

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Eaton ISD, Charlotte Public Schools, Charlotte Alternative Education

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: 07									
All Students	2008-09	<10	79.6%	78.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	82%	83.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	82.8%	81%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	76.5%	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	79.6%	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	61.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	84.7%	79.2%	<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)
White	2009-10	<10	87.3%	84.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	68.3%	69.9%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade: 08									
All Students	2008-09	<10	75.5%	69.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	83.4%	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	87.5%	82.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	72.6%	61.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	79.4%	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	70.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	65.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	80.9%	69.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	86.9%	79.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	62.7%	58.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	75%	69.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics									
Grade: 07									

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	<10	82.6%	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	82.2%	82.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	84.2%	86.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	81.1%	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	81.7%	84.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	63.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	87.9%	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	87.6%	84.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 08									
All Students	2008-09	<10	74.5%	69.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	70.3%	62.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	70.6%	63.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	74.8%	68.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	70%	61.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	44.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	80.8%	71%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	77.1%	63.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	61.6%	58.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	56.3%	47.7%	<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)
Science									
Grade: 08									
All Students	2008-09	<10	76.3%	69%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	75.9%	77.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	77%	76.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	75.4%	65.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.9%	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	63.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	83.5%	69.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.1%	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	61.9%	57.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	63.1%	70.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

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)
English Language Arts / Reading									
Grade: 11									
All Students	2008-09	88.2%	59.9%	61%	26.7%	0%	26.7%	33.3%	40%
All Students	2009-10	96.4%	65.2%	65.5%	11.1%	0%	11.1%	40.7%	48.1%
Female	2008-09	<10	64.2%	66.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	92.9%	68%	68%	15.4%	0%	15.4%	46.2%	38.5%
Male	2008-09	<10	55.5%	56%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	100%	62.3%	63%	7.1%	0%	7.1%	35.7%	57.1%
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	44.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	50.7%	70%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	87.5%	66.1%	61%	21.4%	0%	21.4%	35.7%	42.9%
White	2009-10	96.3%	71.5%	64.9%	11.5%	0%	11.5%	38.5%	50%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	42.4%	58%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	48.5%	55.4%	18.2%	0%	18.2%	36.4%	45.5%
Mathematics									
Grade: 11									

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	88.2%	49.3%	50.2%	13.3%	0%	13.3%	20%	66.7%
All Students	2009-10	92.9%	50.4%	51.2%	3.8%	0%	3.8%	15.4%	80.8%
Female	2008-09	<10	47.2%	41.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	85.7%	48.3%	50.4%	8.3%	0%	8.3%	8.3%	83.3%
Male	2008-09	<10	51.5%	57.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	100%	52.5%	52%	0%	0%	0%	21.4%	78.6%
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	32.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	33.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	87.5%	56.5%	50.2%	14.3%	0%	14.3%	21.4%	64.3%
White	2009-10	92.6%	57.9%	50%	4%	0%	4%	12%	84%
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	28.9%	34%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	90.9%	30.4%	37.5%	10%	0%	10%	0%	90%

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: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	91.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	91.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	87.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	93%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	80.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	85.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	78%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	86.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 08								
All Students	2008-09	<10	47.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	42.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	50.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	30.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	57.4%	<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)
No records to display.								

Participation

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

MEAP-Access

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

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Eaton ISD, Charlotte Public Schools, Charlotte Alternative Education

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	94%
Mathematics	99.1%	94.6%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.1%	64.7%
Mathematics	97.1%	56.3%
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
District		
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		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	98.5%	95.2%
Mathematics	97%	91.8%
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	99.6%	93.9%
Mathematics	99.3%	94.8%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	93.9%	64.7%
Mathematics	93.9%	56.3%
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	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Students with Disabilities		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	100.4%	74.9%
Mathematics	94.8%	84.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	98.2%	90.9%
Mathematics	96.8%	92%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

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

67.01%

School

<5%

Black or African American

State

56.59%

District

<10

American Indian or Alaska Native

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

State

65%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

84.47%

District

<10

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

District

<10

School

<10

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

White

State

81.85%

District

68.25%

School

<5%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

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

District

<10

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

50%

School

<10

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

38.81%

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

School

5%

Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)

All Students

State

94.7%

District

95.7%

School

95%

Black or African American

State

91%

District

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	95.6%
School	
	99.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	93.7%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	96.5%
District	
	96.5%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	
	94.1%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

District

93.8%

School

94.5%

White

State

95.7%

District

95.8%

School

94.9%

Multiracial

State

94.8%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

District

94.1%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

District

98.5%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

District

94.5%

School

96.4%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	94.8%
District	95.7%
School	94.6%

* 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%

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Eaton ISD, Charlotte Public Schools, Charlotte Alternative Education

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
No	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	No Grade	Corrective Action	3

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Eaton ISD, Charlotte Public Schools, Charlotte Alternative Education

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	6	3	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