

August 17, 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 Ellis Elementary 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 Jesus Hernandez 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/ellisaer/> or you may review a copy from the principal's office at your child's school.

Ellis Elementary made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. We are pleased that Ellis students are reaching this important goal. Our staff will continue to work hard to provide a strong foundation for progressive achievement. We appreciate the continued support of parents, staff and our community in this effort.

#### 1. PROCESS FOR ASSIGNING PUPILS TO THE SCHOOL

Belding 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 throughout the school year at grade-levels where it is determined that there is room for additional students.

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

The Ellis Elementary School Improvement team, compiled of several building stakeholders, has written a comprehensive school improvement plan focused on raising the achievement for all students in reading, writing and math. The plan is also focused on closing the achievement gap for our special education and economically disadvantaged students. The goals, objectives, strategies and activities at Ellis School are based on data and research.

### 3. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EACH SPECIALIZED SCHOOL

The philosophy of Belding Area Schools is to serve each individual with special needs in the least restrictive environment. A continuum of educational placement options is offered to individuals with mild to severe special needs from birth to age 26. Supportive services and vocational training programs are designed to meet their needs. Placement options are provided through the cooperative efforts of Belding Area Schools and the Ionia County Intermediate School District (ICISD). Small districts by themselves cannot financially support a complete continuum of services for those with special needs. The ICISD and the local school districts combine to operate programs for low incidence populations. Likewise, pre-primary programs for impaired individuals serve many districts as a whole. It is the goal of the ICISD and Belding Area Schools to provide a complete continuum of services to be made available in an efficient and cost effective manner regardless of district size. Ellis Elementary has the following programs in-house for students with special needs: A resource room for grades K-2, cognitively impaired services, occupational therapy, PT and ancillary services as needed such as visual and social work.

### 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

A copy of Ellis Elementary School's core curriculum is available through the principal's office and on the district website at <http://www.bas-k12.org/index.php/academics/ellis-school/>. The curriculum is aligned to the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. Local assessments are designed to assess these content expectations. Additionally, large-scale assessments are analyzed to determine need and adjustments are made to the curriculum accordingly.

### 5. THE AGGREGATE STUDENT ACHEIVEMENT RESULTS FOR ANY LOCAL COMPENTENCY TESTS OR NATIONALLY NORMED ACHEIVEMENT TESTS

Data is collected at the building level for locally developed assessments. The district is currently working in conjunction with the Kent Intermediate School District to create a data warehouse making this data more accessible.

Ellis School Students continues to perform satisfactorily as determined by the following data for kindergarten, first and second grades:

## End of Year Summary of Teacher Collected - Classroom Data Kindergarten 2009-2010

### **Letter Identification: Student's performance in naming both capital and lower case letters**

Beginning of the year average = 34 letters

End of the year average = 53 letters

At the end of year assessment, 93% of our students were able to identify 52 or more letters correctly.

### **Letter Sound Identification: Student's performance in producing the sound the letter makes when visually shown the letter**

Beginning of the year average = 11 letter sounds

End of the year average = 26 letter sounds

At the end of year assessment, 75% of our students were able to produce 26 letter sounds correctly.

### **Early Literacy Behaviors: Student's performance in demonstrating that they know and can use conventions of print such as where to begin reading, finding words in text, finding letters in print, tracking words, etc.**

Beginning of the year average = Score of 5.4 out of 11

End of the year average = Score of 10.4 out of 11

At the end of year assessment, 60% of our students earned 11 out of 11. 92% of our students earned a score of 10 or higher.

### **Rhyming: Student's performance in correctly hearing a rhyme and providing a rhyming word.**

Beginning of the year average = Score of 10.4 out of 16

End of the year average = Score of 15.4 out of 16.

At the end of year assessment, 85% of our students earned a score of 16, 90% of our students earned a score of 15 or higher.

**Blending: Student's performance on blending words when they are verbally segmented for them. For example: teacher says the sounds "C-A-T," students responds with the word "cat."**

Mid-year average = Score of 11.8 out of 16

End of the year average = Score of 14.7 out of 16.

At the end of year assessment, 77% of our students earned a score of 16, 81% of our students earned a score of 15 or higher.

**Segmenting: Student's performance on segmenting the sounds they hear in a word.**

Mid-year average = Score of 5.2 out of 8

End of the year average = Score of 6.9 out of 8.

At the end of year assessment, 68% of our students earned a score of 8, 81% of our students earned a score of 7 or higher.

**Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words: Student's performance in writing words phonetically.**

Mid-year average = Score of 23.6 out of 36

End of the year average = Score of 30.1 out of 36.

At the end of year assessment, 13% of our students earned a score of 36, 34% of our students earned a score of 35 or higher.

**Writing Prompt Performance: Scored using the attached writing rubric. Kindergarten writers are considered proficient once they have earned a score of 3 or better.**

Mid-year average = Score of 0.5 out of 6

End of the year average = Score of 1.6 out of 6.

At the end of year assessment:

15% earned a 0

25% earned a 1

44% earned a 2

13% earned a 3

2% earned a 4

0% of our students earned a score of 5 or 6

At the end of year assessment, 15% of students met the goal of earning a 3 on their writing prompt.

When comparing the mid-year performance to the end of year performance, 85% of students made progress.

### **Fountas and Pinnell Reading Level**

Mid-year average = Between a level A and B

End of the year average = Between a level B and C

At the mid-year assessment, 57% of our students were reading at a level B or higher.

At the end of year assessment, 91% of our students were reading at a level B or above, 79% of our students were reading at a level C or above. Average progress from mid-year to end of year for students beginning at a Level A or below was 1.5 levels.

## End of Year Summary of Teacher Collected - Classroom Data First Grade 2009-2010

### **Rhyming: Student's performance in correctly hearing a rhyme and providing a rhyming word.**

- 92% of our students earned a score of 16 out of 16 at the end of year assessment.

### **Blending: Student's performance on blending words when they are verbally segmented for them. For example: teacher says the sounds "C-A-T," students responds with the word "cat."**

- 93% of our students earned a score of 16 out of 16 at the end of year assessment.

### **Segmenting: Student's performance on segmenting the sounds they hear in a word.**

- 94% of our students earned a score of 8 out of 8 at the end of year assessment.

### **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words: Student's performance in writing words phonetically.**

- 34% of our students earned a score of 37 out of 37 at the end of year assessment.
- 70% of our students earned a score of 36 or higher at the end of year assessment.

**Writing Prompt Performance: Scored using the attached writing rubric. First grade writers are considered proficient once they have earned a score of 3 or better.**

Beginning average = Score of 1.2 out of 6

Mid-year average = Score of 1.4 out of 6

End of the year average = Score of 2.3 out of 6

At the end of year assessment:

2% earned a 0

7% earned a 1

46% earned a 2

37% earned a 3

7% earned a 4

2% earned a 5

At the end of year assessment, 46% of students met the goal of earning a 3 on their writing prompt.

When comparing the beginning of the year performance to the end of year performance, 80% of students made progress.

### **Fountas and Pinnell Reading Level**

Beginning average = Level C

Mid-year average = Between a Level E and F

End of the year average = Level G

At the mid-year assessment, 64% of our students were reading at a level E or higher.

At the end of year assessment, 71% of our students were reading at a level G or above, 61% of our students were reading at a level H or above, 49% of our students were reading at a level I or above. Average progress for students beginning at a Level C or below was 5 levels by the end of year assessment.

## End of Year Summary of Teacher Collected - Classroom Data Second Grade 2009-2010

### **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words: Student's performance in writing words phonetically.**

- 34% of our students earned a score of 37 out of 37 at the end of year assessment.
- 70% of our students earned a score of 36 or higher at the end of year assessment.

### **Writing Prompt Performance: Scored using the attached writing rubric. First grade writers are considered proficient once they have earned a score of 3 or better.**

Beginning average = Score of 2.3 out of 6

Mid-year average = Score of 2.6 out of 6

End of the year average = Score of 3.2 out of 6

At the end of year assessment:

1% earned a 0

6% earned a 1

14% earned a 2

58% earned a 3

14% earned a 4

8% earned a 5

2% earned a 6

At the beginning of the year assessment, 44% of our students were already earning a score of 3 or better.

At the mid-year assessment, 49% of our students were earning a score of 3 or better.

At the end of year assessment, 82% of students earned a 3 or better on their writing prompt.

When comparing the beginning of the year performance to the end of year performance, 61% of students made progress.

## **Fountas and Pinnell Reading Level**

Beginning average = Level H

Mid-year average = Level I

End of the year average = Level J

At the beginning of the year assessment, 55% of our students were reading at a Level H or above.

At the mid-year assessment, 49% of our students were reading at a Level J or higher.

At the end of year assessment, 47% of our students were reading at a Level L or above, 37% of our students were reading at a Level M or above.

Average progress for students beginning at a Level H or below was 5 levels by the end of year assessment.

This data is the end product from the Kindergarten through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade experience as it is collected at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade transition to Woodview Elementary.

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

During the 2009-2010 school year Ellis Elementary had 402 students. Of those 402 students, 364 parents attended spring parent/teacher conferences equating to 90% of parents.

#### **Points of Pride**

- Highly qualified and caring staff
- KC4 Curriculum
- Physical Education, technology and art/music courses
- Educational field trips and assemblies
- Classroom audio enhancement systems
- Supportive Parent/Teacher Organization
- Family night programs
- Book fairs
- Breakfast and lunch programs
- Elementary Literacy coaches
- Full time social worker and speech therapist
- On-site instructional consultation coordinator and team

- School psychologist
- Bi-Weekly building newsletter
- Modern playground facilities
- Special education services

At Ellis Elementary we are a caring, dedicated, hard working and highly trained staff. Our goal as a group is constant growth and learning for all of our students. This takes place academically, socially and emotionally. A partnership between home and school only serves to strengthen what happens at Ellis each and every day. Constant improvement for both students and staff is our daily goal. Ellis is the right place to start your educational dreams.

Sincerely,

Jesus Hernandez  
Principal  
Ellis Elementary

## Full Annual Education Report

# School-Level Student Assessment Data for Ionia ISD, Belding Area School District, Ellis Elementary 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)
No records to display.									

## 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)
No records to display.								

### 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, Ellis Elementary 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		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
English Language Arts / Reading	99.9%	92.8%
Mathematics	99.9%	92.9%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
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
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
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
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	94.7%
Mathematics	100%	84.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
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	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Multiracial		
State		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
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%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Students with Disabilities		
State		
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	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
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%

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
Mathematics	101.1%	91%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A

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

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

<b>Graduation Rate (High Schools only)</b> <b>(Goal 80%)</b>	
All Students	
State	
	75.39%
District	
	69.15%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
American Indian or Alaska Native	

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

State

65%

District

<10

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

84.47%

District

<10

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

District

<10

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

White

State

81.85%

District

70.05%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

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

District

<10

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

34.78%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

51.47%

**Attendance Rate**  
**(Goal 90%)**

All Students

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

State

94.7%

District

94.9%

School

95.1%

Black or African American

State

91%

District

93.7%

School

95.8%

American Indian or Alaska Native

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

State

93.7%

District

90.5%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

96.5%

District

89%

School

97.6%

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

District

95.2%

School

96.5%

White

State

95.7%

District

95%

School

95.1%

Multiracial

State

94.8%

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

District

93.5%

School

93.7%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

District

95.5%

School

95%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
District	
	93.4%
School	
	94.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	94.8%
District	
	95.3%
School	
	95.3%

\* 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](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%
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%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
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, Ellis Elementary 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
Yes	Met	Met	Met	A	N/A	0

## December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Ionia ISD, Belding Area School District, Ellis Elementary

# School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	18	13	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%
	<b>School Aggregate</b>
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					

<b>Reporting Group</b>	<b>Percent of Students</b>	<b>Percent below Basic</b>	<b>Percent Basic</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>
Program Eligibility	43	36	47	16	1
Eligible	56	11	40	40	9
Not Eligible	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
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**

<b>Reporting Group</b>	<b>Percent of Students</b>	<b>Percent below Basic</b>	<b>Percent Basic</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Program Eligibility	38	50	37	12	1
Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Not Eligible	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Program Eligibility	43	52	33	13	2
Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Not Eligible	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
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

<b>Reporting Group</b>	<b>Percent of Students</b>	<b>Percent below Basic</b>	<b>Percent Basic</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>
National Lunch Program Eligibility	37	44	41	14	1
Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Not Eligible	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Participation Rate for IEP Students</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>
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