

Waterford Village Annual Education Report (AER) Cover Letter

August 27, 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 the Waterford Village 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 Valerie Grimes, Waterford Village Principal, for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site www.waterford.k12.mi.us or you may review a copy from the Main Office at your child's school.

For 2009-2010, Waterford Village Elementary School made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. While we are pleased to have reached this important goal, we are continuously working to improve. We appreciate the continued support of parents, staff and our community in this effort. Staff assessed student learning and saw that less than 50% of students in first through fourth grade were entering the school year on grade level. The staff focused on strategies for improving reading achievement, developing strategic lessons and interventions to advance student learning. By the end of the school year, students approximately 70% of students were on grade level, with 90% of our fifth graders leaving Village at or above grade level. Throughout the summer, students were encouraged to maintain their reading growth from the previous year with our summer reading program. Students in grades K-4 were given books for summer reading and then given two opportunities to exchange books. The goal was to keep students from experiencing a loss in their reading gains from the previous school year. The interventions that are in place are effectively meeting the needs of students.

State law requires that we also report additional information.

1. PROCESS FOR ASSIGNING PUPILS TO THE SCHOOL:
 - a. Students are assigned to their elementary, middle, and high school buildings based upon established geographical boundaries at each level. Students from outside of the district are admitted through a School of Choice process in kindergarten only and are placed at buildings based upon available space.

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

- a. The District received accreditation through the North Central Association starting in the 2009-2010 school year. This process placed the district in the top 5% of districts across the country receiving the designation as being nationally accredited.

3. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EACH SPECIALIZED SCHOOL

- a. Kingsley Montgomery School (KMS), formerly known as Montgomery Developmental Training Center, is a segregated special education facility that provides support for severe cognitive impaired (SCI), severe multiply impaired (SXI), post secondary cognitive impaired (MoCI), and severe emotionally impaired (SEI) students. Kingsley Montgomery School has been providing special education services since January 1979, starting with SXI and SCI students. Students and staff from the Waterford Training Institute merged with Montgomery Developmental Training Center in the 1997-98 school year and the center was renamed Kingsley Montgomery School.

Kingsley Montgomery School currently provides center-based support for SXI and SCI students who are 3 to 26 years of age. KMS currently has three SXI classrooms located in three general education buildings. At KMS there are two SCI and four SXI classrooms, along with seven SEI classrooms.

- b. Children's Village School is a North Central Association accredited facility owned by Oakland County and operated by the Waterford School District. The school serves children in grades K-12 who have been adjudicated via the Probate Court for delinquency, neglect, truancy at home/school, or incorrigibility at home/school. These students come from all 28 school districts in Oakland County, other counties within the State of Michigan and also out-of-State.

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. The core curriculum can be accessed through the district website at <http://www.waterford.k12.mi.us/curriculum/contact.htm>. It was implemented in alignment with the State of Michigan which has a comprehensive curriculum for all grade levels. There are no variances from the state's model.

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

- a. In 2009, Village students scored well on the MEAP tests for the state. In 3rd grade, 94% of students passed the reading test while 91% passed in 4th grade and

90% passed in 5th grade. For math the results were also good. In 3rd grade 100% of students passed while 98% passed in 4th grade and 74% passed in 5th grade.

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

- a. In 2009-2010, 97% of parents were in touch with their child's teachers for parent/teacher conferences. Staff met with parents at parent/teacher conferences in the fall and spring and had phone conferences with parents who were unable to come to the school.

We are very encouraged by our long term data that shows steady growth in student achievement with highly effective interventions and instructional strategies, the work that we are doing in our building as a part of our school improvement process, the commitment our staff continues to show towards our professional learning communities, and the enthusiasm of our parents and students toward learning.

Sincerely,

Valerie L. Grimes
Waterford Village Principal

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Oakland Schools, Waterford School District, Waterford Village 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)
English Language Arts / Reading									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	86.4%	86.6%	91.2%	57.9%	33.3%	8.8%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	91.5%	94.4%	40.7%	53.7%	5.6%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	89.1%	92.9%	67.9%	25%	7.1%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	92.5%	95.8%	33.3%	62.5%	4.2%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	84.2%	89.7%	48.3%	41.4%	10.3%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	90.4%	93.3%	46.7%	46.7%	6.7%	0%
Black or	2008-09	<10	75.1%	75%	<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)
African American									
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	80.6%	83.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	93.1%	88.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	79%	71.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	84.6%	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	90%	89.4%	92.3%	57.7%	34.6%	7.7%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	93.9%	95.6%	46.7%	48.9%	4.4%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	74.9%	60.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	82.2%	73.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	63.4%	48.8%	69.2%	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	71%	64.4%	<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)
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	79.1%	77.2%	82.6%	39.1%	43.5%	17.4%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	87.9%	93.1%	34.5%	58.6%	6.9%	0%
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	84.7%	81.6%	40.8%	40.8%	16.3%	2%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	86.7%	90.7%	42.6%	48.1%	7.4%	1.9%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.7%	85.4%	76%	40%	36%	20%	4%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	90.5%	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	80.9%	83.9%	87.5%	41.7%	45.8%	12.5%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	82.1%	83.1%	82.1%	35.7%	46.4%	14.3%	3.6%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	65.6%	67.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	68.6%	66.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	81.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	91.6%	81.3%	<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)
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	90.5%	91.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	72.6%	72.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.3%	68.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	88%	87.4%	81.6%	44.7%	36.8%	15.8%	2.6%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	90.8%	91.7%	45.8%	45.8%	6.3%	2.1%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	61.2%	62.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	64.3%	62.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	54.7%	29.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	58%	63.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	75.6%	73.9%	26.1%	47.8%	21.7%	4.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75.7%	82.2%	89.7%	17.2%	72.4%	6.9%	3.4%

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)
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	85.4%	80.7%	31.6%	49.1%	12.3%	7%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	88.3%	90%	30%	60%	4%	6%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	87.1%	81.8%	31.8%	50%	18.2%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	86.8%	88.9%	29.6%	59.3%	7.4%	3.7%
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	83.7%	80%	31.4%	48.6%	8.6%	11.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	89.8%	91.3%	30.4%	60.9%	0%	8.7%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	63.5%	72.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	70.4%	69%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	82.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.8%	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	2009-10	<10	90.6%	86.7%	<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)
Islander									
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	71.2%	82.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.6%	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	87.1%	83%	31.9%	51.1%	10.6%	6.4%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	91.4%	90%	35%	55%	5%	5%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	56.2%	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	61.8%	63.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	49.2%	36.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	57.6%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	70.5%	78.1%	72%	16%	56%	16%	12%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	76.6%	81%	86.2%	24.1%	62.1%	3.4%	10.3%
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%	90.3%	92.9%	53.6%	39.3%	7.1%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	94.7%	100%	58.2%	41.8%	0%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	89.7%	92.9%	57.1%	35.7%	7.1%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	93.6%	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	90.9%	92.9%	50%	42.9%	7.1%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	95.7%	100%	64.5%	35.5%	0%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	78.9%	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	87.7%	84.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	96%	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	86.9%	84.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	92.3%	91.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	93%	92.2%	52.9%	39.2%	7.8%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	96.2%	100%	67.4%	32.6%	0%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	85.1%	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English	2009-10	<10	92.1%	88.6%	<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)
Alaska Native									
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	95.1%	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	96.9%	91.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	81%	77%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	89.3%	91.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	92%	92.3%	89.5%	42.1%	47.4%	10.5%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	96.4%	97.9%	43.8%	54.2%	2.1%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	75.7%	76.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	86.6%	86.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	68.1%	51%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with	2009-10	<10	80%	87%	<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)
Disabilities									
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	78.7%	83.3%	33.3%	50%	16.7%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	90%	96.6%	31%	65.5%	3.4%	0%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	75%	73.2%	26.8%	46.4%	21.4%	5.4%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	80.3%	74%	30%	44%	26%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	73.2%	68.2%	22.7%	45.5%	27.3%	4.5%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	79.2%	70.4%	22.2%	48.1%	29.6%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	76.7%	76.5%	29.4%	47.1%	17.6%	5.9%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	81.6%	78.3%	39.1%	39.1%	21.7%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	55.2%	52.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	62.5%	56.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	71.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	2008-09	<10	92.3%	81.3%	<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	93%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	66.1%	65.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	71%	67.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	83%	78.1%	71.7%	30.4%	41.3%	23.9%	4.3%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	83.1%	70%	32.5%	37.5%	30%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	60.7%	62.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	67.6%	63.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	46.9%	27.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.8%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	64.4%	62.8%	62.5%	20.8%	41.7%	29.2%	8.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	71.8%	65.5%	27.6%	37.9%	34.5%	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)
Science									
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	83.1%	87.3%	82.5%	36.8%	45.6%	12.3%	5.3%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	86.3%	80.8%	32.7%	48.1%	17.3%	1.9%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	86.4%	77.3%	31.8%	45.5%	18.2%	4.5%
Female	2009-10	100%	81.1%	85.8%	77.8%	29.6%	48.1%	18.5%	3.7%
Male	2008-09	100%	82.9%	88.1%	85.7%	40%	45.7%	8.6%	5.7%
Male	2009-10	100%	80.8%	86.8%	84%	36%	48%	16%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	61.8%	74.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	59.6%	63.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	77.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.9%	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian,	2009-10	<10	88.8%	81.3%	<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)
Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander									
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	72.9%	79.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.8%	62.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	89.6%	80.9%	38.3%	42.6%	14.9%	4.3%
White	2009-10	100%	87.4%	90.5%	83.3%	38.1%	45.2%	14.3%	2.4%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	59%	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	56.7%	64.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.6%	60.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	60.7%	69%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.3%	80.7%	80%	24%	56%	12%	8%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	77.6%	86.2%	24.1%	62.1%	13.8%	0%

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: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	80.6%	<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)
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	76.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	65.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	58%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	61.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	48.2%	<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	2008-09	<10	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	82.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	79.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	86.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	90.2%	<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)
Male	2009-10	<10	91%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	89.7%	<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
Reading								
Grade: 03								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
All Students	2009-10	100%	31.3%	22.2%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Female	2009-10	<10	31.5%	18.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	100%	31.2%	25%	100%	0%	100%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	31.7%	19%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	30.4%	16.7%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	100%	50.7%	62.1%	75%	0%	75%	25%
Female	2009-10	100%	50.6%	54.5%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	50.8%	66.7%	50%	0%	50%	50%
White	2009-10	100%	52.8%	63.2%	75%	0%	75%	25%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	49.8%	65%	66.7%	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Female	2009-10	100%	53.8%	44.4%	0%	0%	0%	100%
White	2009-10	100%	52.5%	52.2%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	48%	57.9%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Mathematics								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	100%	60.1%	64.3%	66.7%	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Female	2009-10	<10	55.5%	45.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	100%	62.2%	76.5%	100%	0%	100%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	63.8%	66.7%	66.7%	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	60.8%	73.7%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	100%	73%	79.3%	100%	25%	75%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	71.2%	63.6%	100%	50%	50%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	74%	88.9%	100%	0%	100%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	76.4%	84.2%	100%	25%	75%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.5%	80%	100%	33.3%	66.7%	0%
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	100%	62.6%	70.4%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	60.9%	75%	100%	0%	100%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	65.9%	77.3%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	60.3%	63.2%	100%	0%	100%	0%

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Oakland Schools, Waterford School District, Waterford Village 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		
English Language Arts / Reading	99%	94.5%
Mathematics	98.8%	92.8%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	100%	93.8%
Mathematics	100.6%	95.2%
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	96.7%	89%
Mathematics	96.3%	86.4%
School		
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		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.8%	92%
Mathematics	94.4%	88%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
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	100%	94.5%
Mathematics	100%	95.5%
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	99.1%	92.1%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	98.5%	89%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	95.2%
Mathematics	99.1%	93.7%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	93.9%
Mathematics	100%	95%
Multiracial		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
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	105.1%	92.6%
Mathematics	108.8%	91.2%
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	113.9%	69%
Mathematics	113.4%	66%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	182.4%	74.3%
Mathematics	182.4%	82.9%
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	91.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	90%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	105.6%	89%
Mathematics	105.6%	92.7%

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	
	75.42%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
District	
	64.52%
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	
	87.5%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	
	59.94%
District	
	60.32%
White	

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

State

81.85%

District

77.28%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

District

56.25%

Students with Disabilities

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

State

57.61%

District

56.76%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

59.54%

Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)

All Students

State

94.7%

District

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	95.5%
School	
	95.6%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	95%
School	
	95.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	93.7%
District	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
93.6%	
School	
92.7%	
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
96.5%	
District	
97.2%	
School	
97.1%	
Hispanic or Latino	
State	
94.1%	
District	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	95.1%
School	
	96.3%
White	
State	
	95.7%
District	
	95.5%
School	
	95.5%
Multiracial	
State	
	94.8%
Limited English Proficient	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
State	
	94.6%
District	
	95.9%
School	
	97.1%
Students with Disabilities	
State	
	93.5%
District	
	94.6%
School	
	93%
Economically Disadvantaged	

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
State	94.8%
District	95.6%
School	95.5%

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

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

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

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		38%			31%		42%
2002-03		38%			31%		42%
2003-04		38%			31%		42%
2004-05		48%			43%		52%
2005-06	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Oakland Schools, Waterford School District, Waterford Village 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 Oakland Schools, Waterford School District, Waterford Village Elementary School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	11	20	0

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

Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School with Emergency Certification	0%
	School Aggregate
Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	0%

Michigan Report Card for the National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	22	43	30	5
Male	50	22	41	30	7
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	‡	‡	‡	‡

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

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