

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

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Ms. Mary Cooper

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

Official School Name Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 3800 Waldenwood Dr

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Ann Arbor State MI Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 48105-3007

County Washtenaw County State School Code Number* 81010

Telephone 734-994-1940 Fax 734-997-1258

Web site/URL http://www.a2schools.org/king/home/home E-mail morhous@aaps.k12.mi.us

Facebook Page

https://www.facebook.com/pages/King-

Twitter Handle School-PTO/253562963502 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. Jeanice Swift E-mail: swift@aaps.k12.mi.us

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Ann Arbor Public Schools Tel. 734-994-2232

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 Mrs. Deb Mexicotte

(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 (per district designation):
- 21 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 5 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 6 High schools
 - 1 K-12 schools
- 33 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
 - Suburban
 - Small city or town in a rural area
 - Rural
3. 3 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	32	74
1	39	40	79
2	38	35	73
3	42	40	82
4	36	31	67
5	35	35	70
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	232	213	445

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 47 % Asian
 - 5 % Black or African American
 - 1 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 38 % White
 - 9 % 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: 8%

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 <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	19
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	17
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	36
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	442
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.081
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	8

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 16 %
70 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 36
 Specify non-English languages: Arabic, Bangla, Bengali, Chinese, Cantonese, Farsi, Filipino, French, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Japanese, Igbo, Israeli, Kazakh, Korean, Malayalam, Mandarin, Marathi, Palestinian, Persian, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala, Sinhalese, Somali, Spanish, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, Vietnamese, Visayan

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 11 %
 Total number students who qualify: 48

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: 5 %
21 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.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1 Autism | 0 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 Deafness | 4 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 0 Specific Learning Disability |
| 0 Emotional Disturbance | 16 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 0 Mental Retardation | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 Multiple Disabilities | 0 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	17
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	5
Paraprofessionals	4
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 26:1

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	95%	97%	97%	95%	98%
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

We are the Martin Luther King Dreamkeepers, keeping the dream alive everyday. We believe that our students are learning and growing, and it is our responsibility to make sure they all become life-long learners and responsible global citizens.

We follow the Lifelong Guidelines and Lifeskills, which provide a common language that helps to guide us in determining appropriate expectations for behavior that supports learning and sets the stage for a safe and learner-friendly environment. Our school and classrooms are lined with reminders of these skills, including the names of our hallways. We teach and reinforce the lifelong guidelines and life skills daily during Responsive Schools' Morning Meetings and during teachable moments. Students have the opportunity to participate in leadership programs including student council, district community builders, and green school initiatives.

We are located near the University of Michigan's North campus. We are a school population of 450 about students, 47 percent of whom are Asian, 38 percent of whom are Caucasian, and 15 percent of whom represent a combination of several other cultural groups. We support economically disadvantaged families that attend our school by identifying both PTO and staff representatives who work with families in a variety of ways to assure an inclusive environment where they are active participants of our school. This partnership has been instrumental in supporting these children and families. We have a large ELL population with over 70 students receiving extra support to learn the English language. Eleven percent of our students this year receive free or reduced meals.

We have many traditions that celebrate what we value. International Night serves as an expression of our collective stories. Although perhaps the most loved event that showcases our diverse community, it is not the only tradition that highlights where we are from and what we value as global citizens. Our tradition of respect for our namesake, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. – and his philosophy that all people matter, all people are celebrated – permeates our daily lives and MLK Day celebrations are a highly anticipated yearly event for our students. Many of our families are scientists and engineers, and they support our PTO efforts to engage all of our students in after school programs such as Science Olympiad, Academic Games, and Math Olympiad. The culminating event of fifth grade is a trip to Huntsville, Alabama for a week of Space Camp. Through generous donations, all children attend regardless of ability to pay. The rule has been since the beginning, "We all attend or no one attends." This is our 17th year of attending.

Parent education is an important part of educating the whole child. Yearly, our School Improvement Team offers families opportunities to learn more about our curriculum through after school events such as Math and Literacy Family Nights, Assessment Workshops, Master Gardeners, Curriculum Nights, and Parent/Teacher Conferences.

We have worked diligently to be a high achieving school for all of our students. Our School Improvement Team (SIT) works with the staff to identify academic areas that need attention and support. We also work to differentiate our curriculum to meet the ongoing and changing needs of our students. We value academic growth for every student. To this end, we make use of data that is available from the district research department. We systematically gather, analyze, and use academic data from formative to summative, and from local, state, and national assessments. We desegregate data by subgroups. We then identify focus areas to concentrate our collective efforts to find effective ways to teach every child. This focus becomes our School Improvement Plan, and from there we concentrate all other academic efforts. We participate in Data Teams and meet weekly to analyze grade level needs to teach, reteach, and reinforce these school-wide goals. As we examine student growth every four to eight weeks, we look closely at who is achieving because of our identified focused efforts and who is not. We then set personalized learning plans for students who struggle despite our focused efforts. These plans are documented in our Achievement Team database and updated at least every six weeks.

This year, we saw evidence that we were making a significant difference through our Michigan Educational

Assessment Program (MEAP) math scores across three different grade levels. We have also seen a closing of the achievement gap between our highest and lowest performing students without neglecting the needs of our high performing students. More students are performing at higher rates in reading, writing, and math. It is this effort that makes Martin Luther King School worthy of National Blue Ribbon status.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) Our school makes use of two standardized assessments to help us make sure that our local assessment and curriculum are aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).

The state standardized assessment is the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and is given to all 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders in October. MEAP establishes four levels of proficiency: Not Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced. The state considers Proficient as acceptable performance. Our school standards are higher. We want all of our children growing and learning every year, so a score of Proficient may be our first challenge, but it is not our last. Once students reach Proficient, we want them to meet the state standards for Advanced. Although the state expects that all subgroups of more than 10% will score as well as the total school average, we examine all subgroups no matter how small and expect all subgroups to perform as well as the school average.

We also participate in the Northwest Evaluation Association's (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment in the areas of mathematics and reading. This adaptive, computerized assessment is given three times per year for students in grades K-5. We use this assessment to assure that children are learning throughout the school year. Our expectation is that our students exceed the MAP standards for their grade level and show increased growth with each assessment no matter where they initially scored.

b) Most of our students performed well, but we want all to do well. An average of the past five years of 3rd-5th grade MEAP scores show more than 92% of students are proficient or higher in reading, 88% in math, 89% in writing, and 56% in science. While we continue to work to improve our students' science achievement, this percentage is significantly higher than the state average of 13%. From year to year, scores are rather steady, usually varying less than five percent. From here, we asked ourselves, "What can we do to increase these scores by more than five percent?"

Our challenge has been to close the achievement gap between our highest and lowest performing students without compromising the achievement of our highest performing students. Although four years ago the state awarded us with Beating the Odds school status, three years ago, we were considered a Focus School. The subgroup most represented in our bottom 30% were English Language Learners, but other subgroups fell into that category as well. Last year, we became a Rewards School because of our work to close our gap. There are still subgroups, however, where there is more than a 10% gap. Because of our recent growth in math, we are confident that we should stay the course and will continue to use data-driven decision making to reduce this gap.

Over the past five years, our staff attended district-sponsored and building-based professional development each year. We participated in professional development in the following areas: equity, Responsive Classrooms, PBIS, morning meetings, data teams, achievement teams, differentiating instruction, mathematical discourse, gender, technology, computation strategies, writing, reading, classroom management of math groups, guided reading, conferring with students during reading and writing conferences, mini lessons, science, social studies, humanities, Common Core, using assessment to inform instruction, NWEA-MAP resources, etc.

Three years ago, our SIT developed three goals. First, we committed to increasing reading proficiency by at least a year and a half for all students not meeting expectations. Second, we agreed to make sure all of our students were scoring proficient in the algebraic strands of math. Lastly, we broadened our efforts to integrate science and literacy to deepen students' understanding of concepts. We dedicated time for collaboration in grade level teams. We created personalized learning plans and smart goals through the achievement team process. All personalized learning occurs in the classroom under the guiding hand of the classroom teacher. Our commitment in designing and implementing personalized learning plans and smart goals around the SIT goals explains the growth for our lowest performing students.

This year, our MEAP math scores in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade showed significant improvement over the previous year: Third graders improved just over five percent; fourth graders improved 11.5 percent; and fifth graders improved seven percent. We believe this growth was a result of our work in grade data teams, which gave us a structured way to collaborate on effective ways to differentiate our math curriculum to make sure all students became fact fluent. As a result, our students overall math proficiency improved and we made great strides toward meeting our SIP goal of all students being proficient in the algebraic strands of math.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Three times every year, our district provides us with both formative and summative data on every student. Our report letters are outcome-based, and teachers use a consistent rubric and/or assessment tool to determine whether or not students are secure. Student progress on outcomes is reported to parents in report letters three times each year and provides us with consistent grade level formative assessment data.

In addition to MEAP, the NWEA-MAP assessment provides us with more timely standardized assessments for grades 3-5, and a standardized assessment for grades K-2. Teachers use the data from MAP to help them personalize instruction for groups and individuals. We spend time with the rubric that MAP provides to determine which outcomes our students know and which ones to focus on. We use the NWEA reports to flexibly group students for differentiated instruction. We adjust instruction based upon students' zone of proximal development.

We use SRI for 2nd-5th grade, NWEA-MAP's Lexile score, Scholastic's FASTT Math scores, Raz-Kids, Xtramath, and Big Brainz to inform instruction. All data that is tracked by the district gets collated and sent to us as a student profile report and as a spreadsheet. We also make use of other ongoing assessment information. These assessments include running records, notes taken during reading and writing conferences, Everyday Mathematics assessments, daily math work, and class discussions. All of this data becomes an important part of how we get to know and understand our students' strengths and weaknesses. This gives us a big picture of growth for each child and this data becomes part of every child's record. This record is easily accessed any time in the Achievement Team database and is sent home to families and discussed at parent/teacher conferences.

We also encourage students to set personal smart goals based on their review of formative assessments in reading, writing and math. We are taking steps to increase students' sense of agency by developing their metacognitive strategies in all subjects.

As a SIT, we sort the data in the spreadsheet format in various ways to try to better understand where our students excel and where they stumble. We color code various scores to get a better picture of whether or not students struggle across all assessments or whether some assessments are more problematic. Then we ask ourselves if this assessment profile is consistent with what we see daily in the classroom. If we determine that our curriculum is weak in this area, we adjust instruction for all students as well as individual students to accelerate achievement.

At King, we use all of this data to create personalized learning plans and adjust curriculum and instruction through Data Teams and the Achievement Team process.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

We are a school with many teacher leaders who are curriculum and instructional specialists. Over 88% of classroom teachers serve as mentor teachers for student interns from the University of Michigan. As such, these teachers teach and present to groups of interns on all aspects of teaching and curriculum. One of these teachers co-taught a University of Michigan Elementary Masters Certification course and another presented on the topic of technology integration.

Teachers who are members of our School Improvement Team make presentations to parents every year. In the past five years, we have presented on the topics including literacy (how to support writing at home),

math (using fact fluency strategies and games to support math at home), assessment (how teachers use assessment to inform instruction), and CCSS (what standards look like for students in the classroom).

Teachers serve as District Curriculum Instructional Specialists, and have presented at district sponsored professional development. Topics included mathematical discourse, CCSS, writing rubrics, math groups, reading in content area, and technology integration. In addition units on African American and Arab culture were created and shared.

One of our teachers presented Family Literacy Workshops through the Eastern Michigan Writing Project in other schools in the greater Ann Arbor area, as well as at EMU during their summer literacy workshops. Another teacher regularly delivers presentations on environmental education topics of Green Schools and our learning garden initiative to the district, state, and other professional associations. At The National Literacy Research Association Conference and at the Michigan Council of English Teachers, a teacher presented on the topic of literacy instruction. A teacher is a member of the Dynamic Learning Map in collaboration with the University of Kansas and analyzes bias and sensitivity content on assessment.

Our principal has presented to the district's administrative groups of Elementary Council and Instructional Council, and to the Board of Education on the topics of teacher evaluation, strategic planning, data driven decision making, and designing master schedules that provide common planning time for teachers during the school day to facilitate collaborative planning for school improvement, differentiation, and improving student achievement.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

The fabric of our community is our strength, carefully woven together with a primary goal of supporting our students. Our parent community weaves together a tapestry of STEAM opportunities with many organizations to bring enriching opportunities to our students. Our students benefit from parent-led programs tied to the University of Michigan School of Engineering including: A World In Motion (funded through General Motors) and the Wind Tunnel field trips. Parents and staff organize an annual Disability Awareness Day with the Ann Arbor Center for Independent Living. More than 30% of our students participate in after-school enrichment events that are parent-led including Academic Games and Math Olympiad. Last year, we had 135 second-fifth grade students and 44 parent and older sibling coaches leading our students in Science Olympiad.

Our International Night celebrates the cultural diversity of our neighborhood. More than 50% of our students share and demonstrate their heritage through dance, song, costumes, activities and displays. Parent volunteers spend months preparing for this galvanizing event.

Parents are committed partners in all that we do. They are welcomed, encouraged, and included. Curriculum Night brings new classes together to meet teachers and learn about curriculum, procedures, and policies. The principal presents the School Improvement Plan and Year End Report. National African American Parent Involvement Day (NAAPID) is another day families are invited to visit and learn. Parents seek out opportunities to share their time and talents with us. Several parents sit on our School Improvement Team and others chair another 34 PTO committees. We have many bilingual families that volunteer to translate at events. We communicate through websites and newsletters and goal set with parents during parent/teacher conferences.

We reach out to the families who live in affordable housing by opening our facility to them in the evening, assisting with their after school program at their facility, and collaborating with their director. We value an all-inclusive philosophy and our PTO financially supports our commitment by making sure everyone is able to participate in field trips, school pictures, t-shirts, book fairs, or any opportunity that has a cost associated with it.

Four years ago, the staff engaged in a gender study. As a result, teachers implemented new strategies to help boys better engage in learning and our PTO supported these efforts by purchasing a variety of tools, including stand-up desks for every classroom. Every year, they provide us with materials that support our efforts to differentiate instruction.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

King School offers exceptional academics and extra-curricular opportunities in diverse and supportive learning environments. Differentiated learning at all levels offers students the ability to be successful in the classroom.

The Everyday Math program is a proven curriculum that emphasizes the application of mathematics to real world situations. Our students work in flexible groups and engage in mathematical discourse as they learn to think deeply about math concepts. Our instructional strategies support student learning across ability levels. Students participate in extension activities such as Exemplars. These activities are project-based and develop students' abilities to use analytical and logical reasoning strategies. We also provide regular practice for increased proficiency with online math using BigBrainz, E-Suites, XtraMath, SumDog, Fastt Math, and support programming for all students.

Our literacy curriculum addresses district standards that include word study, reading, writing, speaking, listening, and representing. In addition to direct instruction, our students utilize technology during our literacy block. The use of technology allows for differentiation in multiple capacities to support student achievement, e.g., SYSTEM 44, Read 180 and RazKidz. Students develop the skills to read and write across multiple genres. Students design and publish projects for varying audiences. Students are engaged in developing common core skills that increase their proficiency in reading and writing.

Our interactive, multi-media social studies program is grounded in three educational theories: that students learn in many ways; that learning occurs in tolerant, collaborative classroom environments; and that lessons must incorporate what students already know and build to more complex understandings. Each level of social studies is centered upon developing strategies supporting content and diversity in text and materials. Students are able to review and complete assignments with staff support online from school and home. Mastery of Common Core Standards is built with dynamic interactive lessons that always involve connecting social studies concepts, past and present, to students' lives.

Our inquiry-based science program engages students in hands-on science and the process skills used by scientists. The units are aligned from grade-to-grade, with a life science, earth science, and physical science module at each grade level. Our staff has received extensive training in instruction and design of our science program. Students work as scientists to design and perform experiments that teach scientific concepts and strategies. Students learn and use activities that teach the importance of recycling, conservation, and the effects of pollution. Students are able to visit sites that are pertinent and support student learning in the areas of scientific study. Our students are engaged in hands-on scientific applications and testing. Real-life applications of skills are extended through our learning garden. Students are required to apply their skills in reading, writing, and mathematics throughout the program as they inquire, observe, measure, record and interpret data, draw conclusions, and make connections to what they already know.

Students participate weekly in visual art, vocal music, information, literacy and technology (ILT), physical education, and humanities classes that support learning by tapping into the unique strengths and learning style of our students. Through cooperative and constructive participation, visual art develops active learners through diverse creative challenges, in-depth experiences, and opportunities for discovering talents and developing transferable life skills. Vocal music provides a variety of experiences that conceptually and sequentially build independent and active participants that are sensitive creators and intelligent consumers. Weekly ILT classes engage students in integrated project based learning. Physical education provides health-related fitness and physical learning experiences that improve mental alertness and build a positive attitude about healthy active lifestyles. Lastly, our humanities program provides a curriculum in which our special area instructors (physical education, visual arts, and vocal music) teach and reinforce science and social studies Common Core Standards through the lens of their area of expertise.

Another feature of our curriculum is the world language program, available to all third and fourth graders through a collaborative partnership with the University of Michigan. Student interns majoring in Spanish provide Spanish language instruction in the classroom for all students. In turn, our classroom teachers remain in the room and provide interns with classroom management strategies to enhance their teaching. At the fifth grade level, Spanish continues to be taught utilizing a certified instructor.

2. Reading/English:

The K-5 Literacy Framework is based on the work of Marie Clay, Irene Fountas, and Gae Su Pinnell. Readers learn to integrate visual information on the page with their understanding of how the English language sounds, along with prior knowledge.

In grades K-2, students are taught to use these three systems through immersion in four key areas as they learn to read. Interactive read-alouds engage students in learning how to process and comprehend text. Emphasis is on expanding and deepening students' vocabulary knowledge, comprehension strategies, and response to literature. Shared/Modeled Reading focuses on decoding strategies and teaching concepts about print, e.g., one-to-one correspondence, directionality of print, high frequency words, and punctuation. Students learn strategies to bring meaning to the author's text through choral reading and using punctuation to interpret the author's message. During guided reading, students are placed in flexible, small groups to learn specific strategies for interacting with print at their instructional level. The teacher provides guided, scaffolded support to meet the students' ongoing changing learning needs. Independent Reading provides many experiences with authentic text in order to build a reading process. Students have daily experiences reading texts to build fluency, learn a large number of vocabulary words, and gain control of making meaning on the run while decoding words.

In grades 3-5, students engage in a daily Reader's Workshop. The workshop begins with a whole-class mini lesson where students are taught strategies to process and comprehend different genres to notice and anticipate features, structures, and elements used by writers that they then apply during the independent reading session. During this time, the teacher meets with small groups for differentiated instruction. These small group lessons occur at the students' instructional reading level, which enables learning to occur at the student's point of instructional need. Students also write weekly reading response letters, which they exchange with their teacher to create a personal dialogue about text to further deepen comprehension.

3. Mathematics:

We utilize Everyday Mathematics to provide students with the mathematical instruction and experiences that support the Common Core Mathematical Standards and Practices.

Conceptual understanding is developed through a carefully sequenced series of lessons that involve students in concrete and abstract activities. Teachers connect concepts to real world examples providing a purpose for learning. Mastery of skills is achieved through ongoing practice over time. Teachers differentiate instruction to support students requiring additional time to develop mastery of these concepts and to challenge students who have already mastered grade level targets. Teachers provide specific instruction based on student skills and create learning opportunities through flexible grouping, reteaching, and enrichment activities during each lesson. Through ongoing formative assessments, teachers know which skills are mastered by individual students and adjust the instruction for these guided groups. Instruction for high performing students seeks first to deepen their understanding and then to broaden their knowledge of the concept. Instruction for under-performing students seeks first to reach students at their zone of proximal development, fill gaps in understanding, and then to cement key concepts that are the foundation for other concepts.

We want our students to be fact fluent so that they can focus their energy on algebraic thinking. Teachers use a systematic approach to increase fact knowledge so students are always improving their fact fluency. Students have access to instructional support and software programs that help develop fact fluency. Blended learning opportunities include Fastt Math, Xtramath, Big Brains, curriculum games and support, etc.

Common Core Mathematical Practices are enhanced through mathematical discourse. Teachers help students explain their mathematical thinking and encourage student understanding of peer strategies. As students engage in dialogue, they develop the skills to present their ideas in a precise manner. In addition to our regular math program, we use Exemplars, a problem solving program which challenges students to use a variety of mathematical strategies. Exemplars require multiple steps to solve problems and clear explanations to convey mathematical thinking.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Our unique humanities program extends curriculum integration by incorporating our special area instructors (physical education, visual arts, and vocal music) by capitalizing on their specialized skill set. The humanities experience thoughtfully and explicitly integrates common core standards from social studies and science specifically with one or more of the special areas. Each grade level receives humanities instruction in one area. The physical education instructor teaches and enriches physical science lessons on motion and geography lessons on directionality. She also teaches aspects of the grade level health curriculum regarding fitness and nutrition. The vocal music instructor teaches a physical science lesson on sound. The visual arts teacher builds scientific concepts and process skills through science writing and the drawing of diagrams. Students maintain art/science journals. While media, information, literacy, and technology is not a part of the humanities program, instructors use technology to reinforce and enrich curriculum-based research skills to answer a "big inquiry based question" having to do with social studies or science. These are natural and authentic connections within and among our elementary disciplines.

Educators have long recognized that students have different learning styles and background knowledge. With a culturally relevant lens, teachers work to weave the 4 R's into their lessons: realness, rigor, relevance and relationships. Interdisciplinary instruction provides students multiple opportunities to achieve outcomes in different ways, in different disciplines, and with different teachers. Increasing the relevancy through embedded or applied learning increases student understanding and rigor. When the MEAP test items are released, each one is correlated with a specific grade level content expectation. We examine assessment data and compare it with building performance and individual student performance. If, for instance, students or a grade level did not do well on a specific outcome, we increase "interdisciplinary" teaching opportunities in order to better teach or reinforce that concept. Interdisciplinary teaching gives students repeated opportunities to learn a concept or proficiency in different ways with increased relevancy.

5. Instructional Methods:

Dynamic lessons build mastery of the CCSS. Teachers make learning accessible to all students using a variety of learning structures, strategies and methods of teaching. Teachers help students access prior/background knowledge enabling students to make connections to new learning. Teachers regularly model new concepts and strategies before engaging students in guided practice opportunities, monitoring and adjusting the amount of support students need to achieve the learning outcomes. Independent practice is used as an assessment opportunity, informing teachers of subsequent lessons. The cycle of teaching and formative assessment is one way teachers assure student learning.

Learning structures vary depending on the subject matter and the students' learning needs. Our social studies program is based upon Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences where students access the learning in a variety of ways. Teachers often work with students in flexible, fluid small groups or on an individual basis. Thus, differentiating the curriculum to meet the ongoing and changing learning needs of students. Teachers value the diversity of the student body. Our commitment to ongoing equity work and courageous conversations has led us to cultivate an atmosphere that recognizes and celebrates everyone's cultures. Teachers design lessons where the students see themselves in the learning.

Students process and deepen their understanding of concepts through emphasis on vocabulary development in the content areas. Students are nudged to use the language of math, social studies, and science. Teachers use discussion moves to engage all students in developing their thinking skills. Comprehensive graphic

organizers are used to record key ideas to further help students create meaning from what they read. Graphic organizers help students to see the underlying logic and interconnections among concepts by improving their comprehension and retention in the subject area. Literature connections and informational writing are also used as a way to reinforce and enrich concepts.

In the upper grades, technology is used as a way for students to collaborate and share their learning. Students are provided opportunities to have peer discussions about content through online learning communities, such as Edmodo. Students utilize multiple Web 2.0 tools to create products that demonstrate their learning in science, math, and literacy. Students also keep blogs as a tool to communicate learning to a wider audience.

Our program provides a strong educational base for all students emphasizing achievement, success, and diversity of education.

6. Professional Development:

Our school improvement plan focuses all stakeholders on student growth and achievement levels. We use data-driven action research in a structured collaborative manner to inform and focus our instruction. We regularly collect, desegregate and analyze data and seek professional development opportunities that focus on the instructional practices to address the identified learning outcomes of students.

Five years ago, we began developing personalized learning plans for under-performing students. Throughout this process, teachers, teacher teams and parents meet and identify interventions that can be implemented to propel learning. Plans are documented in an Achievement Team database allowing teachers across grade levels to access the data. Teachers document growth or lack of as a result these interventions. Teacher teams work effectively, efficiently and persistently to gauge their efforts against results. Through this process we learned the importance of teacher collaboration around “high leverage practices” that serve as effective interventions for students who find areas of school life problematic.

We remain diligent in creating time for teachers to collaborate. We adjust our special schedule to create common planning time and devote much of our staff meeting time for collaborative efforts.

After attending a Data Driven Decision Making workshop with Dr. Kris Nielson, the SIT presented a plan to staff to introduce the power of working in Data Teams. In our first year we selected a content area that was straightforward allowing us to focus on the process before we tackled more complex outcomes. We knew our math data indicated students who mastered expected grade level fact fluency did better on all algebraic outcomes than those who did not. We wondered, ‘Would more children master algebraic outcomes if they had effective fact fluency?’ Using this as our premise for action research, we set out to determine how to get all of our students fact fluent. We met as grade level data teams to chart and examine student assessments every eight weeks. As we analyzed our data, we adjusted our teaching to achieve the short-term goals we set and reassessed. We discovered we were making a difference for many more students. We then wrote personalized learning plans for the few that continued to struggle. This year, we are using the data team process to address more of our SIT goals.

Our success is due to our inter-dependency between our collaboration and our SIT goals.

7. School Leadership

Our school celebrates, recognizes and reinforces significant, sustained improvement where all stakeholders are united in our efforts. Our goal-oriented culture cultivates leaders to influence the school community to sustain ongoing student achievement.

Through the school improvement process, a team comprised of parents, community members, staff, and the principal leads the staff and community in identifying areas of focus in order to increase student achievement. Our team meets regularly to examine data, set achievement goals, and plan staff/parent education.

Our Building Advisory Team meets monthly to identify issues and to problem solve situations that might inadvertently be getting in the way of student achievement and teachers' capacity to improve achievement.

Our PTO actively supports our achievement efforts through after school enrichment opportunities and through generous contributions for materials and enrichment opportunities that support the curriculum.

Our Curriculum and Instructional Specialists serve as liaisons to the district curriculum director. They lead professional development, organize material acquisitions, mentor fellow teachers, etc.

Student leaders, along with our Community Builders advisor, attend district leadership programs to learn and design school-wide projects that promote a positive school climate with members of the student council. Projects include increasing the diversity of texts, student engagement, and improved recess interactions.

Student Council advisors lead two student leadership groups, a Green Team and a Community Service Team. The Green Team educates students about environmental issues and plans project based learning events. The team also leads our daily all-school commitment to compost and recycle in the classroom and lunchroom.

Students have the opportunity to work as leaders in the student council to identify problems in their local and world community. They work together to problem-solve and then coordinate efforts of the school community to make a positive impact on the lives of others, including:

- a food and clothing drive for Food Gatherers and the Detroit Partnership,
- honoring veterans through coordinated efforts with the Red Cross,
- supporting schools in the Philippines.

King School is celebrated as a learning school for novice teachers from the University of Michigan and Eastern Michigan University. Our teachers currently mentor 15 interns.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Publisher: State of Michigan

Test: 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	80	82	84	100
% Advanced	20	20	20	41	97
Number of students tested	69	66	66	73	80
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	1	0	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	33	25	67	100
% Advanced	11	0	0	0	100
Number of students tested	9	3	4	5	6
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	50	100	100	100
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students tested	4	6	2	2	5
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	88	83	96	97	100
% Advanced	25	25	42	54	100
Number of students tested	32	24	24	28	28
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	79	73	77	100
% Advanced	21	14	10	33	100
Number of students tested	19	28	30	32	34
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: In the 2011-12 school year, the state changed the cut scores for each level of proficiency, requiring more questions to be answered correctly to qualify as Proficient or Advanced. The state has provided us with revised scores that reflect the new cut scores for 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. They did not provide this for the 2008-09 school year. In order to give you five years of consistent cut scores, we have provided the 2013-14 school year below.

MEAP Math Grade 3 Oct 2013-14

All:

93% Proficient + Advanced

48% Advanced

81 students tested;

Asian:

95% Proficient + Advanced

58% Advanced

43 Students tested;

Caucasian:

93% Proficient + Advanced

41% Advanced

29 Students tested;

Free & Reduced:

60% Proficient + Advanced

20% Advanced

10 Students tested;

LEP:

83% Proficient + Advanced

33% Advanced

6 Students tested.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: State of Michigan

Test: 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	80	87	86	92	97
% Advanced	51	42	37	61	92
Number of students tested	74	69	79	79	79
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	0	40	40	75
% Advanced	50	0	20	0	72
Number of students tested	6	1	5	5	8
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	43	100	33	100	100
% Advanced	29	0	0	0	100
Number of students tested	7	2	3	1	9
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	80	92	91	96	100
% Advanced	60	48	55	73	97
Number of students tested	30	25	33	28	30
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	79	85	88	97	100
% Advanced	38	36	19	56	100
Number of students tested	29	33	32	35	32
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: In the 2011-12 school, year the state changed the cut scores for each level of proficiency, requiring more questions to be answered correctly to qualify as Proficient or Advanced. The state has provided us with revised scores that reflect the new cut scores for 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. They did not provide this for the 2008-09 school year. In order to give you five years of consistent cut scores, we have provided the 2013-14 school year below.

MEAP Math Grade 4 Oct 2013-14

All:

99 % Proficient plus Advanced

57 % Advanced

67 Students tested

Asian:

100% Proficient + Advanced

55% Advanced

29 Students tested;

Caucasian:

95% Proficient + Advanced

54% Advanced

22 Students tested;

Free & Reduced:

100% Proficient + Advanced

40% Advanced

5 Students tested;

LEP:

100% Proficient + Advanced

0% Advanced

4 Students tested;

The following data* shows growth from year to year for the same grade level of students, two years in a row:

*When this year's grade 4 students were in grade 3 (2012-13) there were 69 students, 87% of them were Proficient + Advanced, 20 % Advanced.

*This year [in 4th grade (2013-14)] there are 67 students, 99% are Proficient + Advanced, and 57% Advanced.

We are confident that our work in data teams has significantly contributed to the increase in the number of students that are scoring in the Proficient and Advanced levels.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: State of Michigan

Test: 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	94	87	89	93	100
% Advanced	41	46	46	55	93
Number of students tested	71	85	76	80	76
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	40	57	60	100
% Advanced	0	20	0	30	100
Number of students tested	1	5	7	11	4
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	83	33	100	100
% Advanced	33	17	0	33	100
Number of students tested	3	6	3	3	4
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	97	93	97	100
% Advanced	54	65	54	67	100
Number of students tested	26	34	28	30	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	91	85	91	97	100
% Advanced	39	38	47	56	91
Number of students tested	33	34	34	34	34
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: In the 2011-12 school year, the state changed the cut scores for each level of proficiency, requiring more questions to be answered correctly to qualify as Proficient or Advanced. The state has provided us with revised scores that reflect the new cut scores for 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. They did not provide this for the 2008-09 school year. In order to give you five years of consistent cut scores, we have provided the 2013-14 school year below.

MEAP Math Grade 5 October 2013-14

All:

87% Proficient + Advanced

54% Advanced

70 Students tested;

Asian:

96% Proficient + Advanced

79% Advanced

28 Students tested;

Caucasian:

82% Proficient + Advanced

37% Advanced

27 Students tested;

Free & Reduced:

67% Proficient + Advanced

0% Advanced

6 Students tested;

LEP:

100% Proficient + Advanced

80% Advanced

5 Students tested;

The following data* shows growth from year to year for the same grade level of students, three years in a row:

*When this year's grade 5 students were in grade 3 (2011-12) there were 66 students, 80% of them were Proficient + Advanced, 20 % Advanced.

*When this year's grade 5 students when in grade 4 (2012-13) there were 74 students, 80% were Proficient + Advanced, and 51% Advanced.

*This year's 5th grade group (2013-14) has 70 students, 87% were Proficient + Advanced, and 54% Advanced.

We are confident that our work in data teams has significantly contributed to the increase in the number of students that are scoring in the Proficient and Advanced levels.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: State of Michigan

Test: 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	92	94	84	96	96
% Advanced	36	34	33	21	77
Number of students tested	69	66	66	73	80
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	75	100	0	100	66
% Advanced	38	67	0	33	33
Number of students tested	9	3	4	5	6
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	50	0	50	100
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students tested	4	6	2	2	5
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	91	91	93	100
% Advanced	26	41	41	32	84
Number of students tested	32	24	24	28	28
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	95	93	83	97	97
% Advanced	47	21	30	10	76
Number of students tested	19	28	30	32	34
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: In the 2011-12 school, year the state changed the cut scores for each level of proficiency, requiring more questions to be answered correctly to qualify as Proficient or Advanced. The state has provided us with revised scores that reflect the new cut scores for 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. They did not provide this for the 2008-09 school year. In order to give you five years of consistent cut scores, we have provided the 2013-14 school year below.

MEAP Reading Grade 3 October 2013-14

All:

95% Proficient + Advanced

33% Advanced

81 Students tested;

Asian:

100% Proficient + Advanced

40% Advanced

43 Students tested;

Caucasian:

93% Proficient + Advanced

31% Advanced

29 Students tested;

Free & Reduced:

75% Proficient + Advanced

0% Advanced
10 Students tested;

LEP:
100% Proficient + Advanced
0% Advanced
6 Students tested.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: State of Michigan

Test: 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	88	90	95	93	94
% Advanced	20	27	20	41	73
Number of students tested	74	69	79	79	79
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	0	50	60	63
% Advanced	25	0	0	0	50
Number of students tested	6	1	5	5	8
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	78
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students tested	7	2	3	1	9
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	84	96	100	96	90
% Advanced	16	25	17	35	60
Number of students tested	30	25	33	28	30
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	85	97	97	100
% Advanced	21	24	22	53	94
Number of students tested	29	33	32	35	32
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100				
% Advanced	44				
Number of students tested	10				
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: In the 2011-12 school year, the state changed the cut scores for each level of proficiency, requiring more questions to be answered correctly to qualify as Proficient or Advanced. The state has provided us with revised scores that reflect the new cut scores for 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. They did not provide this for the 2008-09 school year. In order to give you five years of consistent cut scores, we have provided the 2013-14 school year below.

MEAP Reading Grade 4 October 2013-14

All:

95% Proficient + Advanced

33% Advanced

76 Students tested;

Asian:

92% Proficient + Advanced

25% Advanced

29 Students tested;

Caucasian:

95% Proficient + Advanced

41% Advanced

22 Students tested;

Free & Reduced:

80% Proficient + Advanced

20% Advanced

5 Students tested;

LEP:

67% Proficient + Advanced

33% Advanced

4 Students tested;

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: State of Michigan

Test: 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	93	95	96	92	97
% Advanced	62	44	46	44	80
Number of students tested	71	85	76	80	76
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	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	80	71	73	100
% Advanced	0	20	14	18	67
Number of students tested	1	5	7	11	4
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	100
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students tested	3	6	3	3	4
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	94	100	87	100
% Advanced	61	52	63	43	83
Number of students tested	26	34	28	30	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	94	97	97	100	98
% Advanced	64	39	35	56	77
Number of students tested	33	34	34	34	34
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: In the 2011-12 school year, the state changed the cut scores for each level of proficiency, requiring more questions to be answered correctly to qualify as Proficient or Advanced. The state has provided us with revised scores that reflect the new cut scores for 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. They did not provide this for the 2008-09 school year. In order to give you five years of consistent cut scores, we have provided the 2013-14 school year below.

MEAP Reading Grade 4 October 2013-14

All:

91% Proficient + Advanced

46% Advanced

70 Students tested;

Asian:

89% Proficient + Advanced

56% Advanced

28 Students tested;

Caucasian:

93% Proficient + Advanced

37% Advanced

27 Students tested;

Free & Reduced:

60% Proficient + Advanced

40% Advanced

6 Students tested;

LEP:

50% Proficient + Advanced

25% Advanced

5 Students tested;