

**Leslie Public Schools**  
**District Annual Education Report (AER)**

August 7, 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 Leslie Public School District and our schools. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and some requirements of state laws; however, our staff is available to help you understand this information. Please contact Corey Netzley, Superintendent of Schools for help if you need assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the school district's website [www.lesliek12.net](http://www.lesliek12.net) or you may review a copy in the principal's office at your child's school.

The report contains the following information:

**Student Assessment Data: Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP), Michigan Merit Exam (MME), and Michigan's Alternative Assessment Program (MI-Access)**

Presents achievement data for English language arts and mathematics for grades 3 to 8 (MEAP), for grade 11 (MME) and science for grades 5 and 8 compared to targets for all students as well as subgroups of students  
Provides achievement data for English language arts, mathematics and science for students with significant disabilities (MI-Access) compared to targets for all students with disabilities as well as subgroups of students  
Helps readers understand achievement progress within schools and compare these to district and state achievement

**Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – Detail Data and Status**

Provides information from assessments, graduation and attendance rates and AYP status in relation to four criteria:

The district must test 95% of students in total and in each required subgroup  
The district must attain achievement goals in English language arts and mathematics or reduce the percentage of students in the non-proficient category of achievement significantly ("safe harbor") annually  
The district must attain achievement goals for each subgroup that has at least 30 students in the group  
The district must meet or exceed the other academic indicators set by the state: graduation rate for high schools and attendance rate for elementary and middle schools

**Teacher Quality Data**

Identifies teacher qualifications at district and school levels  
Reports percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers not considered highly qualified to teach such classes

**NAEP Data (National Assessment of Educational Progress)**

Provides state results of the national assessment in mathematics and reading every other year in grades 4 and 8

Cannot be compared with MEAP results for grades 4 and 8 because there are no national standards.

**District and all schools made AYP**

For 2009-2010, the Leslie Public School District made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. All schools in the district (Woodworth Elementary, Leslie Middle School, and Leslie High School) also made AYP. None of our schools were identified for school improvement, corrective action or restructuring.

Leslie Public Schools continually strives to provide the best educational experience for the children of our district. We are pleased to provide this information to you and are committed to continuing evaluation and improvement of instruction. Congratulations to our three schools for making AYP again this year.

Sincerely,

**Woodworth Elementary School**  
**School Annual Education Report (AER)**

August 6, 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 Woodworth 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 Andrea Roach, Response to Intervention (RTI) coach, or myself for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site [lesliek12.net](http://lesliek12.net) or you may also review a copy from our office here at Woodworth.

For 2009-2010, Woodworth 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. Woodworth has been actively involved with the Ingham Intermediate School District's initiative for Response to Intervention this past year which is the first of two years. This opportunity has supported our increased knowledge of working with all students in the core curriculum for improvement. We appreciate the continued support of parents, staff and our community in this effort.

State law requires that we also report additional information:

- Students are assigned to Woodworth Elementary primarily by resident and district boundaries. A percentage of Schools of Choice students attend Woodworth Elementary.
- Woodworth Elementary
- Began a new three to five year cycle in 2009 – 2010 school year. It is aligned with district school improvement goals.
- Woodworth Elementary is a Pre-K – 4<sup>th</sup> grade building with a student population of approximately 520 students. Woodworth is located in a rural area south of Lansing. Twenty six certified staff provide classroom and special education services to students on a daily basis.
- The core curriculum, description of its implementation, and an explanation of the variances from the State of Michigan model is available for review in the school office (517-589-5151) and district superintendent's office (517-589-

8200). Parents may request to review these materials by contacting either office.

- Woodworth Elementary monitors student achievement on a continuous basis through the use of district and national curriculum assessments.
- Ninety- three percent (93%) of students were represented by parents at parent-teacher conferences in the 2009- 2010 school year.

There is always room for improvement when it comes to working with a wide range of learning styles and needs from Early Childhood through 4<sup>th</sup> Grade. Our diligence will not stop in finding ways to meet those needs. Woodworth students, staff, and parents continue to expect the "Best" by supporting educational initiatives that increase learning. Thank you all for practicing our motto, "Be the Best You Can Be."

Sincerely,

Maureen Packer

**Leslie Middle School**  
**School Annual Education Report (AER)**

August 9, 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 Leslie Middle 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 Carol Franz, Principal, for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site, <http://lesliek12.net>, or you may review a copy from the Leslie Middle School office.

For 2009-2010, Leslie Middle School made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. While we are pleased to have reached this important goal, we are continuously working to improve. We appreciate the continued support of parents, staff and our community in this effort.

State law requires that we also report additional information.

1. All students of the district in grades 5-8 attend Leslie Middle School.
2. Leslie Middle School has completed the second year of its school improvement plan.
  
3. A copy of the core curriculum can be obtained from the school web site listed above, or from the main office of Leslie Middle School.
4. Student growth is monitored on a continuous basis through the use of our district curriculum assessments.
5. The percentage of student represented by parents at parent-teacher conferences was 77% in the 2009-2010 school year.

I am extremely proud of the accomplishments of the staff, students, and parents of Leslie Middle School, and I am excited about continuing our work together to improve our student achievement.

Sincerely,

Carol J. Franz

*Leslie High School*

**School Annual Education Report (AER)**

August 13, 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 Leslie High School. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and state laws. The school's report contains information about student assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact Andrew W Rogers for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site [lesliek12.net](http://lesliek12.net) or you may review a copy from the Principal's office at your child's school.

For 2009-2010, Leslie High School made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. Leslie High School has become involved in Response to Intervention this past school year. The school will continue to look at ways of helping all students reach success. We appreciate the efforts of all staff and the community in the continuous improvement. The school is actively involved in the NCA/ CASI school improvement model and invites parents and the community to join us in this effort.

- Students are assigned to Leslie High School primarily by district boundaries. Leslie High School also has many students who attend from neighboring districts through Schools of Choice.
- Leslie High School is in the third year of the five year cycle for AdvancedEd/ CASI (NCA).
- The curriculum guide is provided on our school web site for all parents to access, or a hard copy can be requested in the high school office. The curriculum follows the Michigan Merit Curriculum.
- The eleventh grade students in the high school an average of 19.7 on the ACT test. Student growth is monitored on a continuous basis through the use of our district curriculum assessments.
- One hundred sixty four parents participated in parent teacher conferences. This represents thirty six percent of the parents.

- Five students were involved in dual enrollment opportunities, representing over one percent of the student body.
- Two AP courses were offered in 2009-2010.
- Twenty-one students were enrolled in the AP courses, which represents over four percent of the student body.
- Ten students earned scores high enough for college credit on the AP tests; this represents almost fifty percent of those participating in the AP program.

While the high school remains proud of our past achievement, we look forward to continuing to improve the readiness of Leslie students for post secondary opportunities. I personally congratulate our recent retirees on the past successes and challenge our new hires to continue the improvement started by your predecessors.

Sincerely,

Andrew W Rogers

## Full Annual Education Report

# District-Level Student Assessment Data for Ingham ISD, Leslie Public Schools

### Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % 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%	82.7%	31.7%	51%	14.4%	2.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	78.1%	21.9%	56.3%	20.8%	1%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	85.4%	29.2%	56.3%	12.5%	2.1%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	79.6%	14.3%	65.3%	18.4%	2%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	80.4%	33.9%	46.4%	16.1%	3.6%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	76.6%	29.8%	46.8%	23.4%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	84.9%	<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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	84.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	90%	82.7%	31.7%	51%	14.4%	2.9%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	78.5%	22.6%	55.9%	20.4%	1.1%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	63.4%	47.4%	10.5%	36.8%	47.4%	5.3%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	71%	30.8%	0%	30.8%	61.5%	7.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	79.1%	80%	34.3%	45.7%	20%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	73.8%	18%	55.7%	26.2%	0%
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	73.3%	25.7%	47.6%	20%	6.7%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	75%	29.8%	45.2%	21.2%	3.8%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.7%	82%	28%	54%	12%	6%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	77.8%	26.7%	51.1%	20%	2.2%
Male	2008-09	100%	80.9%	65.5%	23.6%	41.8%	27.3%	7.3%
Male	2009-10	100%	82.1%	72.9%	32.2%	40.7%	22%	5.1%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	88%	73.3%	25.7%	47.6%	20%	6.7%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	75.7%	30.1%	45.6%	20.4%	3.9%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	54.7%	40%	5%	35%	45%	15%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	58%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	50%	16.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	61.8%	8.8%	52.9%	29.4%	8.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75.7%	68.9%	22.2%	46.7%	24.4%	6.7%
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	87.3%	40.5%	46.8%	7.6%	5.1%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	72.9%	35.5%	37.4%	14%	13.1%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	88.9%	46.7%	42.2%	8.9%	2.2%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	79.2%	35.8%	43.4%	11.3%	9.4%
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	85.3%	32.4%	52.9%	5.9%	8.8%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	66.7%	35.2%	31.5%	16.7%	16.7%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	88.5%	41%	47.4%	7.7%	3.8%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	72.4%	36.2%	36.2%	14.3%	13.3%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	82.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	83.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	49.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	57.6%	14.3%	9.5%	4.8%	38.1%	47.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	70.5%	79.2%	41.7%	37.5%	12.5%	8.3%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	76.6%	62%	24%	38%	16%	22%
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	100%	80.5%	74.8%	24.4%	50.4%	18.5%	6.7%
All Students	2009-10	100%	87.7%	89.3%	21.4%	67.9%	8.3%	2.4%
Female	2008-09	100%	82.9%	83.8%	26.5%	57.4%	11.8%	4.4%
Female	2009-10	100%	90%	95.7%	29.8%	66%	4.3%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.2%	62.7%	21.6%	41.2%	27.5%	9.8%
Male	2009-10	100%	85.4%	81.1%	10.8%	70.3%	13.5%	5.4%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	63.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	75.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	68.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	82.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.7%	77.2%	25.4%	51.8%	16.7%	6.1%
White	2009-10	100%	91.1%	88.9%	22.2%	66.7%	8.6%	2.5%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	79.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	87%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	44.7%	26.7%	13.3%	13.3%	53.3%	20%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	59.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69.2%	54.1%	13.5%	40.5%	29.7%	16.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	81.1%	90%	20%	70%	6.7%	3.3%
Grade: 07								
All Students	2008-09	100%	79.6%	81.3%	27.1%	54.2%	13.1%	5.6%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	79.5%	32.3%	47.2%	15.7%	4.7%
Female	2008-09	100%	82.8%	90.5%	23.8%	66.7%	9.5%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	84.5%	82.9%	32.9%	50%	15.8%	1.3%
Male	2008-09	100%	76.5%	75.4%	29.2%	46.2%	15.4%	9.2%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.6%	74.5%	31.4%	43.1%	15.7%	9.8%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	64.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	76.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	69.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	71.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	84.7%	81.7%	27.9%	53.8%	13.5%	4.8%
White	2009-10	100%	87.3%	80%	33.3%	46.7%	15%	5%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	78.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	42.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	48%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	35.7%	35.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	68.3%	80%	20%	60%	10%	10%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.4%	63.3%	32.7%	30.6%	30.6%	6.1%
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	100%	75.5%	80.2%	31.1%	49.1%	16%	3.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	83.4%	85.8%	28.3%	57.5%	8.8%	5.3%
Female	2008-09	100%	78.6%	84.9%	34%	50.9%	11.3%	3.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	87.5%	94.1%	37.3%	56.9%	3.9%	2%
Male	2008-09	100%	72.6%	75.5%	28.3%	47.2%	20.8%	3.8%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	79%	21%	58.1%	12.9%	8.1%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	70.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	72.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	80.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or	2008-09	<10	65.1%	<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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Latino								
White	2008-09	100%	80.9%	80.6%	31.1%	49.5%	15.5%	3.9%
White	2009-10	100%	86.9%	86.5%	28.8%	57.7%	9%	4.5%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	35.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	48.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	62.7%	75%	21.9%	53.1%	21.9%	3.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75%	87.5%	22.9%	64.6%	4.2%	8.3%
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	94.2%	61.5%	32.7%	5.8%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	95.8%	51.6%	44.2%	4.2%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	95.8%	62.5%	33.3%	4.2%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	95.9%	49%	46.9%	4.1%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	92.9%	60.7%	32.1%	7.1%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	95.7%	54.3%	41.3%	4.3%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	92.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	92.3%	<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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	94.2%	61.5%	32.7%	5.8%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	97.8%	52.2%	45.7%	2.2%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	79.7%	78.9%	36.8%	42.1%	21.1%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	87.8%	76.9%	7.7%	69.2%	23.1%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	85.7%	94.3%	57.1%	37.1%	5.7%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	91.9%	96.7%	45%	51.7%	3.3%	0%
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	100%	87.9%	84.8%	39%	45.7%	13.3%	1.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	92.3%	90.4%	43.3%	47.1%	9.6%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	87.9%	84%	44%	40%	12%	4%
Female	2009-10	100%	92.9%	88.9%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	87.8%	85.5%	34.5%	50.9%	14.5%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	91.6%	91.5%	50.8%	40.7%	8.5%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	89.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	92%	84.8%	39%	45.7%	13.3%	1.9%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	90.3%	43.7%	46.6%	9.7%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	68.1%	65%	20%	45%	30%	5%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	80%	61.1%	16.7%	44.4%	38.9%	0%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	82.4%	20.6%	61.8%	17.6%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	82.2%	40%	42.2%	17.8%	0%
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	73.1%	39.7%	33.3%	24.4%	2.6%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	67.3%	32.7%	34.6%	24.3%	8.4%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	77.8%	42.2%	35.6%	22.2%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	71.7%	32.1%	39.6%	20.8%	7.5%
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	66.7%	36.4%	30.3%	27.3%	6.1%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	63%	33.3%	29.6%	27.8%	9.3%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	71%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	83%	74%	40.3%	33.8%	24.7%	1.3%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	67.6%	33.3%	34.3%	23.8%	8.6%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	76.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	78.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	46.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	52.8%	38.1%	14.3%	23.8%	23.8%	38.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	64.4%	58.3%	25%	33.3%	33.3%	8.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	58%	22%	36%	32%	10%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	100%	79.9%	78.2%	50.4%	27.7%	17.6%	4.2%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	82.1%	48.8%	33.3%	15.5%	2.4%
Female	2008-09	100%	80.9%	82.4%	50%	32.4%	14.7%	2.9%
Female	2009-10	100%	83%	91.5%	55.3%	36.2%	8.5%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.9%	72.5%	51%	21.6%	21.6%	5.9%
Male	2009-10	100%	81.1%	70.3%	40.5%	29.7%	24.3%	5.4%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	61.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	62.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	71.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	75.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.2%	79.8%	51.8%	28.1%	15.8%	4.4%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	82.7%	48.1%	34.6%	14.8%	2.5%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	79.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	80%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	45.5%	46.7%	33.3%	13.3%	33.3%	20%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.3%	<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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69%	54.1%	29.7%	24.3%	35.1%	10.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.5%	76.7%	50%	26.7%	23.3%	0%
Grade: 07								
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.6%	85%	54.2%	30.8%	13.1%	1.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82.2%	78.7%	30.7%	48%	18.9%	2.4%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.2%	95.2%	61.9%	33.3%	4.8%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	82.6%	81.6%	32.9%	48.7%	15.8%	2.6%
Male	2008-09	100%	81.1%	78.5%	49.2%	29.2%	18.5%	3.1%
Male	2009-10	100%	81.7%	74.5%	27.5%	47.1%	23.5%	2%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	62.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	79.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	75.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	75.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	87.9%	85.6%	55.8%	29.8%	12.5%	1.9%
White	2009-10	100%	87.6%	80%	31.7%	48.3%	17.5%	2.5%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	79.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with	2008-09	<10	45.7%	<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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Disabilities								
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	51.2%	35.7%	0%	35.7%	50%	14.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	71.9%	80%	47.5%	32.5%	20%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.4%	65.3%	20.4%	44.9%	30.6%	4.1%
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	100%	74.5%	78.3%	42.5%	35.8%	16%	5.7%
All Students	2009-10	100%	70.3%	73.5%	46%	27.4%	21.2%	5.3%
Female	2008-09	100%	74.3%	83%	47.2%	35.8%	13.2%	3.8%
Female	2009-10	100%	70.6%	76.5%	49%	27.5%	17.6%	5.9%
Male	2008-09	100%	74.8%	73.6%	37.7%	35.8%	18.9%	7.5%
Male	2009-10	100%	70%	71%	43.5%	27.4%	24.2%	4.8%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	44.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	71.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	63%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	64.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	80.8%	77.7%	41.7%	35.9%	16.5%	5.8%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
White	2009-10	100%	77.1%	74.8%	46.8%	27.9%	19.8%	5.4%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	38.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	31.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	61.6%	68.8%	31.3%	37.5%	25%	6.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	56.3%	68.8%	35.4%	33.3%	18.8%	12.5%
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	100%	83.1%	89.9%	54.4%	35.4%	7.6%	2.5%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	74.8%	37.4%	37.4%	24.3%	0.9%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	91.1%	57.8%	33.3%	8.9%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	81.1%	79.2%	34%	45.3%	20.8%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	82.9%	88.2%	50%	38.2%	5.9%	5.9%
Male	2009-10	100%	80.8%	70.4%	40.7%	29.6%	27.8%	1.9%
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	89.7%	55.1%	34.6%	7.7%	2.6%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	75.2%	37.1%	38.1%	23.8%	1%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	84.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	79.3%	<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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	60.7%	57.1%	23.8%	33.3%	42.9%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.3%	87.5%	45.8%	41.7%	12.5%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	72%	26%	46%	26%	2%
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.3%	80.2%	31.1%	49.1%	17.9%	1.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	75.9%	80.5%	26.5%	54%	12.4%	7.1%
Female	2008-09	100%	77.2%	83%	24.5%	58.5%	17%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	77%	84.3%	23.5%	60.8%	11.8%	3.9%
Male	2008-09	100%	75.4%	77.4%	37.7%	39.6%	18.9%	3.8%
Male	2009-10	100%	74.9%	77.4%	29%	48.4%	12.9%	9.7%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	74.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2009-10	<10	70.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	63.9%	<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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
White	2008-09	100%	83.5%	80.6%	30.1%	50.5%	17.5%	1.9%
White	2009-10	100%	83.1%	81.1%	27%	54.1%	12.6%	6.3%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	42.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	42.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	61.9%	78.1%	28.1%	50%	15.6%	6.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	63.1%	75%	18.8%	56.3%	16.7%	8.3%

## 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>% Advanced (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Proficient (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Partially Proficient (Level 3)</b>	<b>% Not Proficient (Level 4)</b>
English Language Arts / Reading								
Grade: 11								
All Students	2008-09	100%	59.9%	54.9%	1.1%	53.8%	33%	12.1%
All Students	2009-10	98.8%	65.2%	67.5%	5%	62.5%	23.8%	8.8%

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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>
Female	2008-09	100%	64.2%	69.8%	2.3%	67.4%	25.6%	4.7%
Female	2009-10	100%	68%	71.7%	5.7%	66%	17%	11.3%
Male	2008-09	100%	55.5%	41.7%	0%	41.7%	39.6%	18.8%
Male	2009-10	96.4%	62.3%	59.3%	3.7%	55.6%	37%	3.7%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	37.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	51.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	50.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	66.1%	55.6%	1.1%	54.4%	32.2%	12.2%
White	2009-10	100%	71.5%	67.5%	5.2%	62.3%	23.4%	9.1%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	23.5%	30%	0%	30%	50%	20%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	23.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	42.4%	40.7%	0%	40.7%	40.7%	18.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	48.5%	54.2%	8.3%	45.8%	25%	20.8%
Mathematics								
Grade: 11								

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>% Students Tested</b>	<b>State % Students Proficient</b>	<b>District % 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%	49.3%	41.8%	8.8%	33%	20.9%	37.4%
All Students	2009-10	97.5%	50.4%	54.4%	7.6%	46.8%	12.7%	32.9%
Female	2008-09	100%	47.2%	46.5%	11.6%	34.9%	18.6%	34.9%
Female	2009-10	98.1%	48.3%	59.6%	7.7%	51.9%	7.7%	32.7%
Male	2008-09	100%	51.5%	37.5%	6.3%	31.3%	22.9%	39.6%
Male	2009-10	96.4%	52.5%	44.4%	7.4%	37%	22.2%	33.3%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	16.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2008-09	<10	36.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	33.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	56.5%	42.2%	8.9%	33.3%	21.1%	36.7%
White	2009-10	98.7%	57.9%	56.6%	7.9%	48.7%	13.2%	30.3%
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	10.2%	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	11.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	28.9%	29.6%	0%	29.6%	25.9%	44.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	95.8%	30.4%	34.8%	8.7%	26.1%	8.7%	56.5%

## MI-Access

### Functional Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts							
Grade: 06							
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	86.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	89.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 07							
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	89%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	86.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	89.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	90.2%	<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>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
Grade: 08							
All Students	2008-09	<10	91.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	93%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 11							
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	89.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	89.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	91%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	93.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics							
Grade: 06							
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	84.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 07							
All Students	2008-09	<10	72.7%	<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>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
All Students	2009-10	<10	70.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	69.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	72.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	76.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	74.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08							
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	85.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	86.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 11							
All Students	2008-09	<10	70.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	74.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	75.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	76.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science							
Grade: 08							
All Students	2008-09	<10	47.5%	<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>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
Male	2008-09	<10	50.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	57.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 11							
All Students	2008-09	<10	62.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	70.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	65.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	73%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	71.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	78.6%	<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>% Surpassed (Level 1)</b>	<b>% Attained (Level 2)</b>	<b>% Emerging (Level 3)</b>
No records to display.							

### Participation

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

## 2009-10 District-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Ingham ISD, Leslie Public Schools

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		
State		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.7%	93.6%
Mathematics	99.6%	94.2%
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.7%	93.6%
Mathematics	99.6%	94.2%
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Limited English Proficient		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	123.6%	86.9%
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
Students with Disabilities		

<b>Subject</b>	<b>% Tested (Goal 95%)</b>	<b>% Proficient for AYP*</b>
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	130%	66.3%
Mathematics	130%	76.3%
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	106.6%	89.9%
Mathematics	106.3%	92.9%

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

87.22%

Black or African American

State

56.59%

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

65%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

84.47%

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

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

White

State

81.85%

District

87.22%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

Limited English Proficient

State

<b>Graduation Rate (High Schools only)</b> <b>(Goal 80%)</b>	
	65.51%
Students with Disabilities	
State	
	57.61%
District	
	73.33%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	59.8%
District	
	85%
<b>Attendance Rate</b> <b>(Goal 90%)</b>	
All Students	
State	

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
	94.7%
District	
	95.9%
Black or African American	
State	
	91%
District	
	96%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	93.7%
District	
	97%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

State

96.5%

District

100%

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

District

93.5%

White

State

95.7%

District

95.9%

**Attendance Rate  
(Goal 90%)**

Multiracial

State

94.8%

District

92.7%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

District

95.2%

<b>Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)</b>	
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	94.8%
District	95.9%

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

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

[http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709\\_22875---,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_22875---,00.html)

## Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

### Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		38%			31%		42%
2002-03		38%			31%		42%
2003-04		38%			31%		42%
2004-05		48%			43%		52%
2005-06	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%
2006-07	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%



# 2009-10 District-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Ingham ISD, Leslie Public Schools

## District AYP Status

AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	District Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
Met	Met	Met	N/A	0

## Schools in District AYP Status

School/Building	Title 1 Status	AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	Education Yes Report Card Grade	School Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
Leslie High School	No	Met	Met	Met	B	N/A	0
Leslie Middle School	No	Met	Met	Met	A	N/A	0
Woodworth Elementary School	Yes	Met	Met	Met	B	N/A	0

% of Schools making AYP: 100%

% of Schools in School Improvement status: 0%

% of Schools in Corrective Action status: 0%

% of Schools in Restructuring status: 0%

% of Title I Schools making AYP: 100%  
 % of Title I Schools in School Improvement status: 0%  
 % of Title I Schools in Corrective Action status: 0%  
 % of Title I Schools in Restructuring status: 0%

## December, 2009 District-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Ingham ISD, Leslie Public Schools

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the District	0	31	60	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 District with Emergency Certification	0%		
	District Aggregate	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
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 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	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
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	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
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	†	†	†	†	†
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	21	32	32	3
Black	18	54	37	9	#
Hispanic	4	40	34	24	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	†	†	†	†
American Indian	1	†	†	†	†
Unclassified	1	†	†	†	†
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	9	73	22	4	#
Not SD	91	23	43	30	3
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	2	60	33	8	#
Not ELL	98	27	42	28	3

# Rounds to zero

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Participation Rate for IEP Students</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>
4	Math	82.08	2.771	81.98	2.786	91.89	3.063
	Reading	72.05	2.592	72.01	2.63	81.16	3.53
8	Math	76.39	2.561	76.21	2.578	93.13	4.12
	Reading	70.72	3.239	70.46	3.298	85.15	4.505