U.S. Department of Education
2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I   [ ] Charter   [ ] Magnet   [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Joyce Brasington
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Wattles Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 3555 Ellenboro Dr.
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Troy   State MI   Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 48083-5116

County   Oakland   State School Code Number* 63150

Telephone 248-823-3400   Fax 248-823-3413

Web site/URL
          http://wattles.troy.k12.mi.us/pages/Wattles_
Elementary_School   E-mail jbrasington@troy.k12.mi.us

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

_____Date_____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Barbara Fowler   E-mail: bfowler@troy.k12.mi.us
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Troy School District   Tel. 248-823-4000
I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

_____Date_____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Dr. Nancy Philippart
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

_____Date_____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

*Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school's application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.

6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.

7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.

8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district   <u>12</u> Elementary schools (includes K-8)
    (per district designation):   <u>3</u> Middle/Junior high schools
                                             <u>3</u> High schools
                                             <u>0</u> K-12 schools

                                             <u>18</u> TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

    [ ] Urban or large central city
    [ ] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
    [X] Suburban
    [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
    [ ] Rural

3. <u>1</u> Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0
K	42	36	78
1	34	42	76
2	43	49	92
3	39	44	83
4	34	34	68
5	54	33	87
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	246	238	484

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

    0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
    34 % Asian
    6 % Black or African American
    2 % Hispanic or Latino
    0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    54 % White
    4 % Two or more races
    100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 4%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	**Answer**
(1) Number of students who transferred *to* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	10
(2) Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	10
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	20
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	484
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.041
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 22 %
                                     104 Total number ELL

Number of non-English languages represented: 25
Specify non-English languages: Alabanian, Arabic, Chaldean, Chinese, Filipino, Greek, Gujarati, Hindi, Kannada, Konkani, Korean, Kurdish, Malayalam, Mandarin, Marathi, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romainian, German, Russian, Spanish, Tamil, Tulu, and Vietnamese

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 19 %

    Total number students who qualify: 93

If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

9. Students receiving special education services: <u>8</u> %

                                                            <u>39</u> Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>6</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>3</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>13</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>19</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>4</u> Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	19
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	6
Paraprofessionals	2
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	1

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1   <u>25:1</u>

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**
    Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

Post-Secondary Status	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.
    Yes   No X

    If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

Wattles Elementary School is tucked away in the middle of the bustling city of Troy, Michigan. It sits on nineteen acres, surrounded by nature and residential homes. Our mission statement is an acronym for Wattles, Working All Together to Learn, Ensures Success. It is our mission to work together and build community, to ensure that all stakeholders learn and to help all students succeed, both academically and socially. Our mission is further supported by our vision statement which is: Wattles School will become an exemplary learning community that supports innovation and is committed to continuous improvement. Wattles School will be a place where a collaborative community develops and implements meaningful curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment to ensure all students learn.

Our Wattles community consists of 484 students, an administrator, classroom teachers, special teachers including art, music, physical education, Spanish, and media, along with a social worker, a psychologist, a speech pathologist, an ELL teacher, reading specialists, special education and ASD teachers, Title 1 Tutors, paraprofessionals, custodians, office personnel, cooks, and noon aides. Each of these groups is a crucial component to the development of lifelong learners. Educators work tirelessly to develop rigorous curriculum and meaningful assessments while utilizing best practice instructional methods which challenge students to reach their highest potential.

The Wattles community is rich in cultural and economic diversity. One hundred four of our students are serviced by our ELL teachers. Many additional students speak a primary language other than English at home. Twenty-five different languages are spoken at Wattles. Approximately 20% of our students come from economically disadvantaged homes, which is double what it was nine years ago. Only 59% of our fifth grade students have attended Wattles since kindergarten, adding a relatively transient student population to the challenges facing our educators.

The neighborhoods in the attendance area surrounding our school are as diverse as our student population. Student homes range from federally subsidized apartment housing to upscale homes. We find our small snippet of the very diverse society in which we live to be the quintessential environment for educating children. Upon walking into Wattles School, one would find it challenging to identify children from any of our different socio-economic neighborhoods. There are no social or cultural barriers constructed by our students. Wattles' students don't choose friends by skin color or designer clothing, but instead by the character qualities they exhibit.

Teaching and encouraging positive character qualities is one of our highest priorities. We feel it is our responsibility to contribute to helping students mature into adults who are not only highly literate, critical thinkers, but also responsible individuals with integrity and compassion. This is accomplished through our Positive Behavior Intervention Support program, our CAT Packs school-families initiative, and the overall culture of our building. Wattles' expectations are that our students are principled, respectful, optimistic, caring people.

The school improvement process at Wattles is led by a steering committee consisting of the principal, teacher leaders, and parents. The steering committee plans for professional development, facilitates the creation and implementation of the school improvement plan, and directs the activity of other school initiatives. The steering committee leads stakeholders in reviewing student achievement, analyzing assessment data, and identifying specific needs and areas of concern. Using this information, the stakeholders work collaboratively to develop goals for the next school year. Goal committees are established for each building goal.

Wattles' staff strategically choose additional initiatives to help increase student achievement and improve the overall school experience for students. Recent initiatives include Grade Level Meetings, Visible Thinking and Positive Behavior Intervention Support. Grade level meetings utilize a cross-grade level buddy program to provide collaboration time for grade level teams during the school day. Grade level teams monitor the progress of all students at that grade level using a data board, analyze the data, and plan for intervention.

Other resource staff is encouraged to attend meetings to provide additional expertise and experience in planning for and providing intervention.

The Wattles' staff is committed to creating a Culture of Thinking in our classrooms and throughout our school. We have devoted much of our collaboration time over the past three years to training staff in Visible Thinking routines, learning to analyze student thinking, and using that information to plan for instruction.

A diverse committee of educators work together to implement our multifaceted Positive Behavior Intervention Support plan. The committee developed a matrix of expected student behavior and consistent consequences. Staff members track behavior concerns and plan for intervention. We also have several positive incentives in place. We gather for "Wildcat Assemblies" twice a month to celebrate our school community and all that we achieve together. We build community with our cross-grade level "CAT Packs" which stay consistent throughout a student's entire time at Wattles. "CAT Pack" meetings focus on anti-bulling lessons and positive character education.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1.   Assessment Results:

a) Each year, public school students in grades 3-9 are required by the state of Michigan to take the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) test. Students are tested in mathematics, reading, writing, science and social studies. MEAP test scores are reported based on four categories-Not Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced. Students who score at the Proficient level or the Advanced level are considered to be on track for career/college readiness. Students who score at the Advanced level exceed expectations indicating substantial understanding and application of key concepts. The Proficient performance level indicates understanding and application of key expectations. The students who are at the Partially Proficient level need assistance to improve achievement indicating performance is not yet proficient. A student scoring at the Not Proficient level needs intensive intervention and support to improve achievement.

In addition to the MEAP, we use the Fountas and Pinnell-Benchmark Assessment System. The Fountas and Pinnell assessment is an individualized assessment that provides a student's reading level and information on reading behaviors. Collaborative teams in grade levels K-5 develop and administer district common assessments based on the Math Expressions program and common core. These assessments are used to make sure that students have mastered the materials that were taught and re-teaching groups are organized based on the needs identified through these assessments. The Troy Writing Assessment is administered in each grade level in the fall and spring and is scored using a locally developed rubric (based on Common Core standards) to determine a student's strengths and weaknesses in writing. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills test is administered in the 5th grade and is used to identify strengths and weaknesses of each student in the areas of math and language arts to determine appropriate placement for middle school.

b) Wattles Elementary School consistently outperforms the county and state in terms of the percentage of students who meet or exceed expectations at either the Advanced level or the Proficient level of proficiency on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program tests. When reviewing the building MEAP data, we saw a significant improvement from our current 4th graders. In math, 2011-2012, 84% of these students were proficient and as 4th graders in 2012-2013, 88% were proficient with the percentage of advanced students rising 30%. These students demonstrated similar growth in reading--81% proficient to 87% proficient. We saw significant improvement in the 5th grade science scores and attribute that improvement to our focus on claim-evidence-reasoning writing as described in the common core standards. The current group of 5th grade students has shown an increase in the percent of students proficient each year from 3rd through 5th grade.

We were designated as a Michigan Focus school in 2012 based on the achievement gap in student results on the MEAP between high and low achieving students. Wattles staff worked collaboratively to develop and implement research-based strategies to support the low achieving students. One of the interventions implemented by general education staff, Title I tutors, and reading specialists were Leveled Literacy Intervention Kits. "I" time (Intervention Time) was created throughout the academic day for each grade level to receive 30 minutes of support by Title I tutors, reading specialists, and ESL staff. During this time, resource staff provide intensive instruction and remediation in small groups based on academic need. Monthly grade level meetings are held during the school day to analyze assessment data to determine additional interventions. These meetings provide an opportunity for grade level teams to benefit from the expertise of the specialized support staff. Grade level teachers received professional development on implementing a program entitled "Mastering the Basic Math Facts." Classroom teachers and Title I tutors work closely to identify learning concerns for each individual student and plan targeted interventions. Specific checklists were developed to help monitor student growth. Staff also participated in the Superintendent's Challenge which provided additional academic and social mentoring to our highest at risk population in fifth grade. Wattles received grants which were used to purchase additional math, science, and social studies manipulatives.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Each year the staff at Wattles reviews and analyzes a variety of assessment data including MEAP, Fountas and Pinell, common assessments, as well as teacher developed assessments to identify learning trends and to develop school improvement goals. Goal committees are established to plan strategies and activities to successfully work toward achieving each goal. To support implementation of the strategies and activities, each goal committee provides necessary professional development and resources to teachers. Throughout the year, goal committees monitor data to ensure deep implementation. Each fall, a goal night is held with the purpose of informing families of our school improvement goals. Parents leave with greater understanding of our goals along with strategies to support the goals at home.

Assessments are analyzed at grade level meetings to monitor student progress. As a team, we determine how specialized staff and resources can best be allocated to meet the needs of all students within a grade level. These monthly grade level meetings provide time for the team to determine if an intervention is working and make adjustments as necessary.

While our school uses a variety of externally developed assessments, staff value formative assessments which are used daily to inform our teaching and to make sure that all students are challenged and supported. Our formative assessment practices ensure student achievement remains on track and provide students and their family feedback on student growth. Formative assessments such as math talk, written reflections, and guided projects involve students in their own assessment. Giving children the opportunity to understand where they are in relation to learning targets and providing them with feedback help to motivate and guide their own learning. Formative assessment results are used by students, teachers, and families to understand individual student learning needs. Summative assessments like the MEAP are reported to the community through district and school communications, including but not limited to email, newspaper, and websites.

Since the 2010-11 school year, Wattles has embraced Visible Thinking as a formative assessment. Visible Thinking helps to make tangible what thinking centered classroom looks like. Making thinking visible promotes student interest and commitment to their own learning. These formative assessments promote an attitude toward thinking and learning that is open minded and curious. We have seen a deeper understanding of content, greater motivation, and improved attitudes toward learning since instituting the formative assessments that make up Visible Thinking routines. Parents also become aware of the thinking routines and the vocabulary of thinking is shared at home.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Our Wattles' staff has had numerous opportunities to share successful strategies with other educators. The building principal has presented on "Inquiry Based School Improvement" to school leadership teams in Oakland County. The building principal has also mentored aspiring principals in Oakland County. Staff are regularly asked to mentor newly hired teachers in the district. Staff also delivered a presentation on "Effectively Using Data Binders in the Classroom" at an Oakland County PLC Sharing Day which was sponsored by the Intermediate School District. The Wattles' leadership team presented a protocol we developed for successful grade level meetings at a recent district school improvement meeting. Audience members included leadership teams from each of the 18 schools within the Troy School District. The reading specialist has presented at the statewide reading conference as well as numerous in-district professional development sessions on reading, writing, and word study. Numerous teachers have participated on district curriculum committees and presented their work to colleagues. Teachers have written and piloted units of study which have been adopted county-wide. These teachers also trained colleagues on how to successfully implement these new units of study. A variety of staff members have presented to district principal groups and to the Troy Board of Education. Staff have had opportunities to present "Tips on how to Effectively Utilize Technology in the Classrooms" including smartboard lessons and IPAD integration to colleagues in the district.

Teacher labs are held regularly at Wattles in which a classroom teacher opens his/her classroom door to grade level colleagues across the district. Teachers first preview with their colleagues on what they will be observing in the classroom. The teacher then models the successful teaching strategy in the classroom. The experience culminates with rich discussion afterwards on implementation tips.

A priority of the Wattles' staff is to share lessons learned with our parent community. We host several evening events which provide an opportunity to share knowledge with our parents and to build community. Topics for these sessions include kindergarten literacy, facilitating learning for ESL students, word study and reading tips for Title I families, math games, and themed reading events.

4.   Engaging Families and Community:

The Wattles' staff works hard to engage our school families. As referenced above, the numerous evening events that we host provide the opportunity for parents to become partners in educating our students. Research shows that students with involved parents are more likely to be better motivated and experience more academic success.

Family members serve in many different volunteer capacities at Wattles. Our Parent Teacher Organization is very active and essential to supporting our school. The PTO sponsors many social events to help welcome families and foster relationships in our school community. They provide funding for school assemblies, field trips, classroom magazines, classroom libraries, and additional materials to enrich our students' learning experience. Parents and other family members volunteer on a regular basis reading with students, facilitating learning centers, assisting with technology, providing services in the media center and preparing materials. The involvement of all stakeholders is essential to our school improvement process and parents are valued members of our leadership team.

Every school has students who benefit from extra support, but our support is unique and specialized. Our Title I funding allows us to provide tutors and materials for our at-risk students. We strive to engage parents in helping these students at home by communicating with them through Title I newsletters and evening events. In the fall, we conduct a survey of our Title I parents to identify areas of need and how we can best help them. Results of the survey are used to plan parent/child nights where we provide materials and suggestions for supporting learning at home.

We consider ourselves very fortunate to have partnerships with a multitude of community resources. Three area churches provide economically disadvantaged Wattles' students with backpacks, school supplies, haircuts, Thanksgiving meals, Christmas gifts, and weekly food bags. Both our city police and fire departments come into our school to educate our students about safety. Our students are further informed on the dangers of smoking by an area hospital and on disability awareness shared with us by a neighboring school district. In addition, we also have local community members, outside of our school family, who invest their time and talents to benefit our students. These volunteers serve in capacities ranging from tending our gardens to managing our "Literacy Library" to working with small groups of students.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

MAISA (Michigan Association of Intermediate Administrators) Reading and Writing Units of Study, developed at Oakland Schools, are based on the Common Core State Standards. Using the workshop model, the units of study encompass grades K-5 in reading and writing. Units of study are consistent across grade levels: reading and writing narratives, informational text, opinion and persuasive genres are included in all grade levels and form a continuum of learning. Both curriculums begin instruction with whole class grouping; the teacher thinking aloud while reading mentor texts. Each lesson has a specific focus and this thread runs through small group and individualized instruction.

The math curriculum uses Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's Math Expressions. It is an inquiry-based curriculum, focused on the Common Core State Standards. Students study a small number of mathematical concepts, allowing them the time to develop the knowledge to build in-depth understanding of major mathematical ideas. Students invent, question, model, represent and explore, but also learn and practice important math strategies. Mathematics content and models connect and build across the grade levels to provide a progression of teaching and learning.

At Wattles, our science curriculum is based on the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs). We utilize science kits (a combination of Foss kits and district developed kits). These materials help students to deeply understand the content and processes of life, earth and physical science promoting inquiry and discussion. Each unit involves many hands-on experiences including experiments and studies of plants and animals. Digging deeply into science content, students work in groups to observe, hypothesize and evaluate. Informational texts included in the science kits allow students to gain content knowledge and practice strategies taught in reading workshop. Wattles' students use the claim-evidence-reasoning protocol throughout all science units.

The GLCEs form the basis of our social studies instruction. Beginning close to home and expanding into the United States and United States history, our students make connections to their lives and gain content knowledge.

Art and music classes engage students and allow them to showcase their talents from kindergarten to fifth grade. The art curriculum is based on the GLCEs. The art teacher utilizes large group, small group and hand over hand individualized instruction. Elements and principles of design are introduced and reinforced. Connections to other content areas such as math and history are made and live demonstrations, use of technology, Visible Thinking Routines and project examples guide students in creating art. Our music curriculum is based on the national standards. Music activities include singing, dancing, listening, composing and playing instruments. Our teachers have a wide range of expertise, exposing our students to their distinct talents through the years. Specific instrumental music instruction begins in 5th grade.

Physical education classes encourage healthy habits by individual fitness testing and goal setting. Teachers have "Fitness Folders" to record and monitor each student's progress. Awards are given to high achieving students. A variety of instructional groupings are used depending on the skill or sport being taught. The curriculum was written by district teachers and is based on the GLCEs. The path to a healthy lifestyle culminates in a 5th grade fitness run.

Students in grades 3-5 participate in a weekly Spanish class. The curriculum is designed to promote global awareness and cross-cultural understanding as well as to develop writing, speaking, reading, and listening skills in English and Spanish. Each year of study advances the child's language skills leading to the year-long Spanish class in 6th grade.

Our media curriculum is based on state standards and was written by Troy School District teachers. Both teachers and students use technology in lessons about online resources and research technology in a variety of contexts. The Wattles Media Center prides itself upon the wide variety of choices offered to students

when checking out books to read at home. A recently implemented program, which involves students taking home a backpack filled with a stuffed animal and a corresponding book, engages and motivates students to read at home.

Technology is a very important part of each curriculum area. Various devices (Smartboards, iPads, laptops, etc.) allow for the differentiation of instruction, practice of skills and the completion of project based assessments.

2. Reading/English:

Reading and Writing Workshop is the instructional model used in the Troy School District that challenges students to continually develop their skills in reading, writing, listening and speaking resulting in skilled readers and writers who are thinkers that effectively comprehend and communicate.

Workshop empowers students in comprehension and skill acquisition by providing a structured environment that fosters a love of reading and writing by allowing students to engage with text in authentic and meaningful ways. Workshop was chosen because the teachers know it empowers them to differentiate instruction in order to accommodate the learning needs of all students. Many of our teachers worked on the District and County level to write these units of study. They develop additional activities using technology which support all students and share them with other teachers in the district.

Students experience a variety of genres and authors as literacy competencies are developed through narrative and informational units of study scaffolded across the grade levels to provide a progression of teaching and learning that aligns with the Common Core State Standards.

Research points out that the Workshop model allows a teacher time to differentiate instruction to best meet the varying needs of students. Workshop encompasses several instructional methods: whole group, small group and individualized instruction. A short focused mini-lesson is followed with independent practice of the teaching point. During this time, teachers gather small groups for a lesson relating to the teaching point using books at the students' instructional level or individually conference with students. The small group and individual conferences address the needs of both low and high achieving students. Students shop for 'just right' books in the classroom library. If a student needs additional books beyond the classroom library, a "Lending Library" in the Reading Room is available to meet the needs of all students.

Assessments for reading include the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Reading System, test scores from the MEAP, ITBS and CogAT, anecdotal records, rubrics and checklists. All together, these assessments guide and focus our instruction. Under-performing students are given additional instruction using the LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction) materials four times a week.

Books from a variety of publishers are available for reading in the classroom: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's Journeys, Scholastic, MacMillan McGraw Hill, Rigby, Wright Group, and many trade books. Wattles also has a Literacy Library for teachers to check out multiple copies of books for small group instruction.

3. Mathematics:

The Troy School District uses Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's Math Expressions as the mathematics curriculum. These materials were chosen because they are based directly on the Common Core State Standards and they provide a wealthy array of support materials. Math Expressions supports teachers as they create an inquiry environment to encourage constructive discussion. Mathematics content and models connect and build across the grade levels to provide a progression of teaching and learning that aligns precisely with the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics. Through daily "Math Talk", students explain their methods and thinking. This allows students to become more fluent in applying their strategies. "Math Talk" also provides opportunities for students to hear the thinking of their classmates.

Math Expressions provides differentiated pathways to mathematical tasks. Teachers carefully choose appropriate tasks to continually elicit student thinking, while building students' procedural fluency and conceptual understanding. These practices are not simply related to computation and the use of algorithms, but require students to problem solve, reason, communicate and make representations that show their thinking and learning. Students are required to make sense of problems and to persevere in solving them. Students must reason abstractly and quantitatively as well as construct arguments and critique the reasoning of others. Students are asked to create models that represent what they are learning in math connecting their learning to problems that might arise in the real world.

Teachers have a variety of resources available to differentiate instruction. Every Math Expressions lesson provides activity cards, games, and writing prompts for students having difficulty, students having success, and students seeking a challenge. Online resources provide additional intervention for students who are struggling. Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions contain new instruction on prerequisite skills and scaffolded examples to build foundational knowledge necessary to be successful with grade level content. Parent support materials are available online as well, including access to online games. Wattles staff uses a wide variety of manipulatives and games for students needing extra practice. Another resource available for high performing students is a Math Center Challenges Easel. It includes activities, projects and puzzlers to help the highest math achievers reach their potential.

Many assessments are used to monitor the students' progress. Math Expressions end of unit tests, district common assessments, MEAP, ITBS and CogAT, anecdotal records, rubrics and checklists inform instruction and identify areas of strength and weakness.

4. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

There are several reasons why we chose to highlight our Science Curriculum. First, it is a Troy School District school improvement goal and it is also a Wattles building improvement goal. Our students' scores surpass the county and state scores on the MEAP and have steadily increased over the past four years, but many students still do not score in the proficient range. We know that science scores are directly correlated to reading scores and we realize that in order to be career and college ready our students must improve their mastery of science content. Additionally, the curriculum is aligned with the Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs).

The Troy School District chose to use FOSS (Full Option Science System) materials because we believe that science is a discovery-based learning activity consisting of observing objects and events, thinking about how they relate to what is known, testing ideas, and generating explanations that integrate the new information into what is known.

The Foss kits are built around these ideas and provide everything that a teacher needs for the unit: current research on learning, effective instructional methodologies including hands-on active learning, inquiry, integration of content areas, embedded assessment and student discourse. Materials for experiments, specific lesson plans that include student recording/response sheets and trade books specific to the topic are also included in the kit. The FOSS materials are matched to the way students think at different developmental stages and provide an in-depth exposure of science content.

Low performing students and ESL students often do well with the hands-on nature of the investigations. They may need extra support with science content and the recording of their observations. Tutors give additional explicit instruction in vocabulary and background knowledge. Trade books written at the student's reading level can build content knowledge in a way that the student can better understand.

5. **Instructional Methods:**

In language arts, the workshop model provides for whole group, small group and individualized instruction. Teachers work with students in small groups focusing on areas of need at the students' instructional level. Independent practice time also allows teachers to individually conference with students to further pinpoint instruction that will accelerate their progress.

Using several data points, abilities of all students in a curriculum area are identified. Staff plans interventions to meet the specific needs of the students involved. If the teacher doesn't have enough books, students check out independent reading materials at their level. This "Lending Library" is located in the Reading Teacher's room where she can guide the students in appropriate book choice. In May, Title I and ESL students choose between 6-20 books to read over the summer to maintain their reading progress over the summer.

Grade level intervention times allow the support of the entire Title I staff, reading specialists and ESL staff to work with the small groups of the lowest achieving students. Research based interventions such as guided practice, modeling, explicit teaching and using hands on manipulatives are chosen to reinforce new learning. LLI kits provide appropriate books and lesson plans that accelerate the learning of below level performing students.

The ESL and Title I staff provide small group instruction that coordinates with the grade level's science and social study units. This involves deeper instruction in vocabulary and background knowledge. Technology is often used as it can bring unknown concepts to life for a student.

In all subject areas, the use of software such as Power Point, Microsoft Publisher and Movie Maker allows us to differentiate a student's learning. In computer lab, students use websites to further individualize instruction while increasing motivation and providing student choice. Raz-kids and various math websites allow teachers to place all students at their instructional level and provide additional resources for practice at home.

In math instruction, the workshop method is also utilized - giving teachers an opportunity to individualize instruction. "Math Talk" involves students using math vocabulary when talking to classmates about how they solved a problem. Viewing a math problem from different perspectives helps a student internalize important math concepts.

6. **Professional Development:**

Wattles' teachers are provided with significant professional development at both the district and school level. Grade level meetings are held to promote understanding of expectations and best practices. In addition to grade level meetings, 4th and 5th grade teachers participate in teacher labs. Teachers observe one another's practice and then talk about the elements of effective instruction that they might have seen. Teacher labs provide an opportunity for job-embedded professional development that is deeply connected to their daily classroom practices. Teacher labs primarily focus on reading and writing workshop practices that promote individualized and differentiated instruction within classrooms promoting student learning.

Teaching and Learning Leaders (TLLs) support job-embedded professional development for 3rd grade teachers. These TLLs push into classrooms and offer job-embedded professional development and create opportunities for teachers to work together around student learning.

Early elementary teachers have been involved in professional development focusing on increasing their capacity to teach literacy. Teachers also engage in cross-grade collaboration encouraging conversation between grade levels. These are opportunities to share effective instructional strategies, formative assessments, and curricular outcomes which are ideal for learning and for sharing.

Over the past three years, Visible Thinking has been a focus of professional learning. Teachers use it to promote the students' deeper thinking and as a tool for formative assessment. We have engaged with other schools within the district and Oakland County as we learn the routines and practices that make up Visible Thinking. Teachers have eagerly used many routines with their classes and the students have responded with enthusiasm and greater understanding. Low performing students benefit greatly from Visible Thinking routines because the framework readily supports the deeper thinking of the students.

With our school improvement goals in mind, collaborative professional development has focused on disciplinary content, instructional strategies for differentiation, and improved assessment practices in order to meet the needs of all students. Wattles staff members share their expertise and learn from one another. All stakeholders analyze data on high impact instructional strategies and on individual students. We determine an individual student's strengths and weaknesses and match interventions that will increase their learning. This has resulted in steady gains in student achievement.

7.   School Leadership

We recognize the unique skills and talents of each individual member of the Wattles School community. By promoting shared leadership in our building, we are able to fully benefit from the different strengths of our staff, parents, and students. Encouraging and equipping members of our school community to serve in leadership positions in which they are best qualified contributes to improving the effectiveness of our programs and ultimately student achievement.

The Wattles Learning Community (WLC) Steering Committee directs the work of our school improvement process. Teacher leaders chair the steering committee. Other members of the committee include the principal, additional staff members, and parents. The steering committee plans for professional development, facilitates the development and implementation of the school improvement plan, and directs the activity of other initiatives decided upon by the school community. Teacher leaders chair each of our building goal committees making certain the goals' strategies and activities are implemented and the data supporting progress toward the goal is documented.

Our principal's open door policy with parents, staff, and students welcomes questions, comments, and concerns as a way to ensure each student's needs are met. The principal and numerous staff members represent our school on district-wide committees writing curriculum, revising report cards, creating common assessments, and performing many other responsibilities. Teacher leaders also serve as the head of both visiting and presenting teams involved with our district internal review process.

Wattles School is fortunate to have teachers leading and serving on numerous committees directing the work of important initiatives in our building. Our PBIS committee, led by a teacher, promotes responsible behavior, provides positive incentives, and celebrates our successes. Our "Cat Pack school-families", also led by a teacher, build community, foster relationships of students with students and adults with students, and provide anti-bullying and positive character education lessons. One of our Title I Tutors leads our "We Care Club" that works to meet the social and emotional needs of students while planning service projects for our school. Our reading specialist coordinates the work of our Title I Tutors in identifying students, creating schedules, furnishing training, providing materials, and collecting data.

Parents of Wattles' students lead in may different capacities. Some serve on our WLC steering committee and many work as PTO officers or chair numerous PTO committees. Students help make decisions regarding classroom rules. Student leadership is exhibited through Student Council, Service Squad, and Safety Patrol.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher:

Test: Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP)

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	84	99	100	99
% Advanced	22	16	89	89	78
Number of students tested	68	76	71	74	68
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	40	69	100	100	100
% Advanced	13	6	62	93	73
Number of students tested	15	16	13	14	11
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		93	92	100	94
% Advanced		13	77	77	75
Number of students tested		15	13	22	16
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	100	100	100	100
% Advanced	13	33	100	96	81
Number of students tested	31	27	17	25	16

7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	77	100	100	98
% Advanced	13	8	93	90	88
Number of students tested	31	39	43	39	41
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Please note new cut scores to advanced and proficient were determined in the Fall of 2011. Please note under Subgroup Scores/English Language Learners/2012-2013, the number of students was fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher:

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	81	100	100	93
% Advanced	46	25	87	76	81
Number of students tested	78	75	71	72	70
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	36	100	100	
% Advanced	32	7	67	62	
Number of students tested	19	14	12	21	
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		64	100	100	
% Advanced		14	77	72	
Number of students tested		14	13	18	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	84	100	100	100
% Advanced	79	26	95	88	96
Number of students tested	28	19	19	16	24
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	84	100	100	88
% Advanced	33	24	88	78	72
Number of students tested	40	45	41	45	43
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Please note new cut scores to advanced and proficient were determined in the Fall of 2011. Please note under Subgroup Scores/English Language Learners/2012-2013, the number of students was fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher:

Test: Michigan Education Assessment Program
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	91	94	96	100
% Advanced	31	36	76	80	92
Number of students tested	77	69	72	71	65
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	99
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63		84	90	100
% Advanced	0		63	60	100
Number of students tested	16		19	10	10
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		69	82	100	
% Advanced		13	64	62	
Number of students tested		16	11	13	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	95	94	100	100
% Advanced	50	60	89	96	94
Number of students tested	20	20	18	23	18
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	92	98	93	100
% Advanced	26	32	76	74	91
Number of students tested	46	38	41	42	43
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Please note new cut scores to advanced and proficient were determined in the Fall of 2011.
Please note under Subgroup Scores/Free and Reduced Price Meals/2011-2012, the number of students was fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.
Please note under Subgroup Scores/English Language Learners/2012-2013 and 2008-2009, the number of students were fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.
Please note under Subgroup Scores/English Language Learners/2012-2013, the number of students were fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher:

Test: Michigan Education Assessment
Program (MEAP)
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	81	96	97	89
% Advanced	27	12	65	59	58
Number of students tested	67	74	71	73	66
Percent of total students tested	99	97	100	99	97
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	2	0	1	2
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	2	0	1	2
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	67	85	86	82
% Advanced	7	7	38	43	55
Number of students tested	14	15	13	14	11
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		80	92	91	87
% Advanced		7	23	27	60
Number of students tested		15	13	22	15
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	96	100	100	87
% Advanced	38	19	71	72	60
Number of students tested	29	27	17	25	15
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	78	98	97	95
% Advanced	23	8	67	58	63
Number of students tested	30	37	43	38	40
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Please note new cut scores to advanced and proficient were determined in the Fall of 2011. Please note under Subgroup Scores/English Language Learners/2012-2013, the number of students was fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA   **Test:** Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 4   **Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

Publisher:

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	77	75		69
% Advanced	31	20	35		0
Number of students tested	75	70	71		67
Percent of total students tested	96	93	100		96
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	3	5	0		3
% of students tested with alternative assessment	4	6	0		3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	55	42		
% Advanced	17	0	17		
Number of students tested	18	11	12		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		92	38		
% Advanced		8	15		
Number of students tested		12	13		
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	83	74		74
% Advanced	54	33	53		0
Number of students tested	28	18	19		23
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	74	80		63
% Advanced	18	14	29		0
Number of students tested	38	43	41		41
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: These scores represent Writing scores with ELA.

Please note new cut scores to advanced and proficient were determined in the Fall of 2011.

Please note there was no Writing MEAP Test administered to fourth grade in 2009-2010; therefore, no scores are reported.

Please note School Scores % of students tested with alternative assessment in 2008-2009, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013, number represents students who have an Individualized Education Plan which determined alternative assessment would be more appropriate.

Please note under Subgroup Scores/Free and Reduced Price Meals/2008-2009, the number of students were fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.

Please note under Subgroup Scores/English Language Learners/2012-2013 and 2008-2009, the number of students were fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Publisher:

Test: Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP)

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	94	93	89	91
% Advanced	13	16	52	46	55
Number of students tested	75	70	71	70	67
Percent of total students tested	96	93	0	93	96
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	3	5	0	5	3
% of students tested with alternative assessment	4	6	0	6	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	82	75	85	
% Advanced	0	0	33	45	
Number of students tested	18	11	12	20	
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		92	92	82	
% Advanced		8	0	18	
Number of students tested		12	13	17	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	89	100	88	100
% Advanced	11	22	63	38	70
Number of students tested	28	18	19	16	23
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	100	90	88	85
% Advanced	16	14	59	51	49
Number of students tested	38	43	41	43	41
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: These scores represent the Reading section of ELA.

Please note new cut scores to advanced and proficient were determined in the Fall of 2011.

Please note under School Scores/% of students tested with alternative assessment in 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013, number represents students who have an Individualized Education Plan which determined alternative assessment would be more appropriate.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher:

Test: Michigan Education Association Program
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	88	97	94	97
% Advanced	33	32	65	63	77
Number of students tested	73	65	72	70	66
Percent of total students tested	95	94	100	99	98
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	4	0	1	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	5	6	0	1	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79		89		100
% Advanced	14		53		90
Number of students tested	14		19		10
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		64	91	92	
% Advanced		7	36	42	
Number of students tested		14	11	12	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	90	100	100	100
% Advanced	40	45	67	87	94
Number of students tested	20	20	18	23	18
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	86	98	90	95
% Advanced	34	33	66	51	73
Number of students tested	44	36	41	41	44
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: This section represents Reading scores from ELA.

Please note new cut scores to advanced and proficient were determined in the Fall of 2011.

Please note School Scores/% of students tested with alternative assessment in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, number represents students who have an Individualized Education Plan which determined alternative assessment would be more appropriate.

Please note under Subgroup Scores/Free and Reduced Price Meals/2011-2012 and 2009-2010, the number of students was fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.

Please note under Subgroup Scores/English Language Learners/2012-2013 and 2008-2009, the number of students were fewer than 10, so there is no subgroup which is why the cell is blank.