

School Annual Education Report (AER) Cover Letter

August 20, 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 Challenger 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 Challenger Elementary for assistance. The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site www.kentwoodps.org/ourdistrict/annualreports or you may review a copy from the main office at Challenger.

For 2009-2010, Challenger 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 the following additional information.

Process for Assigning Pupils to the School:

Students in Kentwood Public School District are assigned to individual school buildings based on the grade level they attend and the geographic area in which they live. School boundaries were developed with community involvement and can be viewed at the Kentwood Public Schools Administration Building at 5820 Eastern Ave. S.E.

Core Curriculum:

Process:

Kentwood Public Schools has aligned curriculum in all content areas with the Michigan Curriculum Framework and benchmarks which can be found on the Michigan Department of Education website (<http://www.michigan.gov/mde>). Our assessments and report card are also aligned with the curriculum. Classroom instruction is congruent with the curriculum expectations and is monitored consistently by building principals and academic support personnel.

Alignment:

Each grade level on the elementary level and each content area at the secondary levels meet monthly to study curriculum issues and to ensure that all students have common, equitable curricular experiences. A gap analysis is conducted annually with the MEAP testing information and the curriculum is examined for areas of strength and weakness. After this audit, necessary adjustments are made.

Equity:

“Excellence and Equity for All” is the motto of Kentwood Public Schools. Common assessments with common scoring rubrics, a common curriculum, common core materials, and a common electronic standards-based report card help us work toward our goal of equity. In addition, principals and other evaluators have common instructional expectations that are used to guide teacher evaluation. Professional development, study groups, and constant communication between regular education, special education, and gifted programs also facilitate this process. We are committed to ALL of our students having multiple opportunities to learn and be successful in the core curriculum.

Status of School Improvement Plan:

Challenger Elementary has an approved school improvement plan submitted to the State in which stakeholders have outlined goals and objectives for the next 3 years that address student academic needs. The needs addressed in the plan are identified by looking at a variety of data that measures student academic progress. The stakeholders identify areas of need and research scientifically based strategies to address these needs.

Aggregate Student Achievement Results:

Challenger Elementary

District Assessments: SRI or Running Record

Important Note: The following chart only presents data on students who were at Challenger for all 3 testing periods. Data is presented this way to determine the effectiveness of our reading program over the course of a year.

All scores show the Percent Proficient, or the percent of students scoring at or above the 16th percentile on the SRI or meet/surpass the proficiency level on the Running Record.	Kindergarten				1st Grade				2nd Grade			
	Sept. 2009	Jan. 2010	May 2010	Jan-May Chng	Sept. 2009	Jan. 2010	May 2010	Sept-May Chng	Sept. 2009	Jan. 2010	May 2010	Sept-May Chng
Challenger: Aggregate	NA	79%	86%	7%	80%	90%	88%	8%	81%	86%	83%	2%
	3rd Grade				4th Grade				5th Grade			
	Sept. 2009	Jan. 2010	May 2010	Sept-May Chng	Sept. 2009	Jan. 2010	May 2010	Sept-May Chng	Sept. 2009	Jan. 2010	May 2010	Sept-May Chng
	82%	82%	86%	4%	78%	91%	93%	15%	85%	91%	94%	9%

All students in grades K–5 take a Running Record and/or SRI assessment 3 times a year in order to monitor progress in reading and best meet needs. All grade levels showed growth in reading proficiency throughout the year.

The most significant growth since the beginning of the year was shown in 1st Grade (up 8%), 4th Grade (up 15%), and 5th Grade (up 9%).

The least growth was shown in 2nd Grade (up 2%). This is do to the fact that in January students are given the Running Record assessment one on one with the teacher, but in May students take the computerized Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) assessment (typically, transitioning to the SRI is difficult for students the first couple of times they take it).

Based on our reading data for kindergarten through 5th grade, we have launched intervention reading groups to provide assistance to students struggling in reading. Students work in small groups that target the deficit area(s) for 30 to 60 minutes day. Teachers and interventionists meet every 4 weeks to determine student growth and to see what instructional changes need to be made.

Challenger Elementary

District Assessments: Math Cumulative Test

Important Note: The following chart only presents data on students who were at Challenger for both testing periods. Data is presented this way to determine the effectiveness of our mathematics program over the course of a year.

All scores show the Percent Proficient, or the percent of students scoring at or above 55% correct.	Kindergarten			1st Grade			2nd Grade		
	Jan. 2010	May 2010	Dec-May Chng	Dec. 2009	May 2010	Dec-May Chng	Dec. 2009	May 2010	Dec-May Chng
Challenger: Aggregate	NA	NA	NA	100%	96%	-4%	90%	95%	5%
	3rd Grade			4th Grade			5th Grade		
	Dec. 2009	May 2010	Dec-May Chng	Dec. 2009	May 2010	Dec-May Chng	Dec. 2009	May 2010	Dec-May Chng
	68%	90%	22%	74%	72%	-2%	60%	53%	-7%

All students in grades 1–5 take Kentwood’s Cumulative Math Assessment 2 times a year in order to monitor progress in math and best meet needs.

The most significant growth since December was shown in 3rd Grade (up 22%).

According to this assessment, three of the five grade levels (1st, 4th, and 5th) decreased in proficiency. This is do to the fact that May assessment is significantly more difficult than the December assessment (as a district, we are working on raising the expectations of our December assessment). Challenger staff, however, recognizes that we need to continue to improve our math proficiency, and we are taking measures to insure this is done.

Based on our math data for kindergarten through 5th grade, we have launched intervention math groups to provide assistance to struggling students. Students work in small groups that target the deficit area(s) for 30 minutes day. Teachers and interventionists meet every 4 weeks to determine student growth and to see what instructional changes need to be made.

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance:

During the 2009-2010 school year, 98% of our students (328) were represented by a parent or guardian during fall conferences and 96% of our students (325) were represented by a parent or guardian during spring conferences.

Challenger is extremely proud of our students and the achievements they have made throughout the 2009-2010 school year, a year that has been significantly different than any other. Mostly due to the closing of a district elementary and the moving of district boundary lines, over 30% of our students were new to us in the fall of 2009, and we have seen a decrease in proficiency compared to the years before. Since the end of the 2008-2009 school year, Challenger's minority population climbed from 59% to 65% and our economically disadvantaged population jumped from 52% to 68%. We welcomed 15 refugee students from war-ravaged and poverty-inflicted areas of the world, many of whom entered the United States this summer and had never been in a classroom. We have had some challenges along the way, but our students have met these challenges. As Challenger celebrates a student body that creates a beautiful cultural mosaic, we also celebrate the academic accomplishments of our students.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mark C. Bea
Principal

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Kent ISD, Kentwood Public Schools, Challenger Elementary

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)
English Language Arts / Reading									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	86.4%	91.2%	91.5%	46.8%	44.7%	6.4%	2.1%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	93.2%	87.3%	40%	47.3%	10.9%	1.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	93.9%	96.7%	53.3%	43.3%	3.3%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	93.8%	88%	36%	52%	12%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	88.3%	82.4%	35.3%	47.1%	11.8%	5.9%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	92.6%	86.7%	43.3%	43.3%	10%	3.3%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	75.1%	85.1%	80%	40%	40%	10%	10%

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)
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	80.6%	87%	77.8%	22.2%	55.6%	22.2%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	93.1%	95.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	95.1%	88.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	79%	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	84.6%	94.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	90%	94.9%	95.5%	40.9%	54.5%	4.5%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	97.6%	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	85.2%	86.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	88.7%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	74.9%	86.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	82.2%	88%	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%	25%	8.3%
Students	2008-09	<10	63.4%	75.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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)
with Disabilities									
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	71%	82.6%	84.6%	53.8%	30.8%	7.7%	7.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	79.1%	88.2%	89.5%	57.9%	31.6%	5.3%	5.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	89.8%	80.6%	36.1%	44.4%	16.7%	2.8%
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	87.2%	90.9%	30.9%	60%	7.3%	1.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	86.5%	80.4%	35.7%	44.6%	19.6%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.7%	90%	88.9%	33.3%	55.6%	7.4%	3.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	88%	87.1%	38.7%	48.4%	12.9%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	80.9%	84.4%	92.9%	28.6%	64.3%	7.1%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	82.1%	84.9%	72%	32%	40%	28%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	65.6%	83.4%	88.9%	5.6%	83.3%	5.6%	5.6%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	68.6%	77.5%	76.9%	30.8%	46.2%	23.1%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	2008-09	<10	91.6%	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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)
Islander									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	90.5%	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	72.6%	86.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	74.3%	81.7%	83.3%	33.3%	50%	16.7%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	88%	90.2%	91.7%	50%	41.7%	8.3%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	93.9%	83.3%	33.3%	50%	16.7%	0%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	83.4%	85.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	81.1%	81.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	61.2%	65.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	64.3%	71.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	54.7%	67.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	58%	61.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	81.9%	81.8%	18.2%	63.6%	13.6%	4.5%

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	2009-10	100%	75.7%	81.8%	77.4%	29%	48.4%	22.6%	0%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	97.1%	81.5%	86.1%	88.2%	47.1%	41.2%	11.8%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	89.7%	86%	40.4%	45.6%	12.3%	1.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	86.8%	100%	52.6%	47.4%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	92.5%	88.5%	46.2%	42.3%	7.7%	3.8%
Male	2008-09	93.8%	79.8%	85.5%	73.3%	40%	33.3%	26.7%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	87.2%	83.9%	35.5%	48.4%	16.1%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	93.8%	63.5%	79.2%	80%	40%	40%	20%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	70.4%	85%	75%	15%	60%	25%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.8%	78.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	90.6%	88.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or	2008-09	<10	71.2%	88.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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)
Latino									
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.6%	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	91.4%	100%	56.3%	43.8%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	92.4%	91.7%	70.8%	20.8%	4.2%	4.2%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	83.9%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	56.2%	61.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	61.8%	65.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	49.2%	57.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	57.6%	59.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	94.1%	70.5%	79.3%	81.3%	43.8%	37.5%	18.8%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	76.6%	85.4%	77.8%	27.8%	50%	19.4%	2.8%
Mathematics									
Grade: 03									

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)
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	95.5%	91.5%	57.4%	34%	8.5%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	96.4%	94.7%	47.4%	47.4%	5.3%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	95.3%	93.3%	53.3%	40%	6.7%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	94.9%	88%	52%	36%	12%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	95.7%	88.2%	64.7%	23.5%	11.8%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	97.9%	100%	43.8%	56.3%	0%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	100%	78.9%	91.7%	80%	40%	40%	20%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	87.7%	93.9%	95%	15%	80%	5%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	96%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	98%	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	86.9%	92.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	92.3%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	98.1%	95.5%	59.1%	36.4%	4.5%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	98%	95.5%	77.3%	18.2%	4.5%	0%

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)
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	92%	94.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	94.3%	96.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	85.1%	91.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	100%	92.1%	94.3%	92.9%	42.9%	50%	7.1%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	79.7%	90.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	87.8%	93%	92.3%	53.8%	38.5%	7.7%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	85.7%	94.8%	94.7%	73.7%	21.1%	5.3%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	91.9%	95.7%	92.1%	39.5%	52.6%	7.9%	0%
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	87.9%	91.1%	92.7%	58.2%	34.5%	5.5%	1.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	92.3%	96.7%	94.6%	48.2%	46.4%	5.4%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	87.9%	89.8%	88.9%	63%	25.9%	7.4%	3.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	92.9%	96.3%	96.9%	46.9%	50%	3.1%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	87.8%	92.5%	96.4%	53.6%	42.9%	3.6%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	91.6%	97.1%	91.7%	50%	41.7%	8.3%	0%
Black or	2008-09	100%	73.8%	84.8%	77.8%	33.3%	44.4%	16.7%	5.6%

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	100%	82.3%	95.9%	92.9%	35.7%	57.1%	7.1%	0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	95.1%	97%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	96.9%	95.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	81%	94.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	100%	89.3%	94.3%	100%	54.5%	45.5%	0%	0%
White	2008-09	100%	92%	94.1%	100%	83.3%	16.7%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	98.5%	95.8%	50%	45.8%	4.2%	0%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	86.7%	85.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	91%	93.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	75.7%	85.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English	2009-10	<10	86.6%	92.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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)
Proficient									
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	68.1%	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	80%	92.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	89.9%	90.9%	54.5%	36.4%	4.5%	4.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	95.5%	93.5%	41.9%	51.6%	6.5%	0%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	97.1%	76.8%	85.3%	91.2%	67.6%	23.5%	2.9%	5.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	88.4%	82.5%	43.9%	38.6%	15.8%	1.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	82.8%	89.5%	73.7%	15.8%	0%	10.5%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	87.5%	88.5%	42.3%	46.2%	11.5%	0%
Male	2008-09	93.8%	77.8%	87.6%	93.3%	60%	33.3%	6.7%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	89.1%	77.4%	45.2%	32.3%	19.4%	3.2%
Black or African American	2008-09	93.8%	55.2%	79.5%	86.7%	53.3%	33.3%	6.7%	6.7%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	62.5%	83.1%	80%	20%	60%	20%	0%
Asian, Native	2008-09	<10	92.3%	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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)
Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93%	95.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	66.1%	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	71%	84.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	83%	89.5%	93.8%	75%	18.8%	0%	6.3%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	90.8%	91.7%	70.8%	20.8%	4.2%	4.2%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	78.2%	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	60.7%	64.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	67.6%	84.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	46.9%	62.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.8%	65.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically	2008-09	94.1%	64.4%	82%	81.3%	62.5%	18.8%	6.3%	12.5%

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)
Disadvantaged									
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	83.4%	75%	30.6%	44.4%	22.2%	2.8%
Science									
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	97.1%	83.1%	87.4%	94.1%	58.8%	35.3%	5.9%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	85.5%	71.9%	38.6%	33.3%	26.3%	1.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	86.5%	94.7%	63.2%	31.6%	5.3%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	81.1%	87%	69.2%	34.6%	34.6%	30.8%	0%
Male	2008-09	93.8%	82.9%	88.3%	93.3%	53.3%	40%	6.7%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	80.8%	84.2%	74.2%	41.9%	32.3%	22.6%	3.2%
Black or African American	2008-09	93.8%	61.8%	79.5%	86.7%	53.3%	33.3%	13.3%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	100%	59.6%	75.5%	55%	20%	35%	40%	5%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.9%	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native	2009-10	<10	88.8%	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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)
Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander									
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	72.9%	88.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.8%	84.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	92.6%	100%	68.8%	31.3%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	91.7%	87.5%	66.7%	20.8%	12.5%	0%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	79.3%	88.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	59%	65%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	56.7%	64.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.6%	73.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	60.7%	62.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	94.1%	72.3%	83.1%	93.8%	50%	43.8%	6.3%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	79.8%	61.1%	27.8%	33.3%	36.1%	2.8%

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)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	82.8%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	90.5%	<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	2008-09	<10	82.1%	<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%	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	71%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	75.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	79.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.3%	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.5%	90%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	75.2%	88.2%	<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	2008-09	<10	83.1%	85.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	75.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	77.6%	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or	2009-10	<10	69.4%	<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)
African American								
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	87.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.2%	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.1%	95%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	84.2%	90%	30%	60%	10%
Female	2008-09	<10	83.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	81.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	83%	93.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	80.6%	84.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	76.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	82.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	81.2%	<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)
White	2008-09	<10	84.8%	100%	<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%	94.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.4%	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	76.7%	<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%	90%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	69.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	82.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	83.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	79.3%	90%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	86.5%	96.3%	<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	85%	88.9%	<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	2008-09	<10	87.7%	95.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	85.9%	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	81.3%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	87.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	88.2%	90%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	88.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	74.6%	88.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	100%	71.1%	57.9%	50%	10%	40%	50%
Female	2008-09	<10	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	65.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	75.9%	85.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.2%	61.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or	2008-09	<10	66.9%	<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)
African American								
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	65.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	73.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	78.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	59.6%	70.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	100%	58%	55.6%	50%	10%	40%	50%
Female	2008-09	<10	57.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	51.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	60.6%	76.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	61.6%	53.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	47.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African	2009-10	<10	48.2%	<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)
American								
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	57.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	54.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	65.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	63.2%	<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)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	80.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	80.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								

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	2008-09	<10	78.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	79.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	66.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	69.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	66.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	79.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	67.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	88.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	88.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								

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	2008-09	<10	88.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	87.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	85.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	81.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	86.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	80.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	75.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	75.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	76%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or	2009-10	<10	75.4%	<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)
African American								
White	2008-09	<10	77.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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 Kent ISD, Kentwood Public Schools, Challenger Elementary

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100.1%	94.6%
Mathematics	99.8%	94.3%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	91.4%
Mathematics	100.5%	91.4%
Black or African American		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.8%	90.7%
Mathematics	98%	92.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	98.5%	88.1%
Mathematics	101.5%	92.5%
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
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	103.8%	94.6%
Mathematics	101.5%	96.3%
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	100.5%	94.8%
Mathematics	100%	92.6%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	98.6%	96.7%
Mathematics	98.3%	95%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	98.8%	93.2%
Mathematics	98.8%	92%
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	125.9%	96.2%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	127.2%	97.8%
School		
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	109%	88.8%
Mathematics	116.3%	93.5%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
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	101.7%	73.5%
Mathematics	101.2%	72.7%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	104.3%	69.4%
Mathematics	104.3%	67.3%
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.9%	92.7%
Mathematics	101.4%	93.1%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100.8%	87.7%
Mathematics	103.2%	86%

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	
	73.32%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
District	
	65.16%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
	65%
District	
	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	84.47%
District	
	88.68%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	
	59.94%
District	
	59.09%
White	

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

State

81.85%

District

77.35%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

District

66.67%

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

District

62.16%

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

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

36.11%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

60.61%

Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)

All Students

State

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.7%
District	
	96.2%
School	
	95.6%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	95.9%
School	
	95.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	93.7%
District	
	95.3%
School	
	97.6%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	96.5%
District	
	97.5%
School	
	96.6%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.1%
District	
	95.7%
School	
	95.7%
White	
State	
	95.7%
District	
	96.4%
School	
	96%
Multiracial	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	94.8%
District	
	94.8%
School	
	92.1%
Limited English Proficient	
State	
	94.6%
District	
	96.3%
School	
	95.8%
Students with Disabilities	
State	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	93.5%
District	
	95.7%
School	
	94.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	94.8%
District	
	95.9%
School	
	95.2%

* 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%
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 Kent ISD, Kentwood Public Schools, Challenger Elementary

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 Kent ISD, Kentwood Public Schools, Challenger Elementary

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	12	14	1

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
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	†	†	†	†	†

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	14	43	37	6
Black	20	52	39	9	0
Hispanic	5	29	51	19	1
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	13	32	36	19
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	12	42	39	17	2
Not SD	88	19	44	31	6
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	48	40	11	1
Not ELL	97	21	43	31	5

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	38	50	37	12	1
Not Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	23	40	29	8
Black	18	68	27	4	1
Hispanic	4	38	45	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	11	30	31	28
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	10	75	22	2	1
Not SD	90	27	39	27	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	2	58	32	10	0
Not ELL	98	32	37	24	7

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	36	34	23	6
Male	50	39	35	21	5
Female	50	32	34	26	8
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	52	33	13	2
Not Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Info not available	#	‡	‡	‡	‡

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	28	36	28	8
Black	19	65	26	7	1
Hispanic	5	49	34	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	21	37	25	17
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	10	66	24	8	3
Not SD	90	32	36	25	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	65	26	9	1
Not ELL	97	35	35	24	7

Rounds to zero

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	28	41	28	3
Male	51	33	42	23	2
Female	49	23	41	32	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	37	44	41	14	1
Not Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

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