

August 9, 2010

Dear Parents and Community Members:

I am pleased to present you with the Annual Education Report (AER) which provides key information on the 2009-2010 educational progress for Woodview Elementary. 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 Julie Milewski, Principal, 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/woodviewaer/> or you may review a copy from the principal's office at your child's school.

For 2009-2010, Woodview Elementary 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

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 Woodview Elementary School Improvement Team and several building stakeholders have written a comprehensive school improvement plan focused on raising achievement for all students in reading, writing and math. The plan is also focused on closing the achievement gap for our special education students and economically disadvantaged students. Woodview Elementary goals, objectives, strategies, and activities are based on data and research. The team also worked closely with our Literacy Teachers and Instructional Consultation Team members.

3. A 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 Areas Schools to provide a complete continuum of services to be made available in an efficient and cost effective manner regardless of district size. Woodview Elementary has the following programs in-house for students with special needs: self-contained EI, self-contained LD, Resource Room at each grade level, and direct contact with the ICISD for students with Autism Spectrum Disorder.

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 the Woodview Elementary core curriculum is available through the principal's office and on the district website at <http://www.bas-k12.org/index.php/academics/elementary/> . The curriculum is aligned to the Michigan Content Expectations. Local assessments are designed to assess these content expectations. Larger scale assessments are analyzed as well 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 ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

**MEAP**

Woodview Elementary students continue to score above the AYP targets on the MEAP test.

**ELA MEAP Percent Proficient**

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade –	81.6%	82.3%
4 <sup>th</sup> grade –	79.5%	81.2%
5 <sup>th</sup> grade –	80.1%	82.9%

**Math MEAP Percent Proficient**

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade –	89.8%	95.1%
4 <sup>th</sup> grade –	88.1%	91%
5 <sup>th</sup> grade –	76.5%	78.6%

**Science MEAP Percent Proficient** (only tested at 8<sup>th</sup> grade)

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009
5 <sup>th</sup> grade –	86.6%	81.9%

**NAEP**

In 2009, 4<sup>th</sup> grade students at Woodview took the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Scores in ELA and math:

Grade/Subject	Percent Proficient
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	23%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	30%

**Local Assessment Results for Writing**

All students in grades 3-5 are given two schoolwide writing assessments each year, one the first week of September and one the first week of May (1 is low and 6 is high)

**Fall 2008**

<b>Writing Prompt Score based on MEAP Writing Rubric (1 is low and 6 is high)</b>														
<b>3rd grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (163)	0	4	7	18	33	29	34	18	12	6	1	1	0	0
Percent	0%	2%	4%	11%	24%	18%	21%	11%	7%	4%	<1	<1	0%	0%
<b>4th Grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (152)	1	24	13	16	22	25	16	17	9*	4	3	2	0	0
Percent	<1	16%	9%	11%	14%	16%	11%	11%	6%	3%	2%	1%	0%	0%
<b>5th Grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (163)	2	8	2	6	10	35	29	27	22	17	3	1	1	0
Percent	1%	5%	1%	4%	6%	21%	18%	17%	13%	10%	2%	1%	1%	0%
<b>Schoolwide</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (478)	3	36	22	40	65	89	79	62	43	27	7	4	1	0
Percent	<1	8%	5%	8%	14%	19%	17%	13%	9%	6%	1%	1%	<1	0%

**Spring 2009**

<b>Writing Prompt Score based on MEAP Writing Rubric (1 is low and 6 is high)</b>														
<b>3rd grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (158)	0	3	5	7	15	30	27	31	19	8	8	5	0	0
Percent	0%	2%	3%	4%	9%	19%	17%	20%	12%	5%	5%	3%	0%	0%
<b>4th Grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (149)	0	11	6	11	8	8	25	22	21	12	9	2	4	0
Percent	0%	7%	4%	7%	5%	12%	17%	15%	14%	8%	6%	1%	3%	0%
<b>5th Grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (159)	0	8	1	5	15	19	23	40	23	12	8	5	0	0
Percent	0%	5%	1%	3%	9%	12%	14%	25%	14%	8%	5%	3%	0%	0%
<b>Schoolwide</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (466)	0	22	12	23	38	67	75	93	63	32	25	12	4	0
Percent	0%	5%	3%	5%	8%	14%	16%	20%	14%	7%	5%	3%	1%	0%

**Fall 2009**

<b>Writing Prompt Score based on MEAP Writing Rubric (1 is low and 6 is high)</b>														
<b>3rd grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (176)	0	15	1	39	21	31	30	17	19	3	0	0	0	0
Percent	0%	9%	0%	22%	12%	18%	17%	10%	11%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>0</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (160)	0	18	14	19	14	20	30	20	9	6	8	2	0	0
Percent	0%	11%	9%	12%	9%	13%	19%	13%	6%	4%	5%	1%	0%	0%
<b>5th Grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (158)	0	9	0	10	14	32	26	40	12	8	2	4	1	0
Percent	0%	6%	0%	6%	9%	20%	16%	25%	8%	5%	1%	3%	1%	0%
<b>Schoolwide</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (494)	0	42	15	68	49	83	86	77	40	17	10	6	1	0
Percent	0%	9%	3%	14%	10%	17%	17%	16%	8%	3%	2%	1%	0%	0%

**Spring 2010**

<b>Writing Prompt Score based on MEAP Writing Rubric (1 is low and 6 is high)</b>														
<b>3rd grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (163)	0	7	5	9	17	36	38	28	16	5	1	1	0	0
Percent	0%	4%	3%	6%	10%	22%	23%	17%	10%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%
<b>0</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (157)	0	8	5	12	12	18	34	24	15	12	6	7	2	2
Percent	0%	5%	3%	0%	8%	11%	22%	15%	10%	8%	4%	4%	1%	1%
<b>5th Grade</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (151)	0	5	0	5	5	25	30	22	30	16	6	5	1	1
Percent	0%	3%	0%	3%	3%	17%	20%	17%	11%	4%	2%	3%	1%	1%
<b>Schoolwide</b>														
<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6</b>
Total (471)	0	20	10	26	34	79	102	74	61	33	13	13	3	3
Percent	0%	4%	2%	6%	7%	17%	22%	16%	13%	7%	3%	3%	1%	1%

- Comparing the fall 2008 and spring 2009 writing assessments helps us to see great growth.
- The percentage of students receiving a score of 2 or lower decreased while students earning a score of 3 or higher increased.
- 30% of students scored a 3 or higher in the fall of 2009. In the spring of 2010, 44% of students scored a 3 or higher.
- 36% of students scored a 1.5 or lower in the fall of 2009. This number dropped to 19% for the spring of 2010.

## STAR Reading

The Accelerated Reader (AR) provides Star Reading test scores to further aid in the evaluation of reading programs.

2008-2009	Pretest Mean	Post Test Mean	Change
3rd Grade	2.8	3.6	+0.8
4th Grade	4.0	4.8	+0.8
5th Grade	4.9	5.4	+0.5

2008-2009	Pretest Mean	Post Test Mean	Change
3rd Grade	2.9	3.5	+0.6
4th Grade	3.6	4.3	+0.7
5th Grade	4.5	4.8	+0.3

	2009	2010	Change
3rd Grade	2.8	2.9	+0.1
4th Grade	4.0	3.6	-0.4
5th Grade	4.9	4.5	-0.4

Cohort	Fall 2008	Spring 2010	Change
2018	2.8	4.3	+1.5
2019	4.0	4.8	+0.8

- Pretest and posttest data indicates consistent growth in each grade level.
- A fall 2008 to fall 2009 comparison indicates growth at 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, but a slight decrease at 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades.
- The class 2018 and 2019 have demonstrated growth in their Star reading scores.

## DIBELS

DIBELS is utilized in the area of reading fluency to assess students' skills. Grade appropriate curriculum materials are used in this assessment. This information has been used to provide interventions for students on an individual basis. Scores indicate average number of words read correctly over a three minute timeframe.

2008-2009	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade
Fall	71	90	110
Winter	84	107	120
Spring	97	99	124
<b>Growth</b>	<b>+28</b>	<b>+9</b>	<b>+14</b>

<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>3rd Grade</b>	<b>4th Grade</b>	<b>5th Grade</b>
Fall	78	89	111
Winter	93	102	115
Spring	99	113	119
<b>Growth</b>	<b>+21</b>	<b>+22</b>	<b>+8</b>

	<b>3rd Grade</b>	<b>4th Grade</b>	<b>5th Grade</b>
Winter '08	84	107	120
Winter '09	93	102	115
<b>Change</b>	<b>+9</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>-5</b>

<b>Cohort</b>	Fall 2008	Spring 2010	Change
2018	71	113	<b>+42</b>
2019	90	119	<b>+29</b>

- DIBELS data indicates consistent growth across each grade level.
- A winter 2008 to winter 2009 comparison indicates growth at 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, but a slight decrease at 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades.
- The class of 2018 and 2019 have demonstrated significant growth from the fall of 2008 until the spring of 2010.

### Local Assessment Data for Math

In the fall, Woodview teachers administer a comprehensive beginning-of-the-year assessment covering grade level math standards. In the spring, an end-of-the-year assessment is administered to measure growth. The results are found below.

<b>Year</b>	<b>3rd Grade</b>			<b>4th Grade</b>			<b>5th Grade</b>		
	Pretest	Post Test	Change	Pretest	Post Test	Change	Pretest	Post Test	Change
2008-2009	32.1	72.2	+40.6	28.6	59	+30.4	35.7	59.3	+23.6
2009-2010	41.6	73	+31.4	37.4	65.4	+28.0	42.9	61.3	+18.4
Change	+9.5	+0.3	-9.2	+8.8	+6.4	-2.4	+7.2	+2.0	-5.2

- Consistent growth is found at each grade level.
- It should be noted that the amount of growth decreases across grade levels.  
Each grade's level of the 2009-2010 posttest scores have increased from the 2008-2009 posttest scores.

## NAEP

In 2009, 4<sup>th</sup> grade students at Woodview took the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Scores in ELA and math:

Grade/Subject	Percent Proficient
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	23%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	30%

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

In 2009-2010, Woodview Elementary had 480 students (based on winter 2010 count). Of those 480 students, 467 attended parent/teacher conferences which equates to 97.3% attendance.

At Woodview Elementary, we believe:

- All students need to feel safe, successful, cared for and valued.
- Students learn when their emotional, social and instructional needs are met.
- Student achievement is a collaboration of efforts between school, home and community.
- Discovering and developing the talents of students and teachers increases achievement.

In 2010, Woodview received the Excellence in Education award for its Reading Enrichment Program. The staff works diligently to ensure that all kids are successful. Teachers utilize such programs as the CAFE', Daily Five, ICT, Leveled Literacy and Literacy Teachers to carry out the goals of the school's comprehensive school improvement plan. Woodview Elementary cares about the needs of all its students , therefore, it works closely with the PTO and community organizations to make sure that kids have what they need to be successful. Woodview Elementary truly is "The right size. The right choice."

Sincerely,

Julie Milewski  
Principal



<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
or Pacific Islander									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	95.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	79%	61.5%	61.5%	0%	61.5%	38.5%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	84.6%	85.7%	85.7%	7.1%	78.6%	14.3%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	90%	83.2%	83.2%	32.9%	50.3%	16.1%	0.7%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	81.5%	81.5%	31.5%	50%	16.4%	2.1%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	88.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	74.9%	63.6%	63.6%	0%	63.6%	36.4%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	82.2%	81.8%	81.8%	0%	81.8%	18.2%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	63.4%	61.9%	61.9%	19%	42.9%	38.1%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	71%	68.8%	68.8%	18.8%	50%	25%	6.3%
Economically	2008-09	100%	79.1%	82.4%	82.4%	24.2%	58.2%	17.6%	0%



<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Latino									
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	74.3%	75%	75%	0%	75%	25%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	88%	80.1%	80.1%	32.4%	47.8%	17.6%	2.2%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	81.3%	81.3%	34.5%	46.8%	16.5%	2.2%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	83.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	61.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	64.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	54.7%	36.8%	36.8%	5.3%	31.6%	52.6%	10.5%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	58%	50%	50%	14.3%	35.7%	42.9%	7.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	77.4%	77.4%	23.7%	53.8%	20.4%	2.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75.7%	78.3%	78.3%	22.8%	55.4%	19.6%	2.2%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	63.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	100%	68.3%	80%	80%	0%	80%	20%	0%
Grade: 05									

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	80.1%	80.1%	30.7%	49.4%	13.9%	6%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	82.9%	82.9%	41.4%	41.4%	11.8%	5.3%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	79.5%	79.5%	36.4%	43.2%	14.8%	5.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	88%	88%	44.6%	43.4%	7.2%	4.8%
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	80.8%	80.8%	24.4%	56.4%	12.8%	6.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	76.8%	76.8%	37.7%	39.1%	17.4%	5.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	80.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	90.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	71.2%	76.9%	76.9%	15.4%	61.5%	7.7%	15.4%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	74.6%	80%	80%	33.3%	46.7%	20%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	79.9%	79.9%	31.5%	48.3%	14.8%	5.4%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	83.8%	83.8%	43.8%	40%	10%	6.2%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	82.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	83.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	56.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited	2009-10	100%	61.8%	70%	70%	10%	60%	30%	0%



<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	98%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	86.9%	66.7%	66.7%	8.3%	58.3%	33.3%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	92.3%	100%	100%	61.5%	38.5%	0%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	91.6%	91.6%	50.3%	41.3%	8.4%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	95.2%	95.2%	54.4%	40.8%	4.8%	0%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	92%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	94.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	100%	85.1%	70%	70%	10%	60%	30%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	92.1%	100%	100%	63.6%	36.4%	0%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	79.7%	76.2%	76.2%	19%	57.1%	23.8%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	87.8%	84.8%	84.8%	36.4%	48.5%	15.2%	0%



<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	89.3%	91.7%	91.7%	25%	66.7%	8.3%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	92%	88.2%	88.2%	39.7%	48.5%	11.8%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	90.7%	90.7%	41.4%	49.3%	8.6%	0.7%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	86.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	91%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	75.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	86.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	68.1%	42.1%	42.1%	21.1%	21.1%	57.9%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	80%	66.7%	66.7%	11.1%	55.6%	29.6%	3.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	87.1%	87.1%	32.3%	54.8%	12.9%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	87%	87%	34.8%	52.2%	13%	0%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	82.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	100%	88.1%	90%	90%	30%	60%	10%	0%

Grade: 05

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	76.5%	76.5%	39.8%	36.7%	19.3%	4.2%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	78.6%	78.6%	36.4%	42.2%	17.5%	3.9%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	70.5%	70.5%	29.5%	40.9%	26.1%	3.4%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	75%	75%	40.5%	34.5%	20.2%	4.8%
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	83.3%	83.3%	51.3%	32.1%	11.5%	5.1%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	82.9%	82.9%	31.4%	51.4%	14.3%	2.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	72.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	66.1%	69.2%	69.2%	38.5%	30.8%	23.1%	7.7%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	71%	86.7%	86.7%	33.3%	53.3%	13.3%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	83%	77.2%	77.2%	39.6%	37.6%	18.8%	4%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	78.8%	78.8%	37.9%	40.9%	16.7%	4.5%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	76.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	78.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	60.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited	2009-10	100%	67.6%	90%	90%	20%	70%	10%	0%



<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Alaska Native									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	88.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	100%	72.9%	72.7%	72.7%	36.4%	36.4%	18.2%	9.1%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	68.8%	62.5%	62.5%	6.3%	56.3%	37.5%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	87.9%	87.9%	44.3%	43.6%	8.1%	4%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	86.1%	86.1%	45.3%	40.9%	9.5%	4.4%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	84.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	59%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	56.7%	50%	50%	0%	50%	50%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	63.6%	65.4%	65.4%	11.5%	53.8%	15.4%	19.2%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	60.7%	63.6%	63.6%	18.2%	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%
Economically	2008-09	100%	72.3%	83.7%	83.7%	38.8%	44.9%	12.2%	4.1%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Disadvantaged									
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	77.6%	77.6%	31.9%	45.7%	16.4%	6%
Migrant	2008-09	<10	62.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Migrant	2009-10	100%	64.6%	75%	75%	8.3%	66.7%	25%	0%

### **Michigan Merit Examination (MME)**

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

### **MI-Access**

### **Functional Independence**

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
English Language Arts								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	82.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	80.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	83.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	79.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	77.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	75.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	74.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	75.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African	2008-09	<10	77.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
American								
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	81.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	80.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	80.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	81.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	82.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	73.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
White	2008-09	<10	83.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	86.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	85%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	84.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	83.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	87.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	88.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	65.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	58%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	51.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	61.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	63.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

## Supported Independence

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
English Language Arts								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	83.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	80.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	80.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
All Students	2008-09	<10	78.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	79.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	76.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	70.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	84.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	88.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	86.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	88.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	87.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
All Students	2009-10	<10	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	86.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	85.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

## Participation

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

## MEAP-Access

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Level 1</b>	<b>% Level 2</b>	<b>% Level 3</b>
Reading								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	31.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	31.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	31.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	31.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	30.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	50.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	50.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	50.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	46.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	49.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Level 1</b>	<b>% Level 2</b>	<b>% Level 3</b>
Female	2009-10	<10	53.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	48%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	55.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	48%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	60.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	62.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	63.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	60.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	73%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	71.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % Students Proficient</b>	<b>School % Students Proficient</b>	<b>% Level 1</b>	<b>% Level 2</b>	<b>% Level 3</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	72.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	62.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	60.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	63.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	62.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	65.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	60.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
All Students		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.9%	92.8%
Mathematics	99.9%	92.9%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	92.5%
Mathematics	100.2%	94.8%
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		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
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	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
District		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
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	100%	93.8%
Mathematics	100%	87.5%
White		
State		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
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%	92.2%
Mathematics	100.2%	94.9%
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
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
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	120%	100%
Mathematics	120%	100%
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%

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
Mathematics	106.3%	74.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	103%	71.6%
Mathematics	103%	79%
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	101.9%	90.6%
Mathematics	101.9%	92.8%

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

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

<b>Graduation Rate (High Schools only)</b> <b>(Goal 80%)</b>
All Students

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

State

75.39%

District

69.15%

Black or African American

State

56.59%

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

65%

District

<10

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

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

State

84.47%

District

<10

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

District

<10

White

State

81.85%

District

70.05%

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

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

District

<10

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

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

District

34.78%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

51.47%

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

All Students

State

94.7%

District

94.9%

School

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
	96.1%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	93.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	93.7%
District	
	90.5%
School	
	95.2%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

State

96.5%

District

89%

School

97.6%

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

District

95.2%

School

97.1%

White

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

State

95.7%

District

95%

School

96%

Multiracial

State

94.8%

District

93.5%

School

97.1%

Limited English Proficient

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

State

94.6%

District

95.5%

School

98.4%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

District

93.4%

School

95.4%

Economically Disadvantaged

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
State	94.8%
District	95.3%
School	96%

\* 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%



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

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	17	15	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 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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
having a disability	12	42	39	17	2
SD	88	19	44	31	6
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	48	40	11	1
ELL	97	21	43	31	5
Not ELL					

‡ 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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
having a disability	10	75	22	2	1
SD	90	27	39	27	7
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	2	58	32	10	0
ELL	98	32	37	24	7
Not ELL					

‡ 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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
having a disability	10	66	24	8	3
SD	90	32	36	25	7
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	65	26	9	1
ELL	97	35	35	24	7
Not ELL					

# 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	‡	‡	‡	‡

<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>
Student classified as having a disability	9	73	22	4	#
SD	91	23	43	30	3
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	2	60	33	8	#
ELL	98	27	42	28	3
Not ELL					

# 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