

School Annual Education Report

August 9, 2010

Dear Parents and Community Members:

We are pleased to present you with the Annual Education Report (AER), which provides key information on the 2009-10 educational progress for Nottawa Community School. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and state laws. The school's report contains information about student assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact Marcia Griffin, superintendent/principal, for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting our website, www.nottawaschool.org, or you may review a copy from the school office.

For 2009-10, Nottawa Community School made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. While we are pleased to have reached this important goal, we are continuously working to improve. We appreciate the continued support of parents, staff and our community in this effort.

State law requires that we also report additional information for the two most recent years on the following:

PROCESS FOR ASSIGNING PUPILS TO THE SCHOOL

All students who reside in the Nottawa district are welcome to attend Nottawa Community School, as well as those students who elect to come through school of choice.

THE STATUS OF THE 3-5 YEAR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Nottawa Community School's school improvement plan has been revised and updated in 2010. It will be posted on our website, www.nottawaschool.org, or available in printed form at the school office. In preparation for the online posting of the school improvement plan, all content area goals were updated in the spring of 2010. In the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, science and social studies, staff utilized data to set measurable objectives for improvement in all of these areas. In addition, staff identified specific strategies and interventions, as well as action steps for each of these core areas.

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EACH SPECIALIZED SCHOOL

Nottawa Community School is a one-building district, so this does not apply.

IDENTIFY HOW TO ACCESS A COPY OF THE CORE CURRICULUM, A DESCRIPTION OF ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND AN EXPLANATION OF THE VARIANCES FROM THE STATE'S MODEL

Using the Golden Package from MITracker, as well as local assessments, the School Improvement Team analyzes student data to determine areas of strengths and/or concerns. The School Improvement Chairperson also meets with the County Leadership council from St. Joseph ISD monthly as a collaborative countywide effort to determine inservice needs for the year. Nottawa Community School has agreed to align our curriculum review cycle with the St. Joseph ISD to more efficiently utilize resources and funds. The School Improvement Chair then assigns the necessary staff to the appropriate workshop. The School Improvement Team also determines additional inservice needs based on local student data. Evidence to support this is contained in professional development logs, meeting minutes and lesson plans as monitored by the building principal.

Each core academic committee, in conjunction with the School Improvement Committee, completes a systematic analysis of student achievement data, including MEAP and local assessments, and compares the alignment between our curriculum and the Michigan Curriculum Framework.

All students have the same opportunities for curriculum and participation, including Title I services, unless otherwise restricted by health or noted on an IEP. Special Education services are available, and the students participating in that program have goals based on the grade-level benchmarks and content expectations. The Special Education teacher has attended all professional staff inservicing relating to the Michigan Curriculum Framework and Grade Level Content Expectations throughout the school year.

There are no variances from the state curriculum, as Nottawa Community School uses Curriculum Crafter, which is based on the Michigan Curriculum Framework. The Michigan curriculum may be accessed at the state website, <http://michigan.gov/mde>.

THE AGGREGATE STUDENT ACHEIVEMENT RESULTS FOR ANY LOCAL COMPENTENCY TESTS OR NATIONALLY NORMED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

Nottawa Community School has not utilized nationally normed assessments at this time. We have been using standards-based assessments that are based on the Michigan Curriculum Framework and the Grade Level Content Expectations.

Percent of Students Obtaining Mastery (>80%) on Grade Level Standards Assessments

Subject/Year	Math 2009/10	Math 2008/09	ELA 2009/10	ELA 2008/09
Grade K	100%	90%	100%	90%
Grade 1	90%	88%	100%	94%
Grade 2	94%	90%	100%	95%

Since we are a small rural district with 150 students or less, one student can represent anywhere from 6 to 13 percent in a total score. We prefer to look at each individual child and compare growth in that student, as well as the class as a whole, to interpret our methods for intervention, whether it is reviewing skills, teaching strategies or curriculum.

IDENTIFY THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS REPRESENTED BY PARENTS AT PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES

Ninety-seven percent of students were represented at parent-teacher conferences (146 students out of 150).

CONCLUSION

Nottawa Community School is a small rural school district with one grade at each level, kindergarten through 8th grade. Our average class size is around 17 students. Our students participate in countywide activities such as ArtWorks, Geography Bee, Clue-Me-In, Young Authors' Day, Math Meet and Quiz Bowl. In 2009-10, students attended assemblies featuring character values, Steven's Puppets, author Denise Brennan-Nelson, building with Legos and the local fire department. Classrooms also went on several field trips, including: Challenger Space Mission (Kalamazoo Valley Museum), Greenfield Village, Conservation Tour, Nottawa Stone School, Beauty and the Beast (Sturgis High School), Wastewater Treatment Center, Camp Eberhart, Lansing, and many local area businesses.

We strive to give our students a well-rounded education, as many (Amish) do not attend school beyond the 8th grade. Given our population and size, we are pleased that our students place at or near the top in the annual MEAP tests given throughout Michigan.

Sincerely,

Robyn Krawczak
School Improvement Chair
Nottawa Community School

Full Annual Education Report

District-Level Student Assessment Data for St. Joseph County ISD, Nottawa Community School

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Language Arts / Reading								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	100%	86.4%	88.2%	41.2%	47.1%	11.8%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	81.8%	18.2%	63.6%	18.2%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	90.9%	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0%
Female	2009-10	<10	91.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	84.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	87.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	90%	88.2%	41.2%	47.1%	11.8%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	81.8%	18.2%	63.6%	18.2%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	79.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	84.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	85.7%	28.6%	57.1%	7.1%	7.1%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	68.8%	31.3%	37.5%	31.3%	0%
Female	2008-09	<10	84.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	80%	40%	40%	20%	0%
Male	2008-09	<10	80.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	82.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	68.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	88%	85.7%	28.6%	57.1%	7.1%	7.1%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	73.3%	33.3%	40%	26.7%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	54.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	58%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	72.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	75.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	85.7%	19%	66.7%	9.5%	4.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	93.3%	60%	33.3%	6.7%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	100%	18.2%	81.8%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	<10	86.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	70%	20%	50%	20%	10%
Male	2009-10	<10	83.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	90%	20%	70%	5%	5%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	93.3%	60%	33.3%	6.7%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	49.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	70.5%	90.9%	18.2%	72.7%	9.1%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	76.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	100%	80.5%	86.7%	26.7%	60%	6.7%	6.7%
All Students	2009-10	100%	87.7%	89.5%	15.8%	73.7%	10.5%	0%
Female	2008-09	<10	82.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Female	2009-10	100%	90%	100%	18.2%	81.8%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	<10	78.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	85.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.7%	86.7%	26.7%	60%	6.7%	6.7%
White	2009-10	100%	91.1%	88.9%	16.7%	72.2%	11.1%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	44.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	69.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	81.1%	85.7%	7.1%	78.6%	14.3%	0%
Grade: 07								
All Students	2008-09	100%	79.6%	83.3%	33.3%	50%	5.6%	11.1%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	100%	45.5%	54.5%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	82.8%	91.7%	50%	41.7%	8.3%	0%
Female	2009-10	<10	84.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	76.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	79.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	84.7%	83.3%	33.3%	50%	5.6%	11.1%
White	2009-10	100%	87.3%	100%	45.5%	54.5%	0%	0%
Students with	2008-09	<10	42.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Disabilities								
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	48%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	68.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	75.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	100%	83.4%	100%	41.2%	58.8%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	<10	78.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	100%	87.5%	100%	58.3%	41.7%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	<10	72.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	70.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	86.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	80.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	86.9%	100%	43.8%	56.3%	0%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	62.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	94.1%	58.8%	35.3%	5.9%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	100%	27.3%	72.7%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	100%	63.6%	36.4%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	<10	94.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	91.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	94.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	94.1%	58.8%	35.3%	5.9%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	100%	27.3%	72.7%	0%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	85.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	91.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	100%	87.9%	92.9%	71.4%	21.4%	7.1%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	92.3%	100%	43.8%	56.3%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	<10	87.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	100%	92.9%	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Male	2008-09	<10	87.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	91.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	82.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	92%	92.9%	71.4%	21.4%	7.1%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	100%	46.7%	53.3%	0%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	68.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	80.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	87.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	90.5%	47.6%	42.9%	4.8%	4.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	87.5%	31.3%	56.3%	12.5%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	100%	45.5%	54.5%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	<10	79.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	80%	50%	30%	10%	10%
Male	2009-10	<10	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	2008-09	<10	92.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Islander								
White	2008-09	100%	83%	90%	50%	40%	5%	5%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	87.5%	31.3%	56.3%	12.5%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	46.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	64.4%	81.8%	45.5%	36.4%	9.1%	9.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	80%	20%	60%	20%	0%
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	100%	79.9%	86.7%	80%	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	100%	78.9%	21.1%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	<10	80.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	100%	83%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	<10	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.2%	86.7%	80%	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	100%	83.3%	16.7%	0%	0%
Students with	2008-09	<10	45.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Disabilities								
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	69%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.5%	100%	71.4%	28.6%	0%	0%
Grade: 07								
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.6%	100%	77.8%	22.2%	0%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82.2%	91.7%	75%	16.7%	8.3%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.2%	100%	91.7%	8.3%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	<10	82.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	81.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	87.9%	100%	77.8%	22.2%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	87.6%	91.7%	75%	16.7%	8.3%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	45.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	51.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	71.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
All Students	2008-09	<10	74.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	100%	70.3%	88.2%	64.7%	23.5%	11.8%	0%
Female	2008-09	<10	74.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	100%	70.6%	91.7%	58.3%	33.3%	8.3%	0%
Male	2008-09	<10	74.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	70%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	44.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	89.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	80.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	77.1%	93.8%	68.8%	25%	6.3%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	61.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	56.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	100%	83.1%	90.5%	42.9%	47.6%	4.8%	4.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	86.7%	40%	46.7%	13.3%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	100%	36.4%	63.6%	0%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Female	2009-10	<10	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	100%	82.9%	80%	50%	30%	10%	10%
Male	2009-10	<10	80.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	95%	45%	50%	0%	5%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	86.7%	40%	46.7%	13.3%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.3%	90.9%	45.5%	45.5%	0%	9.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	70.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	76.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	100%	75.9%	83.3%	50%	33.3%	16.7%	0%
Female	2008-09	<10	77.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	100%	77%	91.7%	66.7%	25%	8.3%	0%
Male	2008-09	<10	75.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	87.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	83.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	100%	83.1%	88.2%	52.9%	35.3%	11.8%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	42.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	61.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	63.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Michigan Merit Examination (MME)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
No records to display.								

MI-Access

Functional Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts							
Grade: 03							
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	80.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05							
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	81.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics							
Grade: 03							

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science							
Grade: 05							
All Students	2009-10	<10	58%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	51.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	63.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Supported Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
No records to display.							

Participation

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
No records to display.							

MEAP-Access

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Reading							
Grade: 07							
All Students	2009-10	<10	52.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	56.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	55.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08							
All Students	2009-10	<10	58%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	54.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	61.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically	2009-10	<10	57.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Disadvantaged							

2009-10 District-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for St. Joseph County ISD, Nottawa Community School

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	95.4%
Mathematics	100%	97.7%
Black or African American		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	<30	<30
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	95.3%
Mathematics	100%	97.6%
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Limited English Proficient		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	123.6%	86.9%
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
Students with Disabilities		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	102.1%	93.8%
Mathematics	104.2%	95.8%

Note: 467 Recently arrived LEP students took part in the State's ELPA instead of the MEAP/MME/MI-Access.

* [AYP Targets \(Annual Measurable Objectives\)](#)

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
All Students	
State	
	75.39%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	65%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	

Graduation Rate (High Schools only)
(Goal 80%)

State

84.47%

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

White

State

81.85%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

Limited English Proficient

State

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
65.51%	
Students with Disabilities	
State	
57.61%	
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
59.8%	
Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
All Students	
State	
94.7%	
District	
96%	
Black or African American	

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

State

91%

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

93.7%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

96.5%

District

97.7%

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

White

State

95.7%

District

95.9%

Multiracial

State

94.8%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

Students with Disabilities

State

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
93.5%	
District	
94.8%	
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
94.8%	
District	
95.5%	

* All data based on students enrolled for a full academic year.

** More information regarding AYP can be found at the following link:

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_22875---,00.html

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		38%			31%		42%
2002-03		38%			31%		42%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2003-04		38%			31%		42%
2004-05		48%			43%		52%
2005-06	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%
2006-07	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%
2007-08	60%	59%	57%	56%	54%	53%	61%
2008-09	60%	59%	57%	56%	54%	53%	61%
2009-10	70%	69%	68%	67%	66%	65%	71%
2010-11	78%	77%	76%	75%	74%	73%	79%
2011-12	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	82%	86%
2012-13	93%	92%	92%	91%	91%	91%	93%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Mathematics

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		47%				31%	33%
2002-03		47%				31%	33%
2003-04		47%				31%	33%
2004-05		56%				43%	44%
2005-06	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2006-07	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2007-08	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2008-09	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2009-10	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2010-11	75%	74%	71%	70%	67%	66%	67%
2011-12	83%	82%	81%	80%	78%	77%	78%
2012-13	91%	91%	90%	90%	89%	89%	89%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2009-10 District-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for St. Joseph County ISD, Nottawa Community School

District AYP Status

AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	District Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
Met	Met	Met	N/A	0

Schools in District AYP Status

School/Building	Title 1 Status	AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	Education Yes Report Card Grade	School Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
Nottawa Community School	Yes	Met	Met	Met	A	N/A	0

% of Schools making AYP: 100%
 % of Schools in School Improvement status: 0%
 % of Schools in Corrective Action status: 0%
 % of Schools in Restructuring status: 0%

% of Title I Schools making AYP: 100%
 % of Title I Schools in School Improvement status: 0%
 % of Title I Schools in Corrective Action status: 0%
 % of Title I Schools in Restructuring status: 0%

December, 2009 District-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for St. Joseph County ISD, Nottawa Community School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the District	0	7	5	0

Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers

Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the District with Emergency Certification	8.3%		
	District Aggregate	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	0%		

Michigan Report Card for the National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	22	43	30	5
Male	50	22	41	30	7
Female	50	22	45	29	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	36	47	16	1
Not Eligible	56	11	40	40	9
Info not available	†	†	†	†	†
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	14	43	37	6
Black	20	52	39	9	0
Hispanic	5	29	51	19	1
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	13	32	36	19
American Indian	1	†	†	†	†
Unclassified	1	†	†	†	†
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	12	42	39	17	2
Not SD	88	19	44	31	6
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	48	40	11	1
Not ELL	97	21	43	31	5

† Reporting Standards not met. Note: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment Program (NAEP) 2009 Mathematics Achievement.

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	38	50	37	12	1
Not Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	23	40	29	8
Black	18	68	27	4	1
Hispanic	4	38	45	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	11	30	31	28
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	10	75	22	2	1
Not SD	90	27	39	27	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	2	58	32	10	0
Not ELL	98	32	37	24	7

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment Program (NAEP) 2009 Mathematics Achievement.

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	36	34	23	6
Male	50	39	35	21	5
Female	50	32	34	26	8
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	52	33	13	2
Not Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Info not available	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	28	36	28	8
Black	19	65	26	7	1
Hispanic	5	49	34	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	21	37	25	17
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	10	66	24	8	3
Not SD	90	32	36	25	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	65	26	9	1
Not ELL	97	35	35	24	7

Rounds to zero

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	28	41	28	3
Male	51	33	42	23	2
Female	49	23	41	32	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	37	44	41	14	1
Not Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Info not available	†	†	†	†	†
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	21	32	32	3
Black	18	54	37	9	#
Hispanic	4	40	34	24	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	†	†	†	†
American Indian	1	†	†	†	†
Unclassified	1	†	†	†	†
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	9	73	22	4	#
Not SD	91	23	43	30	3
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	2	60	33	8	#
Not ELL	98	27	42	28	3

Rounds to zero

† Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

Grade	Subject	Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities	Standard Error	Participation Rate for IEP Students	Standard Error	Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students	Standard Error
4	Math	82.08	2.771	81.98	2.786	91.89	3.063
	Reading	72.05	2.592	72.01	2.63	81.16	3.53
8	Math	76.39	2.561	76.21	2.578	93.13	4.12
	Reading	70.72	3.239	70.46	3.298	85.15	4.505