

August 12, 2010

Dear Parents and Community Members:

We are pleased to present you with the Annual Education Report (AER) which provides key information on the 2009-2010 educational progress for Belding High 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 John Deiter for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site: <http://www.bas-k12.org/index.php/news/article/highschoolaer/> or you may review a copy from the main office at Belding High School.

For 2009-2010, Belding High 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.

1. PROCESS FOR ASSIGNING PUPILS TO THE SCHOOL

Students come to us by virtue of living within the boundaries of Belding Area Schools. In addition to resident students, we open our enrollment to school-of-choice students. School-of-choice information can be found on our website or in the superintendent's office.

2. THE STATUS OF THE 3-5 YEAR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Our school improvement plan has been developed in accordance to the guidelines established by the State of Michigan and North Central Association (NCA). The SI team has reviewed and analyzed data from several sources to identify needs and write goals that address these needs. We have goals for all four core areas. The plan is reviewed and updated annually.

3. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EACH SPECIALIZED SCHOOL

Belding Area Schools does not offer specialized schools in the sense of separate buildings for students with special needs. We offer many programs within our schools to serve the needs of students. For example, we have a very comprehensive Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) program and a

program for students with cognitive impairments. We also serve several other students with various impairments in the least restrictive classroom environment.

4. 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. Belding High School’s curriculum can be found on the district’s web page or copies are available in the main office. BHS has adopted and follows the state of Michigan curriculum.

5. THE AGGREGATE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS FOR ANY LOCAL COMPETENCY TESTS OR NATIONALLY NORMED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

	Math	Science	ELA	Social Studies	ACT Composite
2010	64%	67%	Read 63% Writing 45%	81%	19.7
2009	54%	61%	Read 62% Writing 56%	89%	19.4
2008	39%	46%	Read 47% Writing 33%	70%	18.3

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

Over 40% (256) of parents attended parent teacher conferences in the fall. Numbers were not kept for winter or spring conferences.

7. FOR HIGH SCHOOLS ONLY ALSO REPORT ON THE FOLLOWING:

- a. THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENTS (DUAL ENROLLMENT) Seven students out 147 (4.5%) in the 12th grade were dual enrolled.
- b. THE NUMBER OF COLLEGE EQUIVALENT COURSES OFFERED BHS offers AP English, Calculus, Biology and History
- c. THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN COLLEGE EQUIVALENT COURSES (AP/IB) 93 (19.5%) of students in grades 10-12 took 109 AP tests in 2010. 46% of students in grade 12 took at least one AP class.
- d. THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING A SCORE LEADING TO COLLEGE CREDIT > 15 students 13% received college credit on AP exams.

As indicated by the "A" grade that we earned on our most recent state report card, Belding high School has made some great strides in recent years to increase student achievement. Our entire school community should be proud and confident of the education that Belding High School students receive. We are preparing students for the next step in their lives and we are preparing them well. I am excited about the future of BHS and I am excited for our children.

Sincerely,

John B. Deiter, Ph.D.
Principal
Belding High School

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Ionia ISD, Belding Area School District, Belding High School

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

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

Michigan Merit Examination (MME)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Language Arts / Reading									

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
African American									
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	16.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	38.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	72.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	32.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	33.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	98.6%	56.5%	52.3%	55.7%	4.3%	51.4%	18.6%	25.7%
White	2009-10	99.3%	57.9%	62%	62.4%	6%	56.4%	14.3%	23.3%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	47.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	10.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	11.2%	8.3%	8.3%	0%	8.3%	0%	91.7%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	28.9%	45.2%	51%	2%	49%	23.5%	25.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	30.4%	60.6%	59.4%	4.3%	55.1%	11.6%	29%

MI-Access

Functional Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	89.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	88%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Female	2009-10	<10	90.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	91%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	93.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	85.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2008-09	<10	70.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	63.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	65.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	74.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	76.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	68.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2008-09	<10	62.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
All Students	2009-10	<10	70.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	59.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	67.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	65.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	71.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	78.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	60.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Supported Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % 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	School % 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	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
No records to display.								

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Ionia ISD, Belding Area School District, Belding High 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		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.9%	92.8%
Mathematics	99.9%	92.9%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	95.5%
Mathematics	99.3%	87.2%
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
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
Mathematics	<30	<30
Hispanic or Latino		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	94.7%
Mathematics	100%	84.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.9%	92.5%
Mathematics	99.9%	93.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	86.7%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Limited English Proficient		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	123.6%	86.9%
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	116.3%	95.8%
Mathematics	116.3%	83.3%
Students with Disabilities		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	106.3%	71.6%
Mathematics	106.3%	74.2%
School		
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		
English Language Arts / Reading	101.1%	90.8%
Mathematics	101.1%	91%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	93.8%
Mathematics	100%	83.1%

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%
District	
	69.15%
School	
	87.18%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
	65%
District	
	<10
School	
	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	84.47%
District	
	<10
School	
	<10
Hispanic or Latino	
State	

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

59.94%

District

<10

School

<10

White

State

81.85%

District

70.05%

School

87.07%

Multiracial

State

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

71.12%

District

<10

School

<10

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

District

<10

School

<10

Students with Disabilities

State

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
	57.61%
District	
	34.78%
School	
	58.33%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	59.8%
District	
	51.47%
School	
	72.34%
Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
All Students	

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

State

94.7%

District

94.9%

School

95.3%

Black or African American

State

91%

District

93.7%

School

91.8%

American Indian or Alaska Native

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

State

93.7%

District

90.5%

School

88.1%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

96.5%

District

89%

School

75.4%

Hispanic or Latino

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

State

94.1%

District

95.2%

School

93.5%

White

State

95.7%

District

95%

School

95.6%

Multiracial

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

State

94.8%

District

93.5%

School

99.1%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

District

95.5%

School

92.6%

Students with Disabilities

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
State	
	93.5%
District	
	93.4%
School	
	93.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	94.8%
District	
	95.3%
School	
	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%
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%

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

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Ionia ISD, Belding Area School District, Belding High School

School AYP Status

Title 1 Status	AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	Education Yes Report Card Grade	School Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
No	Met	Met	Met	A	N/A	0

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Ionia ISD, Belding Area School District, Belding High School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	17	22	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 School with Emergency Certification	0%
	School Aggregate
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

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
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