–2009 Highlights

- A leadership structure and team were developed and took oversight for the school improvement plan and process in the building
- Parents designed and promoted with the faculty a recognition program for student achievement
- A family technology program was developed and implemented to provide more families with a home computer
- Student-led conferencing was implemented as a school-wide structure to place greater responsibility for achievement on students
- A school-wide read was implemented with the book, *Uglies*, to promote family literacy.

## 2008–2009 Highlights (cont.)

- A cohort group of 15 eighth graders completed a three year mentoring project with Eaton Corp. employees
- A integrated thematic curriculum was developed with faculty that outlines the scope and sequence of state GLCE

## Parent Involvement

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates				
School	Fall 2008		Spring 2009	
	#	%	#	%
Milwood Magnet	329	55	315	55

## 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.

### Milwood Magnet 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
- 39 teachers; 28 with a Bachelors Degree; 15 with a Masters Degree; and 1 with a Masters+ 30
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

## School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	Improve reading achievement of all students
Data to support goal selection:	There is a 16 percentage point gap in proficient achievement in 6 <sup>th</sup> grade, a 19 percentage point gap in 7 <sup>th</sup> grade and a 43 percentage point gap in 8 <sup>th</sup> grade on the 2008-2009 MEAP reading test when examining economic differences. This gap is echoed in the Ed Performance data. A similar gap exists when examining ethnicity.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Increase the number of literacy strategies being used in daily learning, increase the opportunity to learn, increase the engagement of students in effective literacy activity, and increase professional conversations among teachers over common assessment and literacy data.
Accomplishments:	51 students reached the school-wide goal of reading 10 books over the year, literacy strategies were provided to team leaders who implemented them on their teams over the course of school year.
Implications for next year:	We have to increase the amount of time students spend reading daily through homework expectations and in-school reading.
Writing	
Goal:	Improve the quality and quantity of student writing
Data to support goal selection:	There is a 15 percentage point gap in proficient achievement in 6 <sup>th</sup> grade, a 30 percentage point gap in 7 <sup>th</sup> grade and a 30 percentage point gap in 8 <sup>th</sup> grade on the 2008-2009 MEAP writing test when examining economic differences. A similar gap exists when examining ethnicity.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Increase the quality and quantity of writing in all content area classrooms, and increase professional conversations among teachers over common assessment and literacy data.
Accomplishments:	Intensive professional development of ELA staff over the use of writing strategies and GLCE alignment. Saw improvements at all grade levels in MEAP writing
Implications for next year:	Maintain focus on writing process and alignment, continue PD.
Math	
Goal:	Improve mathematics achievement for all students
Data to support goal selection:	There is a 35 percentage point gap in proficient achievement in 6 <sup>th</sup> grade, a 17 percentage point gap in 7 <sup>th</sup> grade and a 32 percentage point gap in 8 <sup>th</sup> grade on the 2008-2009 MEAP math test when examining economic differences. This gap is echoed in the Ed Performance data. A similar gap exists when examining ethnicity.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Review curriculum articulation and alignment across all levels in mathematics, increase the use of culturally appropriate learning strategies, provide focused and directed opportunities for targeted students in mathematics, increase opportunities for differentiated approaches to mathematics mastery with all students, increase of technology use, and increase professional conversations among teachers over common assessment and literacy data.
Accomplishments:	Scope and sequenced curriculum documents were created. MathForward program was implemented for students to receive extended time in mathematics.
Implications for next year:	Develop pre-algebra program for summer camp experience, prepare more students for 8th grade success. Extend mathematics instructional time for more students

## School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	Improve the science achievement of students at Milwood Magnet School
Data to support goal selection:	There is a 2.8 year gap in proficient achievement in 6 <sup>th</sup> grade and a 1.6 year gap in 7 <sup>th</sup> grade as measured on the EdPerformance science test when examining economic differences in students. While there was no gap at the 8 <sup>th</sup> grade level, the scores were over 3 years below the expected grade level equivalent. These gaps are also noted in the 2008 MEAP data.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	To align curriculum expectations to the MEAP and provide students with differentiated opportunities for science learning and achievement.
Accomplishments:	Science GLCEs were prioritized and aligned to the magnet curriculum. Science support was extended to all students after
Implications for next year:	Curriculum relevance must be improved to engage students to a deeper level. The use of thinking and literacy strategies must be emphasized and implemented across the science curriculum.

Social Studies	
Goal:	To improve the social studies achievement of all students at Milwood Magnet
Data to support goal selection:	There is a 30 point gap in social studies achievement when the SES level is considered as measured by the 6 <sup>th</sup> grade MEAP
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	To align curriculum expectations to state outcomes and instructional strategies that provide a higher degree of engagement in learning, implement literacy, thinking and writing strategies and civic engagement.
Accomplishments:	Social Studies GLCEs were prioritized and aligned to the magnet curriculum.
Implications for next year:	Curriculum relevance must be improved to engage students at a deeper level. The use of thinking and literacy strategies must be emphasized and implemented across the social studies curriculum.



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

## School Assessment Data

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

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	44	62	80	81	3	42	43	12
	2008-09	53	67	80	98	8	45	45	3
African American	2007-08	39	49	59	81	2	38	47	14
	2008-09	46	54	61	100	7	39	51	3
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	64	58	69	100	0	64	36	0
	2008-09		63	68					
White	2007-08	44	76	86	73	7	37	41	15
	2008-09	68	83	85	100	12	56	29	2
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		27	41					
	2008-09	10	21	45	100	0	10	70	20
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		46	53					
	2008-09		69	50					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	37	51	67	86	1	36	49	14
	2008-09	47	58	68	88				
Migrant	2007-08			63					
	2008-09			58					
Male	2007-08	38	56	76	83	4	34	52	10
	2008-09	49	65	77	95	5	44	48	3
Female	2007-08	50	68	83	79	2	48	36	14
	2008-09	57	70	82	100	12	45	41	2

Student Group 7th 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	38	52	74	86	4	34	28	34
	2008-09	47	62	80	98	3	44	36	17
African American	2007-08	25	37	49	85	2	23	34	41
	2008-09	40	48	62	99	2	38	41	18
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08			70					
	2008-09			77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	85					
	2008-09		83	91					
Hispanic	2007-08	40	48	62	100	0	40	25	35
	2008-09	65	59	71	100	0	65	29	6
White	2007-08	60	73	82	84	9	51	17	23
	2008-09	59	79	85	95	7	52	25	16
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	3	14	32	79	0	3	15	82
	2008-09	14	27	41	100	0	14	48	38
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	31	46	43	100	0	31	25	44
	2008-09	50	54	54	92	0	50	42	8
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	28	37	59	88	1	27	31	41
	2008-09	42	52	69	91	2	40	40	18
Migrant	2007-08			50					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	36	46	70	85	7	29	27	38
	2008-09	43	57	76	98	2	41	39	18
Female	2007-08	40	58	79	88	0	40	30	30
	2008-09	52	67	84	97	4	49	33	15

## School Assessment Data

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

Student Group 8th 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	49	55	75	84	4	45	32	19
	2008-09	48	60	77	96	3	45	32	20
African American	2007-08	32	40	55	83	2	30	40	28
	2008-09	32	46	58	95	0	32	41	27
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		70	70					
	2008-09			73					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	86					
	2008-09		100	88					
Hispanic	2007-08	67	47	63	67	0	67	17	17
	2008-09	50	52	67	100	0	50	32	18
White	2007-08	66	72	82	89	7	59	26	8
	2008-09	76	80	82	96	9	67	16	9
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	16	18	34	70	0	16	21	63
	2008-09	10	14	34	100	0	10	33	57
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	62	43	44	72	0	62	23	15
	2008-09	47	51	48	94	6	41	29	24
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	38	42	62	81	2	36	40	23
	2008-09	39	47	64	85	0	39	38	23
Migrant	2007-08			51					
	2008-09			56					
Male	2007-08	42	46	69	81	4	38	36	23
	2008-09	44	56	73	96	4	41	33	22
Female	2007-08	56	63	81	86	4	51	28	17
	2008-09	54	64	81	96	2	52	30	16



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

## School Assessment Data

### Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: MATHEMATICS

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	30	55	73	83	7	19	23	52
	2008-09	52	68	80	97	22	30	40	8
African American	2007-08	25	39	48	85	6	14	20	61
	2008-09	43	53	61	99	20	23	43	13
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	27	58	61	100	0	27	73	0
	2008-09		74	71					
White	2007-08	41	73	80	73	22	19	30	30
	2008-09	60	83	85	98	30	30	40	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	0	28	35	80	0	0	17	83
	2008-09	20	31	45	100	0	10	10	80
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		49	51					
	2008-09		72	62					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	22	42	58	89	6	15	44	34
	2008-09	45	59	69	87	17	27	46	10
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			73					
Male	2007-08	33	58	72	85	14	20	39	27
	2008-09	48	67	79	94	18	30	43	8
Female	2007-08	28	53	73	82	10	17	41	31
	2008-09	56	69	81	100	26	30	37	7

Student Group 7th 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	33	51	73	87	9	24	48	18
	2008-09	51	65	83	99	13	38	39	10
African American	2007-08	21	38	48	85	5	15	56	23
	2008-09	47	54	63	99	11	36	42	11
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08			67					
	2008-09			79					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	88					
	2008-09		83	94					
Hispanic	2007-08	40	43	61	100	0	40	45	15
	2008-09	53	67	75	100	6	47	47	0
White	2007-08	54	71	80	87	18	36	34	12
	2008-09	62	79	88	98	21	41	29	9
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	3	10	32	76	0	3	56	41
	2008-09	24	31	46	100	7	17	45	31
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	25	42	50	100	6	19	56	19
	2008-09	50	61	66	92	8	42	50	0
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	22	36	58	89	4	17	56	22
	2008-09	48	57	72	93	11	37	42	9
Migrant	2007-08			56					
	2008-09			72					
Male	2007-08	37	51	71	85	12	25	44	19
	2008-09	52	64	81	99	11	41	38	11
Female	2007-08	29	51	74	91	6	23	53	17
	2008-09	51	66	84	99	16	36	40	8

## School Assessment Data

### Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Math

Student Group 8th 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	51	71	87	15	26	32	27
	2008-09	43	56	75	98	13	31	38	19
African American	2007-08	21	38	45	83	3	18	42	37
	2008-09	33	45	52	99	5	28	44	23
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		50	67					
	2008-09			72					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		92	89					
	2008-09		79	89					
Hispanic	2007-08	31	36	59	89	13	19	38	31
	2008-09	27	46	64	100	9	18	45	27
White	2007-08	66	70	79	90	29	37	19	15
	2008-09	67	75	81	96	27	40	24	9
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	35	24	32	85	13	22	30	35
	2008-09	26	31	39	100	3	24	50	24
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	35	35	51	94	18	18	29	35
	2008-09	18	41	57	94	6	12	53	29
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	32	40	56	85	8	24	36	33
	2008-09	35	44	62	89	5	30	44	20
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			64					
Male	2007-08	50	52	71	85	17	33	24	26
	2008-09	45	59	75	99	15	30	36	19
Female	2007-08	31	51	72	89	13	19	40	29
	2008-09	40	53	74	97	8	32	41	19



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

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	25	48	73	79	7	19	23	52
	2008-09	33	50	74	99	15	18	23	45
African American	2007-08	20	31	45	85	6	14	20	61
	2008-09	23	32	48	100	10	13	25	52
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	18	35	59	100	0	18	36	45
	2008-09		42	59					
White	2007-08	43	69	81	73	13	30	22	35
	2008-09	54	74	81	100	24	29	15	32
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	0	35	40	73	0	0	17	83
	2008-09	10	31	40	60	0	10	10	80
Limited English Proficient	2007-08		23	40					
	2008-09		38	41					
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	22	33	56	82	3	16	19	62
	2008-09	26	39	59	88	9	17	24	51
Migrant	2007-08			48					
	2008-09			48					
Male	2007-08	33	49	72	82	10	16	20	53
	2008-09	29	52	74	97	11	18	18	53
Female	2007-08	28	46	73	75	4	21	25	51
	2008-09	36	49	73	100	19	17	28	36

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Science

Student Group 8th 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	58	79	83	12	38	28	21
	2008-09	41	54	76	98	9	32	33	26
African American	2007-08	32	42	54	80	4	28	38	30
	2008-09	27	37	51	97	1	27	35	38
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		60	78					
	2008-09			74					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		83	88					
	2008-09		93	87					
Hispanic	2007-08	58	48	67	67	0	58	17	25
	2008-09	41	55	64	100	0	41	36	23
White	2007-08	73	79	87	88	23	50	18	10
	2008-09	63	76	84	97	27	37	28	8
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	17	19	48	85	13	4	43	39
	2008-09	13	19	42	100	0	13	31	56
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	43	42	49	78	0	43	36	21
	2008-09	29	50	48	94	6	24	41	29
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	38	44	65	80	5	33	34	28
	2008-09	32	39	62	89	4	27	37	32
Migrant	2007-08			54					
	2008-09			55					
Male	2007-08	53	57	79	82	14	39	24	22
	2008-09	41	54	75	99	13	29	29	30
Female	2007-08	47	60	80	84	10	38	32	21
	2008-09	40	53	77	97	3	36	40	20

## Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

### Achievement Targets in Relation to AYP Targets and Attendance Rate

Student Group Middle School	Reading/Language Arts						Mathematics						Additional Academic		
	Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Attendance Rate		
	Goal: 95%			Goal: 54%			Goal: 95%			Goal: 54%			Goal: 90%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	98	98	96	70	83		99	99	97	88	90		87	92	
African American	99	98	94	62	76		100	99	96	85	86		85	91	
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	N/A	N/A	94	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	95	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	100	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	100	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	98	99	96	77	85		100	101	98	93	91		88	93	
White	97	98	97	82	90		97	99	97	94	94		89	94	
Students with Disabilities	100	100		33	53		106	102		76	68		82	90	
Limited English Proficient	92	99		N/A	83		94	102		N/A	91		88	93	
Economically Disadvantaged	96	99		63	77		97	100		87	87		84	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.