



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

December 3, 2003

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Thomas D. Watkins, Jr., Chairman

SUBJECT: Reading First Annual Performance Report for Year One

Reading First is Subpart B of Title I of the *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001*. Michigan is the first state in the nation to roll out funding to eligible districts. This board item will give a brief presentation to highlight the overall results of the first annual performance report required by the NCLB legislation. We are making progress but obviously we have a long way to go to ensure that all of Michigan's children learn to read well by the end of third grade.

Michigan's Reading First grant program has completed the first year of implementation for the 2002-2003 school year. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) funded 49 buildings in the first round and has added 70 more buildings in the second round, bringing the total to 119 funded buildings in 23 districts. Three of these districts had buildings funded in both rounds one and two, thus adding to the size of their participation in Reading First.

Attachment A provides an overview of the students' achievement in reading through the Reading First Program.

Attachment

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • HERBERT S. MOYER – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • JOHN C. AUSTIN – TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Reading First Progress Report, 2002-2003 School Year Overview of Students' Achievement in Reading

Prepared by Joanne F. Carlisle, PhD
University of Michigan Department of Education

Point 1: Students performance on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills should be regarded as baseline data; there are no measures of reading achievement from the preceding year that can serve as a basis for determining gains.

Instead, we can examine the extent to which students are meeting grade-level expectations in reading (performance at or above the 50th %ile) and the extent to which students are significantly underachieving in reading (performance below the 25th %ile).

In addition, we can examine students' performance on DIBELS to determine whether there are increases in percentage of students who "meet standards" across the year and where there is a decrease in the percentage of students who "need intensive instruction." These measures would indicate whether classroom instruction is leading to improved reading skills.

Point 2: On the ITBS, the majority of students are not meeting grade-level expectations. Overall, for the RF schools in spring of 2003, 31% of the first graders, 22% of the second graders, and 19% of the third graders demonstrated reading skills at or above grade level.

Point 3: Almost half of the students in RF schools showed significant underachievement in reading on the spring 2003 ITBS. Marked underachievement is important for assessment of the challenge teachers face in trying to improve reading achievement. The extensive underachievement of students in RF schools suggests the need for intensive remedial measures if we are to bring about significant improvement in students' reading. The students with reading achievement below the 25th percentile are the ones most likely to be "left behind."

Point 4: There is significant variation in the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations in reading among schools in the larger districts. Appreciation of the variability is important because it suggests that schools with significant "risk" factors can nonetheless provide effective reading instruction for students.

Point 5: On DIBELS, there are signs of improvement in reading skills that are attributable to teachers' instructional practices. In particular, across the year, increases in the number of students meeting grade-level standards were found in two areas: phonemic awareness and nonsense word reading. In these same areas, some districts were able to reduce the extent of underachievement to less than 10% of the students.

- Point 6:** Small percentages of students in the major categories of students at risk for reading difficulties are reading at or above grade level. The results we report on the disaggregated groups must be understood as representing trends. Because of the incomplete information in SRSD, it is not possible to provide an accurate overview of the reading achievement of students in the major risk categories.
- Point 7:** In the up-coming years, the reading achievement of students in RF schools and districts will be most readily interpreted if accompanied by an evaluation of compliance with RF requirements, including implementation of appropriate principles and methods of instruction, participating in professional development activities, and support of school personnel.



Annual Performance Report
for
Reading First

Form Approved
OMB No. 1810-0666
Expiration Date: February 29, 2004

Due Date	Period Covered
November 30, 2003	School Year 2002-2003/FY 2002
November 30, 2004	School Year 2003-2004/FY 2003
November 30, 2005	School Year 2004-2005/FY 2004
November 30, 2006	School Year 2005-2006/FY 2005
November 30, 2007	School Year 2006-2007/FY 2006
November 30, 2008	School Year 2007-2008/FY 2007

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0666. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 20 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington DC 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Reading First, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202-6201.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT
for the
READING FIRST PROGRAM

Legal Name of State Educational Agency Submitting This Report: Michigan Department of Education	
Address: Hannah Building, 4 th Floor 608 W. Allegan St. Lansing, MI 48933	
Contact Person for this Report Name: Faith Stevens Position: Reading First Coordinator Telephone: 517-241-2479 Fax: 517-335-2473 Email: stevensf@michigan.gov	
Typed Name and Title of Authorizing State Official: Mr. Thomas D. Watkins, Jr. Superintendent of Public Instruction, Michigan Department of Education	
_____ Signature of Authorizing State Official	_____ Date

Annual Performance Report for the Reading First Program

I. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

A. Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies

- A-1. Has LEA eligibility changed from what was identified in the State's approved plan (e.g., new data became available)? If so, provide the current total number of eligible LEAs and the percentage this represents of the total LEAs in the State.**

Michigan has not changed its eligibility criteria as established in May 2002. Eighty-three local education agencies (including public school academies) were eligible for Reading First. Michigan has 553 local education agencies. Fifteen percent of Michigan's LEAs were eligible to apply for Reading First funds.

- A-2. Has the State held a subgrant competition during this reporting period? If so, provide the following:**

◆ Number of rounds of competition that have occurred:

Michigan has held two rounds of subgrant applications.

The first round of grants was awarded in August 2002 and the second competition was held in the winter of 2003. Applications for Round 2 were due on February 28, 2003. Awards were announced in May 2003 with official award letters sent on June 2, 2003.

◆ Number of eligible LEAs that applied per round:

In Round one, MDE received proposals from forty-four of the eighty-three eligible local education agencies (53%). These proposals represented 133 buildings. MDE received 42 applications representing 52 eligible districts (63%) in Round 2. The applications for Round 2 represented 161 buildings.

◆ Number of awards per round (include total number of LEAs receiving awards and the total number of participating schools represented by those awards)

In Round 1, MDE funded 51 buildings in ten districts. Two LEAs were eventually dropped in Round 1 with 49 buildings remaining. In Round 2 an additional 70 buildings were added bringing the total number of buildings to 119 and total number of districts to 23. Three districts have buildings funded in both Rounds 1 and 2.

- A-3. When will the next competition(s) occur?**

The next competition will occur in 2005 when all districts must reapply.

A-4. If the State has made subgrant awards, has all required information been entered in the SEDL database? If not, provide the State's timeline for entering this information.

All buildings for Round 1 have been entered, and Round 2 buildings are under way. Data entry will be complete by November 1, 2003.

A-5. List LEAs and/or schools for which Reading First subgrant awards have been discontinued and indicate the reason for discontinuation.

Two charter schools have been discontinued:

Mosaica Academy of Saginaw—The major problem involved having the literacy coach stand in as the building principal because the principal was fired before school started in the fall. By January of 2003 (awards were announced on August 12, 2002) the comprehensive program was still stacked unboxed in the front office. An entire semester had passed and the materials still had not been distributed to the teachers. No professional development had taken place, and the literacy coach was unable to perform her duties as assigned. The lead contact for the PSA called to say that they were not ready to implement at this time. They were discontinued and given the option of reapplying in Round 2. Extensive documentation has been kept on file.

Timberland Academy in Grand Rapids—In this case, the management company, National Heritage Academies, had already purchased a comprehensive program prior to the award for Reading First and wanted to reimburse itself for materials purchased prior to the award date. The building also insisted on using a supplemental program instead of the comprehensive program selected in its grant application. The literacy coach in this building had established a schedule for working three days per week from 8-2 and two days per week from 2-8. She did not perform the duties of a literacy coach as required in Michigan's Grant Announcement and Instructions. This became a clear case of "layering on" and a situation in which the building administrators wanted to continue its existing program, using Reading First funds for purposes other than those required in the legislation. A meeting with the administrators from the management company was held to discuss the circumstances and present the documentation. They were discontinued and given the option of reapplying for Round 2. Extensive documentation is also on file.

A-6. Describe the nature and extent of the participation of non-public school students.

In Round 1, Detroit submitted its grant application without consulting the non-public schools within the attendance boundaries of targeted buildings, so we added this requirement for our Round 2 application process. Districts were required to submit copies of a letter inviting non-public school personnel to a planning meeting as part of the grant application process in Round 2. Districts are required to offer professional development to teachers in non-public schools that are located within the attendance boundaries of funded schools. Detroit has promised to pay a stipend to teachers in non-public schools for attending training as they do for Detroit teachers. We have a small amount of participation in professional development among non public schools. Invitations were extended, and only a few buildings have decided to send their teachers. Three of ten districts funded in Round 1 have had staff from non-publics participate in professional development and in Round 2; two of sixteen districts have staff from non-publics participating.

B. State Professional Development and Technical Assistance Activities

B-1. Describe differences, if any, between the professional development and technical assistance activities that have occurred and the plan for these activities as outlined in the State's approved application.

The program promised in the application is being carried out. In addition, MDE also added two series of coaching seminars, one for literacy coaches and Reading First Facilitators and another for administrators and Reading First Facilitators. For professional development in the essential components of reading instruction, MDE contracted with Sopris West and Dr. Louisa Moats to provide nine days of training in the essential components of reading instruction for our literacy coaches in funded buildings, Reading First Facilitators, and master trainers from our Regional Literacy Training Centers (RLTCs). Each of the 119 funded buildings is required to have a literacy coach, and training in Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) is mandatory. In a few cases, literacy coaches who were hired late have been required to attend LETRS training in Colorado at Sopris West headquarters to make up the sessions they missed. For the statewide professional development component, the Regional Literacy Training Center trainers will provide training for Michigan's MLPP trainers (Michigan Literacy Progress Profile) who will in turn provide training in our statewide initiative. This is described extensively in Michigan's Reading First grant application in the section concerning our statewide initiative.

In addition to LETRS, all coaches and facilitators have participated in four days of training in *Leading Literacy Dialogues* with Peg Luidens of Luidens Consulting. This training supports the coaching model and scaffolds professional dialogues around using data to inform instruction and raising student achievement. Literacy coaches are required to have weekly grade level meetings with teachers to support teachers in the change process. Literacy coaches with the support of Reading First Facilitators provide LETRS modules for teachers in funded buildings.

Administrators in funded buildings, key central office personnel, and Reading First Facilitators are also required to attend four days of training in *Leading Groups and Facilitating Change* with Peg Luidens. These sessions support building principals and central office staff in changing the building culture and helping teachers implement effective classroom practice. Administrators have been very appreciative of the opportunity to enhance their repertoire as they implement Reading First in their buildings, and have given this seminar a very high rating.

B-2. Estimate the percentage of K-3 teachers in the State (including teachers from both Reading First and non-Reading First schools) who participated in any Reading First professional development activities.

In Reading First buildings, 100% of K-3 teachers (both classroom and special education teachers) are participating in professional development in LETRS, DIBELS, and the comprehensive program. Each district in Round 2 has been required to submit its professional development schedule along with its schedule for grade level meetings. Professional development consists of 50 hours (over a two year period) from the publisher of the comprehensive program, 50 hours of LETRS, and weekly grade level meetings with the literacy coach. These schedules were required prior to approval of building budgets as a means of insuring that professional development actually takes place, and attendance is mandatory. In Round 1, we had 623 teachers participating in Reading First buildings. Preliminary counts for this fall with the addition of Round 2 buildings indicate that we now have 415 3rd grade teachers, 409 2nd grade teachers, 390 1st grade teachers, and 294 kindergarten teachers.

For the statewide training of teachers in non-funded buildings, the RLTCs have begun their “trainer of trainers” model by piloting LETRS modules 1-3, and in some cases modules 4-6 as well. There are a total of nine modules, so LETRS training will be completed in the second year of funding for the RLTCs. The statewide initiative has begun this fall. The reason that this training is just beginning in our second year is that Michigan received initial training from Sopris West in a very rough draft format. We did not receive final versions of the LETRS modules 4-6 until

the June 2003 training and modules 7-9 arrived in July 2003. The 2002 draft versions of these modules were not ready for mass distribution, so all RLTCs waited to begin training until after they received the final copies of these materials. Preliminary estimates indicate that 301 trainers and teachers are currently participating in LETRS modules across the state. In addition, several overviews of the LETRS training have been presented at conferences as a way to recruit and encourage participation across the state.

D. Implementation Issues

D-1. Has the State encountered any obstacles or circumstances that are affecting its ability to implement Reading First successfully and in accordance with its approved plan? If so, describe the issues related to implementation, the State's plan to resolve them, and whether technical assistance from the Department is needed.

Because Michigan was the first state to roll out RF funds to districts, and because we were the first state to begin professional development in the essential components of reading instruction, we had only rough draft versions of Sopris West's LETRS program for our Round 1 sessions. In some cases, the PowerPoint and handouts arrived at MDE a day before the national trainers were due to begin training. On several occasions the secretary was stuffing packets the night before the participants arrived. This was a capacity issue on the part of Sopris West, and communication with Sopris West became quite a problem at times. We are now working with the fourth contact person since we began with Sopris West. Hopefully other states will benefit from our experience, and modules are now printed in their final forms.

We also ran into last minute attempts to change fee structures for presenters from Sopris West. An agreement was reached and the original prices quoted were honored. Almost a full year after we began professional development for Round 1 literacy coaches and facilitators, Michigan received the final version of each module including presenters' manuals and participants copies. This caused a delay in the delivery of LETRS modules for our Round 1 teachers. This professional development has begun this fall and will enhance teachers' understandings of the essential components of reading instruction. There may be a quality control issue here, since such a lag occurred in the time Round 1 coaches received this training before they began their training for the teachers. Round 2 coaches and facilitators finished the training on August 15, 2003 and immediately began preparing for delivery of this content to teachers. Being able to use the information so soon after completing the LETRS training could have a significant impact on the quality of professional development experiences between Round 1 and 2 staff.

Another issue that could have an impact is the fact that the first version of the training provided by Sopris West was not as polished or complete as the second version. There was also an issue with one of the national trainers sent by Sopris West who did not have the depth of understanding necessary to answer questions posed by participants. She read “the script” without providing the research and documentation needed when participants inquired. This person was replaced for the second three-day session for Modules 4-6. This group trained in Round 1 had three different trainers and things were a bit disjointed.

At this point, all training from the national trainers has been completed and Michigan’s Reading First Facilitators, Literacy Coaches, and RLTC master trainers have begun the LETRS training sessions for teachers. Even though teachers in Round 1 did not receive the full LETRS modules that will be given out this year, they did receive professional development in the comprehensive program and in the DIBELS assessment. In addition, they participated in the *Leading Literacy Dialogues* and literacy coaches and Reading First Facilitators applied these techniques in weekly grade level meetings. All Round 1 grantees have been required to submit their schedules for professional development for Year 2. Buildings that have high percentages of students not meeting grade level expectations are also being required to submit progress monitoring and more frequent updates concerning student achievement. Additional technical assistance will be available for these buildings.

Part II: ACHIEVEMENT IMPACT

A. Local Educational Agencies Making the Largest Gains in Reading

Reading achievement in Reading First (RF) schools and districts was assessed by administration of the reading-related subtests of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), a standardized test published by Riverside Publishing. The ITBS was not administered in RF schools in the fall of 2002. As a result, it is not possible to report gains on the ITBS for the 2002-2003 school year.

B. Progress of LEAs and Schools Participating in Reading First: Students Meeting Grade-Level Expectations

Reading subtests of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) provide indices of proficiency in reading and language skills that map onto the five components of reading instruction required by the Reading First legislation. The following ITBS subtests were administered to students in RF schools in grades 1 through 3:

Vocabulary	assesses knowledge of word meanings
Word Analysis	assesses ability to analyze word structure for purposes of reading and spelling
Listening Language	assesses abilities to understand language presented orally assesses components of language, such as spelling and grammar
Reading Comprehension	assesses comprehension of written texts

Students were considered to be meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations if their performance was at or above the 50th percentile, using national norms. Nine districts or local educational agencies (LEAs) made up the first cohort in RF in Michigan. In these districts/LEAs, there are forty-nine RF schools. In the spring of 2003, 2,896 first graders, 2,842 second graders, and 3,086 third graders took the ITBS. Table 1 shows the number of students who took the ITBS in grades 1 through 3 in each district.

Table 1: Number of Students in Each RF District or LEA Who Took the ITBS in Spring 2003 (by Grade)

District	Number of Students by Grade			
	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Dearborn	175	200	217	197
Detroit City	1143	1429	1437	1696
Holland	141	165	157	143
Kalamazoo	205	193	207	212
Linden Academy	67	65	77	77
Muskegon	316	347	301	282
Port Huron	242	231	229	224
Saginaw	216	239	196	236
Threshold Academy	29	27	21	19

Table 1 in the Appendix shows the number of students at each grade level whose total reading score on the ITBS was at or above grade level and also the number of students who took that subtest in that grade-level and school.

B-2: Performance of Students in Risk Categories

Analysis of the reading achievement of students in major risk categories, as defined by Part A of the No Child Left Behind legislation, was carried out as requested. To disaggregate the risk groups, we used fields from the Single Record Student Database (SRSD) which is maintained by the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI). We have drawn data from this source for Fall 2002 and Spring 2003. The fields used to identify students in different risk categories are the same ones that the state uses to disaggregate data for analysis of students' performance on Michigan's reading assessment. The risk categories are as follows: limited English proficiency, economic disadvantage, students with disabilities, and major ethnic groups. The ethnic groups listed in NCLB, Part A, include white, African American or Black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, Native American, and Pacific Islander. This last group is of such small numbers in Michigan that it was not included in the tables showing the reading achievement of ethnic groups.

Tables 2 through 5 in the Appendix give the results for students in risk categories by district, school, and grade level on the subtests of the ITBS.

We need to emphasize the possibility that the counts of students in the risk categories are not always accurate in SRSD, as of the spring of 2003. Local data collection and entry standards vary by district and by school; our analysis has shown that for some of the risk categories, the data entry was either not carried out fully (or at all in some cases) or else was inaccurate, when one checks with the school administration in that district. Perhaps the greatest amount of missing information concerned the students with limited English proficiency (LEP). For the LEP table (Table 5 in the Appendix), we have provided results for only those districts and schools that had entered information regarding language status of their students in SRSD.

We have shared our concerns about the missing data in the SRSD with CEPI, and it is hoped that the data entry at the school and district levels will be more accurate and complete in subsequent years.

B-3: Referral Rate for Special Education

The rate of referral for special education in RF schools for Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 was determined by analysis of data in the state's SRSD that indicates referrals to special education. For Reading First schools, overall, the referral rate, expressed as a percentage of all students in these schools, is as follows: for kindergarten, 4% for the fall and 5% for the spring; for first grade, 6% for the fall and 7 % for the spring; for second grade, 8% for the fall and 8 % for the spring; and for third grade, 9 % for the fall and 11 % for the spring.

Table 2 (shown below) gives the referral rate (percentage of students referred to special education) for each RF district and school.

Table 2: Percentage of Students Referred to Special Education in the Fall of 2002 and Spring of 2003

District	School	Percentage of Students							
		Fall				Spring			
		Grade K	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade K	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
Dearborn	Miller Elementary	3	2	3	3	3	0	4	3
Dearborn	Salina Elementary	0	1	1	4	0	3	3	5
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem.	0	5	10	12	0	5	10	15
Detroit City	Beard Elementary	0	4	9	6	0	5	8	6
Detroit City	Berry Elementary	4	9	9	9	4	13	6	9
Detroit City	Blackwell Institute	2	2	0	4	2	4	0	3
Detroit City	Carleton Elementary	3	7	6	9	3	8	6	10
Detroit City	Clinton Elementary	0	5	5	12	0	5	7	14
Detroit City	Cooper Elementary	0	2	2	7	0	2	2	13
Detroit City	Grant Elementary	0	6	0	5	0	9	0	5
Detroit City	Grayling Elementary	0	7	7	13	2	7	12	13
Detroit City	Greenfield Elementary	1	8	6	6	1	8	5	8
Detroit City	Higgins Elementary	1	12	8	17	8	12	10	20
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem.	0	6	8	18	0	6	10	20
Detroit City	Jones Elementary	0	10	5	14	4	5	3	12
Detroit City	Keith Elementary	10	4	8	6	11	6	8	11
Detroit City	Larned Elementary	0	4	6	4	0	4	3	0
Detroit City	Law Elementary	2	3	7	5	2	4	7	7
Detroit City	Macomb Elementary	2	8	12	3	2	17	12	5
Detroit City	Maybury Elementary	0	3	4	7	0	2	4	6
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem.	6	5	8	6	0	6	6	6
Detroit City	Sherrard K-8	3	10	5	2	5	13	8	8
Detroit City	Webster Elementary	4	6	6	7	9	7	7	11
Detroit City	Winship K-8	0	0	18	14	0	0	15	12
Holland	Longfellow	0	2	0	6	0	3	2	6
Holland	Van Raalte	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2
Holland	Washington	0	0	8	0	0	0	8	0
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem.	5	6	39	19	5	6	43	19
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elementary	4	12	7	0	4	15	13	0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Int. Studies	11	5	13	10	11	5	13	10
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elementary	9	8	10	7	14	8	14	5
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem.	0	2	9	2	4	6	11	4
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	3	9	5	3	3	12	6
Muskegon	Angell	7	7	7	12	10	11	7	17
Muskegon	Marquette	4	9	13	11	4	10	9	13
Muskegon	McLaughlin	9	8	14	15	9	8	10	19
Muskegon	Moon	7	10	20	24	7	10	24	39
Muskegon	Nelson	6	9	12	10	8	13	14	12
Muskegon	Oakview	6	5	8	8	6	5	8	10
Port Huron	Cleveland	8	8	16	6	6	14	2	6
Port Huron	Garfield	4	10	6	20	5	9	9	17
Port Huron	Harrison	13	5	11	14	19	5	9	16
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson	6	7	14	16	6	4	8	20
Saginaw	Heavenrich	9	10	14	11	9	8	17	12
Saginaw	Herig	8	11	10	16	8	11	17	19
Saginaw	Jerome	10	20	15	21	17	20	15	21
Saginaw	Longfellow	7	11	7	11	10	13	14	14
Saginaw	Nelle Haley	9	25	13	11	9	28	13	11
Threshold	Threshold Academy	3	17	22	44	3	13	22	50

B-4: Percentage of Students in RF Districts/LEAs Reading At or Above Grade Level

Table 3 shows the percent of students in each RF district/LEA at each grade level whose total reading score on the ITBS was at or above the 50% percentile. The state average is given as well.

Table 3: Percentage of Students At or Above Grade Level on the Total Score of the ITBS by District/LEA

District/LEA	Percentage of Students		
	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Dearborn	20	25	21
Detroit City	35	20	13
Holland	40	27	28
Kalamazoo	45	33	36
Linden Academy	32	21	22
Muskegon	15	17	24
Port Huron	28	27	32
Saginaw	25	29	20
Threshold Academy	15	0	26
State Average	31	22	19

III. PROGRAM EVALUATION

A. External Evaluation

- A-1. Attach the evaluation report conducted by the external evaluator as described in the State's Reading First plan. If this report is not yet available, indicate the timeline for its completion.**

Michigan's Reading First Progress Report prepared by the University of Michigan is attached.

IV. USE OF FUNDS

A. Subgrant Funds

- A-1. For this reporting period, indicate the amount of Reading First funds that have been subgranted to eligible local educational agencies as of the date of this report. If this amounts to less than 80% of the State's award, indicate the State's plans to subgrant the remaining funds.**

Our accounting department keeps records on a cumulative basis for each fiscal year from October 1 to September 30. Since Round Two awards occurred prior to September 30, 2003, the total amount currently approved in our MEIS electronic grants access system totals \$19,368,000. We do

have one district without an approved budget and are working with them to provide technical assistance so that they can submit and approve a budget. 80% of Michigan's first year award is \$22,779,349.60. Once all grantees have an approved budget, the total amount in the system will be \$21,068,250. The remaining amount is left as a result of dropping two buildings from the program as explained in Section I A-5. We will use a Targeted Assistance process for successful grantees similar to the system described for federal grants to states.

B. Funds for State Use

B-1. For this reporting period, indicate the amount of Reading First funds that have been expended for professional and preservice development. Does this amount represent less than or equal to 65 percent of the total funds reserved for State use?

Through September 30, 2003, Michigan has expended \$1,252,886.55 for professional development. Sixty-five percent of the twenty percent set aside for statewide professional development of \$28,474,187 is \$3,701,644.31. \$2,448,757.76 remains in the account. However, \$2,000,000 has been encumbered for our eight Regional Literacy Training Centers in contracts awarded at \$250,000 each.

B-2. For this reporting period, indicate the amount of Reading First funds that have been expended for technical assistance to participating LEAs. Does this amount represent less than or equal to 25 percent of the total funds reserved for State use?

\$887,349.77 has been spent to date in technical assistance to participating LEAs. Twenty-five percent of the total funds reserved for State use are \$1,423,709.35. \$536,359.80 remains for technical assistance.

B-3. For this reporting period, indicate the amount of Reading First funds that have been expended for planning, administration and reporting. Does this amount represent less than or equal to 10 percent of the total funds reserved for State use?

The total amount spent for planning and administration is \$346,631.37. Ten percent of the total funds reserved for State use is \$569,483.74. \$222,852.37 remains in the account.

V. PROFILES OF SUCCESSFUL SITES (OPTIONAL)

A. School Profiles

- A-1. Provide a narrative description of the Reading First program at one or more of the State's most successful participating sites. This is requested to provide an illustrative example of the impact of the State's implementation of instructional practices based on scientifically based reading research. *States are not required to submit these profiles.***

Here are a few thoughts from the Reading First Facilitator for Kalamazoo Public Schools, about why Kalamazoo is one of our most successful sites:

- Kalamazoo as a district has literacy as its primary focus.
- Central administration is fully behind our efforts (even though we have disagreements from time to time).
- School principals participate. They regularly visit classrooms and attend our staff trainings whenever possible. They support us in any way we ask.
- Coach Cohort: We probably meet more often than other cohorts. In the beginning of the year (both last year and this year) we have been meeting almost every week. (From 2:00 to 4:00 on Fridays.) We plan all of our staff training together and deliver it, for the most part together.
(There are some in-building meetings that the coach does alone; however--we still plan those meetings together.)
- Coaches: All of our coaches are in the blocks every morning (after things get rolling). Facilitators do the same. We give regular feedback to teachers (often using that form) that is positive, but also moves them forward with a few suggestions. Coaches do much modeling and participating in the blocks. They do not just observe. Coaches and teachers talk often, even if it is not pleasant. We maintain a "coming from strengths" attitude in dealing with teachers.
- Grade Level Meetings: We do have them weekly. Last year, we mostly did "how to" things. This year, our focus is to use the Intervention Plan Form and consistently evaluate and plan for specific needs. (We did do this last year, but we need to do it more consistently and do a better job of it.)

As I mentioned, the coaches work together. We have created a very strong "coach team." The team consists of the facilitator and the coaches. By creating this type of team, the coaches know that they can count on each other and also on me. Also, I am blessed with very high quality coaches in the first place. The facilitator for the other five buildings has used this same model with Cohort 2 coaches.

VI. TARGETED ASSISTANCE GRANT (BEGINNING IN FY 2004)**A. Application for Targeted Assistance Grant**

- A-1. Indicate whether the State intends the data included in this report also to be reviewed in consideration for a Targeted Assistance Grant. Please see the timeline on page 2 for deadline information.

- B-2. For this reporting period, indicate the amount of Reading First funds that have been expended for technical assistance to participating LEAs. Does this amount represent less than or equal to 25 percent of the total funds reserved for State use?

- B-3. For this reporting period, indicate the amount of Reading First funds that have been expended for planning, administration and reporting. Does this amount represent less than or equal to 10 percent of the total funds reserved for State use?

APPENDIX

Table 1: Students meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations on ITBS subtests by RF schools

Table 2: Students in racial/ethnic categories meeting grade-level expectations on ITBS subtests by RF school

Table 3: Students with disabilities meeting grade-level expectations on ITBS subtests by RF schools

Table 4: Students with economic disadvantage meeting grade-level expectations on ITBS subtests by RF schools

Table 5: Students with limited English proficiency meeting grade-level expectations on ITBS subtests by RF schools

Table 1: Students Meeting Grade-Level Expectations by ITBS Subtest

Name of Assessment: <u>ITBS</u>		Component Measured: <u>Vocabulary</u>					
LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency Year 2002-2003					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	19	85	34	92	27	85
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	11	110	9	119	9	109
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	16	57	13	51	16	71
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	78	160	26	132	37	131
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	2	45	12	28	12	53
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	55	114	46	135	38	145
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	26	52	27	65	18	80
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	39	66	9	75	11	94
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	30	64	9	63	10	94
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	5	72	7	61	10	98
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	7	65	4	67	9	63
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	13	43	3	41	5	60
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	11	86	14	81	14	84
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	26	61	11	71	3	73
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	34	45	13	59	5	54
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	27	37	6	34	17	52
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	9	25	7	38	5	27
Detroit City	Law Elem School	39	99	10	93	10	145
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	9	56	6	55	8	65
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	9	45	21	68	11	78
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	22	66	6	69	3	72
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	3	57	2	40	2	45
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	11	62	5	64	2	43
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	3	23	5	33	11	41
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	22	67	19	46	14	47
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	20	52	13	69	9	51
Holland	Washington Elem School	21	46	13	42	9	43
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	11	25	9	27	10	30
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	13	29	5	17	10	17
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	15	35	16	63	17	46
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	20	50	17	49	20	56
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	26	53	19	50	21	60
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	19	65	11	77	18	77
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	5	46	7	42	5	42
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	6	72	9	50	7	54
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	4	59	5	35	12	49
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	10	53	15	60	5	30
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	7	55	9	44	8	45
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	12	60	16	69	24	57
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	7	42	8	44	12	38
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	21	66	23	66	23	51
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	10	62	14	50	17	47
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	24	61	17	68	29	85
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	8	62	14	58	8	64
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	21	40	10	41	15	59
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	7	58	20	35	8	38
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	1	42	1	27	5	37
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	10	36	8	33	5	35
Threshold	Threshold Academy	4	27	0	21	4	19

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponent Measured: Word Analysis

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency Year 2002-2003					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	24	85	37	92	27	85
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	33	110	29	118	26	109
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	38	57	20	51	22	68
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	64	158	37	133	39	129
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	7	45	21	28	19	46
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	47	114	43	135	26	141
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	18	52	20	65	33	78
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	37	66	7	74	8	92
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	24	64	17	62	17	69
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	10	72	5	60	11	96
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	11	65	9	66	17	63
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	16	43	2	41	12	60
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	27	86	20	81	9	82
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	23	61	15	71	8	72
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	13	45	19	59	6	54
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	23	37	10	34		0
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	15	25	9	38		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	39	99	8	93	26	137
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	10	55	7	55	13	66
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	18	45	25	68	29	78
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	29	66	24	69	4	71
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	7	57	1	41	4	41
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	14	64	12	64	6	44
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	4	23	9	31	9	36
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	32	67	8	46	21	49
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	31	52	19	69	9	51
Holland	Washington Elem School	23	46	15	42	10	43
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	15	24	7	27	9	30
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	15	29	5	17	6	17
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	13	35	13	63	15	46
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	20	50	14	49	15	55
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	26	53	24	50	15	60
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	20	65	24	77	19	76
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	12	46	10	42	9	42
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	5	72	9	50	7	56
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	6	60	1	35	9	49
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	10	53	9	60	3	30
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	7	55	7	44	7	44
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	24	60	11	68	15	57
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	11	42	8	44	6	38
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	23	66	21	66	13	52
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	13	62	5	50	15	47
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	27	61	13	68	15	84
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	14	62	9	58	6	63
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	20	40	11	41	11	59
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	13	58	27	34	10	36
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	1	42	1	27	3	36
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	6	36	9	33	6	36
Threshold	Threshold Academy	4	27	1	21	3	19

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponent Measured: Listening

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency Year 2002-2003					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	16	85	33	92	21	84
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	12	110	11	119	12	109
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	28	56	27	50	17	69
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	58	159	38	133	40	133
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	8	45	16	28	11	48
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	36	113	46	133	22	143
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	9	51	30	64	31	78
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	28	66	10	73	23	93
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	19	64	17	62	14	69
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	17	73	13	60	20	96
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	5	65	10	67	15	62
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	12	44	0	41	22	60
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	12	86	16	81	7	82
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	25	60	16	71	7	72
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	27	45	19	59	14	54
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	18	37	8	34		0
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	7	25	12	38		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	21	99	14	92	11	134
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	17	56	8	55	4	67
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	11	45	20	68	36	78
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	29	64	21	68	9	70
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	6	49	6	40	3	41
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	10	61	14	64	1	44
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	9	22	5	34	7	35
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	26	67	19	46	24	49
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	18	52	16	69	17	51
Holland	Washington Elem School	15	45	14	42	9	43
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	9	25	10	27	9	30
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	8	29	4	17	6	17
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	19	35	18	62	20	46
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	17	49	15	49	21	56
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	29	53	27	49	21	60
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	18	65	15	76	29	76
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	9	46	4	42	7	42
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	5	70	7	50	10	56
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	10	60	5	35	7	49
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	9	53	8	60	6	30
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	9	55	5	44	10	45
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	14	60	7	69	12	57
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	4	42	7	44	7	38
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	27	66	32	66	16	52
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	20	62	22	50	18	47
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	24	61	30	68	27	84
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	4	61	13	59	11	65
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	16	40	13	41	11	58
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	15	57	25	35	10	36
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	3	43	1	27	1	36
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	4	36	13	33	6	36
Threshold	Threshold Academy	8	27	7	20	2	19

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponent Measured: Language

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency Year 2002-2003					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	34	85	38	92	38	84
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	41	109	25	117	22	108
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	35	57	21	51	23	68
Detroit City	Beard Elem School		0	11	86	33	133
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	5	45	18	28	17	53
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	30	109	33	129	38	139
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	16	38	25	62	26	78
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	32	66	8	70	14	94
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	21	64	12	62	13	89
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	8	71	9	60	8	96
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	11	64	8	66	18	61
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	14	43	2	37	13	58
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	10	86	18	80	23	84
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	13	61	11	71	7	72
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	6	45	17	59	13	54
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	23	37	10	33	12	50
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	8	25	14	38	6	27
Detroit City	Law Elem School	34	96	16	90	25	136
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	5	56	7	54	0	1
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	10	44	20	68	24	78
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	18	62	17	63	5	70
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	3	47	3	38	7	39
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	5	64	9	62	2	44
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	4	22	10	32	10	36
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	22	65	19	46	13	49
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	22	52	24	69	10	51
Holland	Washington Elem School	17	45	13	42	9	43
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	9	24	9	26	2	30
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	14	29	2	17	4	17
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	16	35	11	61	13	46
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	19	48	17	49	20	56
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	22	53	18	49	12	58
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	16	65	14	76	16	76
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	10	46	7	42	4	42
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	7	69	10	50	7	53
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	8	59	7	35	7	49
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	12	53	11	60	0	29
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	13	53	13	44	5	40
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	18	60	17	69	12	56
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	8	29	6	44	7	37
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	27	66	24	66	18	50
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	6	27	6	29	13	47
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	11	22	21	66	15	84
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	13	58	13	59	7	61
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	18	40	11	40	14	57
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	18	57	13	34	11	35
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	2	43	2	27	4	36
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	3	35	11	33	2	36
Threshold	Threshold Academy	1	27	3	20	3	19

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponent Measured: Reading Comprehension

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency Year 2002-2003					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	31	85	47	92	37	85
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	24	108	27	118	24	109
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	28	56	18	50	13	69
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	82	158	29	133	33	133
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	5	45	15	28	18	53
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	51	109	51	131	24	140
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	27	51	30	65	17	79
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	38	66	20	73	9	92
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	25	64	11	62	8	93
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	6	70	13	60	7	96
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	8	65	15	60	12	63
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	14	43	6	41	7	59
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	18	86	29	81	12	83
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	23	61	14	70	5	72
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	18	45	13	59	6	54
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	19	34	6	33	19	52
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	12	25	13	38	4	27
Detroit City	Law Elem School	50	98	13	93	23	145
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	28	55	8	55	6	62
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	11	45	24	68	23	78
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	15	62	14	62	5	69
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	4	51	3	38	6	45
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	4	54	19	62	3	44
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	3	24	9	29	5	39
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	22	65	19	46	21	48
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	22	52	18	69	18	51
Holland	Washington Elem School	21	45	12	42	12	43
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	13	24	11	26	13	30
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	15	29	7	17	7	17
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	15	35	19	62	20	47
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	20	44	20	49	25	56
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	23	53	22	49	15	60
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	22	65	22	75	20	77
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	7	45	15	42	6	41
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	10	67	4	49	14	53
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	6	58	6	34	12	49
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	10	52	17	60	5	30
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	8	51	10	44	13	45
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	14	58	14	68	22	57
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	11	42	9	43	7	38
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	23	65	23	66	22	51
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	12	57	17	50	15	47
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	24	58	20	66	21	85
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	16	60	16	58	13	64
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	26	40	15	41	23	58
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	13	56	25	33	9	37
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	3	43	6	25	7	37
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	10	36	13	33	6	36
Threshold	Threshold Academy	5	26	2	21	5	19

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	13	72	1	1	1	4	0	2	0	1
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	11	95	0	2	0	1	0	1		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			16	53						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	12	25	14	21	40	92	1	1	1	2
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			2	39	0	1				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			48	100				0	1	2
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			26	48						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	32	54						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	5	8	17	38			0	1	1	1
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			4	58				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	7	60				0		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	1	12	33	0	3		0		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	3	23	6	54		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	12	29	3	5	9	21		0	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			28	39						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	1	25	33						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	6	20		0				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	34	85		0		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	2	7	46						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	3	7	1	7	5	27				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	17	55		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	2	49						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	3	1	7	6	41				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			3	22						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	13	24	0	2	6	28	0	4	1	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	11	15	0	2	8	31	0	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	10	10	1	2	8	26	1	1		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	8	11	0	4	1	3		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	4	13	2	6		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	7	14	5	15	1	3				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Vocabulary (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	15	25	3	16	1	3				0
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	11	19	10	19	3	4			0	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	5	9	14	55		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	2	8	3	25	0	11		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	1	6	6	48	0	1	0	6		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	1	13	3	37	0	4	0	1		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	2	9	3	29	3	9	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	4	14	2	31	0	2		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	8	31	2	14	1	7	0	1		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	5	18	1	18		0				0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	18	54	1	3	1	1		0	0	5
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	7	43	0	8	0	4		0	1	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	18	47	2	5	1	2			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	7	56						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	9	14	3	5	6	15				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	2	18	2	24	1	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	1	30	0	4				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			10	34	0	2				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	1	15		0	2	5			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	20	72	1	1	0	4	1	2	0	1
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	30	95	0	2	0	1	0	1		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			36	53						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	13	25	11	21	33	90	1	1	1	2
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			7	39	0	1				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			42	100				0	1	2
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			18	48						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	30	54						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	4	8	14	38			1	1	0	1
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			9	58				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	10	60				0		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	1	13	33	1	3		0		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	9	23	15	54		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	9	29	3	5	9	21		0	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			12	39						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	1	22	33						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	14	20		0				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	35	85		0		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	2	7	45						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	3	7	0	7	14	27				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	23	55		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	7	49						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	2	4	1	8	8	41				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			3	22						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	14	24	2	2	10	28	2	4	0	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	12	15	0	2	15	31	2	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	9	10	1	2	9	26	0	1		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	8	11	2	3	2	3		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	5	13	4	6		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	6	14	5	15	1	3				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	14	25	4	16	1	3				0
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	6	19	11	19	4	4			0	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	3	9	17	55		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	3	8	6	25	3	11		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	6	5	48	0	1	0	6		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	1	13	5	38	0	4	0	1		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	1	9	5	29	2	9	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	2	13	4	32	0	2		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	15	31	3	14	3	7	0	1		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	5	18	5	18		0				0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	17	54	1	3	1	1		0	3	5
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	9	43	1	8	0	4		0	1	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	23	47	1	5	1	2			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	12	56						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	7	14	3	5	6	15				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	4	18	4	24	3	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	1	30	0	4				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			6	34	0	2				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	0	15		0	2	5			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Listening

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	13	72	1	1	0	4	0	2	0	1
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	12	95	0	2	0	1	0	1		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			24	52						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	10	25	9	21	33	92	1	1	1	2
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			8	39	0	1				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			30	99				0	1	2
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			7	47						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	23	54						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	8	14	38			0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			13	58				0	0	1
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	5	60				0		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	1	10	34	1	3		0		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	2	23	9	54		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	14	28	2	5	7	21		0	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			24	39						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	1	16	33						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	6	20		0				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	21	85		0		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	1	2	11	46						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	4	7	0	7	7	27				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	23	55		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	6	42						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	4	2	7	5	39				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			9	21						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	16	24	1	2	5	28	1	4	1	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	10	15	1	2	6	31	0	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	8	9	1	2	3	26	1	1		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	7	11	1	4	1	3		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	3	13	2	6		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	11	14	5	15	1	3				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Listening (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	12	24	1	16	1	3				0
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	11	19	12	19	3	4			0	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	5	9	13	55		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	4	8	4	25	1	11		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	6	6	47	0	1	0	6		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	2	13	3	38	2	4	1	1		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	2	9	4	29	1	9	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	5	13	3	32	0	2		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	11	31	1	14	2	7	0	1		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	3	18	1	18		0				0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	20	54	2	3	1	1		0	2	5
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	16	43	0	8	0	4		0	1	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	20	47	2	5	0	2			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	4	55						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	8	14	2	5	5	15				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	6	18	3	24	4	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	2	31	0	4				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			4	34	0	2				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	5	15		0	2	5			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Language

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	29	72	1	1	2	4	0	2	0	1
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	38	94	0	2	0	1	0	1		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			32	53						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School		0		0		0		0		0
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			5	39	0	1				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			26	96				0	1	2
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			16	35						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	27	54						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	8	13	38			0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			6	56				0	0	1
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	11	59				0		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	1	12	34	1	3		0		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	2	23	6	54		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	4	29	3	5	6	21		0	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			6	39						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	1	22	33						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	6	20		0				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	33	84		0		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	2	3	46						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	2	7	0	7	8	26				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	15	53		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	3	39						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	4	0	8	2	41				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			3	21						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	13	23	1	2	5	27	0	4	0	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	11	15	0	2	10	31	1	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	9	9	1	2	4	26	1	1		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	6	11	1	3	1	3		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	3	13	4	6		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	9	14	4	15	1	3				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Language (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	15	25	3	15	1	3				0
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	5	19	12	19	2	4			0	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	3	9	13	55		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	3	8	6	25	1	11		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	1	6	6	47	0	1	0	5		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	1	12	5	38	1	4	1	1		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	2	9	7	29	1	9	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	6	13	6	30	0	2		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	13	31	3	14	2	7	0	1		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	5	12	2	14		0				0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	24	54	1	3	1	1		0	0	5
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	4	20	1	3	0	2		0		0
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	7	17	2	2		0			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	11	52						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	5	14	3	5	6	15				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	5	18	6	24	4	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	1	31	1	4				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			3	33	0	2				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	0	15		0	1	5			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Reading Comprehension

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	25	72	1	1	2	4	0	2	0	1
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	21	93	0	2	0	1	0	1		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			28	52						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	15	25	12	21	43	90	1	1	1	2
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			4	39	1	1				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			43	95				0	2	2
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			27	47						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	32	54						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	3	8	13	38			1	1	1	1
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			3	55				0	0	1
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	8	60				0		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	1	12	34	1	3		0		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	6	23	11	54		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	9	29	3	5	9	21		0	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			17	39						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	1	18	31						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	10	20		0				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	44	84		0		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	2	25	45						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	2	7	0	7	9	27				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	12	52		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	4	43						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	3	0	6	3	36				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			2	23						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	12	23	1	2	5	27	2	4	0	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	12	15	0	2	8	31	1	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	9	9	1	2	8	26	1	1		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	7	11	1	3	1	3		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	4	13	4	6		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	7	14	5	15	1	3				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 1									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	15	25	4	12	1	3				0
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	6	19	12	19	3	4			0	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	5	9	17	55		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	8	5	24	1	11		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	1	5	10	47	0	1	0	5		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	1	13	4	36	0	4	1	1		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	2	9	5	28	1	9	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	3	12	4	29	0	2		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	9	31	2	14	2	7	0	1		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	4	18	6	18		0				0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	19	54	2	3	1	1		0	0	5
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	9	39	0	7	0	4		0	1	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	19	44	2	5	1	2			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	15	55						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	10	14	3	5	9	15				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	3	17	5	23	1	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	2	31	1	4				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			9	34	1	2				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	15		0	2	5			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Vocabulary

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	31	81	0	2	2	3		0	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	9	109		0	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			12	49						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	7	31	7	19	9	64		0		0
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			12	26		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			40	123			1	1		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			21	56						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	9	65						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	6	7	43				0		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			7	52				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	1	1	3	60			0	2		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School		0	3	34	0	1		0	0	1
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	5	29	7	42		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	2	16	1	10	6	36	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			11	51						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	4	28						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	0	1	6	31	0	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	1	8	79		0	0	1		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School		0	6	53						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	2	6	1	7	18	55				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	0	1	5	59		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	1	2	30						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	5	1	15	3	31				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			5	32						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	12	21	0	2	6	18		0		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	8	14	0	3	5	48	0	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	6	7	0	2	4	25		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	4	10	2	11		0		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	4	10	1	3	0	1			0	1
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	9	14	4	39	1	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Group: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	11	23	6	20	0	2			0	1
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	7	14	9	21	0	1				0
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	4	11	66		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	4	5	31	1	4		0		0
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	5	5	30	1	4	1	1		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	1	7	3	20	0	2		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	6	16	6	27	0	7		0	0	2
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	4	10	3	24	1	6	1	1	0	1
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	8	26	6	28	1	10		0		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	5	17	2	22	0	1			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	19	53	2	6	1	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	10	34	1	7	3	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	12	52	3	12	1	1			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	13	52						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	3	8	4	18	3	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	8	15	6	10	6	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School		0	1	20	0	5				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			7	27	1	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	0	16		0	0	2			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	33	81	0	2	1	3		0	1	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	27	108		0	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			19	49						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	9	31	9	19	16	64		0		0
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			20	26		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			39	123			1	1		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			16	56						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	5	65						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	1	6	13	42				0		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			4	52				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	1	8	59			1	2		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School		0	2	34	0	1		0	0	1
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	10	29	9	42		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	0	16	2	10	10	36	1	1	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			15	51						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	6	28						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	0	1	7	31	1	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	1	7	79		0	0	1		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School		0	7	53						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	5	6	2	7	18	55				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	0	1	20	59		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	1	1	31						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	2	5	2	15	6	31				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			8	31						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	5	21	0	2	2	18		0		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	8	14	0	3	11	48	0	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	7	7	0	2	5	25		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	2	10	3	11		0		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	4	10	0	3	0	1			0	1
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	7	14	4	39	0	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	11	23	2	20	1	2			0	1
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	9	14	10	21	1	1				0
Linden Academy	Linden Charter Academy	2	4	21	66		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	4	6	31	3	4		0		0
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	5	5	30	1	4	1	1		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	0	7	1	20	0	2		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	3	16	4	27	0	7		0	0	2
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	2	10	5	24	1	6	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	6	25	1	28	4	10		0		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	4	17	3	22	0	1			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	18	53	1	6	1	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	3	34	1	7	1	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	10	52	1	12	1	1			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	9	53						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	2	8	5	18	4	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	12	14	7	10	7	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School		0	0	20	1	5				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			9	27	0	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	1	16		0	0	2			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Listening

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	27	81	1	2	3	3		0	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	11	109		0	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			25	48						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	9	31	8	19	18	64		0		0
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			15	26		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			42	121			1	1		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			27	56						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	8	64						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	2	6	12	43				0		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			12	51				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	1	10	60			0	2		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School		0	0	34	0	1		0	0	1
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	9	29	7	41		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	6	16	1	10	5	36	1	1	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			17	51						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	7	28						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	1	1	10	31	1	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	1	13	78		0	0	1		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School		0	7	53						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	2	6	4	7	14	55				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	1	1	17	58		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	1	4	31						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	3	5	4	15	4	31				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			4	33						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	13	21	0	2	5	18		0		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	8	14	1	3	6	48	1	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	5	7	0	2	7	25		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	4	10	2	11		0		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	4	10	0	3	0	1			0	1
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	10	14	4	38	1	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Listening (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	11	23	2	20	2	2			0	1
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	7	14	15	20	0	1				0
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	2	4	12	65		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	4	3	31	0	4		0		0
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	5	6	30	1	4	0	1		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	2	7	2	20	0	2		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	4	16	2	27	0	7		0	0	2
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	2	10	2	24	0	6	1	1	0	1
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	5	26	2	28	0	10		0		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	3	17	1	22	0	1			1	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	28	53	1	6	1	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	19	34	1	7	0	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	24	52	5	12	1	1			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	12	53						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	2	8	5	18	6	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	12	15	7	10	6	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School		0	1	20	0	5				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			11	27	0	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	5	15		0	0	2			1	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Language

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	34	81	0	2	2	3		0	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	23	107		0	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			20	49						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	3	16	3	13	4	44		0		0
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			16	26		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			29	118			1	1		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			22	54						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	7	61						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	6	8	43				0		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			8	51				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	1	7	59			0	2		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School		0	2	32	0	1		0	0	1
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	10	29	7	41		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	0	16	1	10	8	36	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			14	51						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	6	28						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	1	1	12	31	1	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	1	15	76		0	0	1		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School		0	7	52						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	2	6	1	7	16	55				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	1	1	13	53		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	1	3	30						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	5	1	14	7	30				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			10	32						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	15	21	0	2	4	18		0		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	9	14	0	3	14	48	0	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	6	7	0	2	4	25		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	2	10	4	10		0		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	2	10	0	3	0	1			0	1
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	5	13	5	39	0	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Language (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	12	23	4	20	1	2			0	1
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	4	14	10	20	0	1				0
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	1	4	13	65		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	0	4	6	31	1	4		0		0
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	5	8	30	0	4	1	1		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	1	7	5	20	0	2		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	4	16	5	27	0	7		0	0	2
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	5	10	4	24	3	6	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	8	26	4	28	4	10		0		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	3	17	2	22	0	1			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	21	53	1	6	1	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	4	20	1	3	1	2		0	0	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	16	50	3	12	1	1			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	12	53						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	2	8	3	17	6	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	5	14	4	10	4	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School		0	1	20	1	5				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			9	27	1	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	15		0	1	2			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	39	81	1	2	3	3		0	1	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	26	108		0	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			17	48						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	9	31	7	20	10	63		0		0
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			14	26		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			47	120			1	1		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			24	56						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	16	64						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	6	8	43				0		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			10	52				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	1	13	53			1	2		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School		0	6	34	0	1		0	0	1
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	14	29	12	41		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	1	15	2	10	9	36	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			11	51						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	4	28						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	1	1	11	31	1	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	1	12	79		0	0	1		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School		0	8	53						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	4	6	1	7	19	55				0
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	0	1	13	52		0				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	1	3	30						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	2	5	7	15	8	29				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			8	29						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	12	21	0	2	6	18		0		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	7	14	0	3	11	48	0	2		
Holland	Washington Elem School	7	7	0	2	3	25		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	4	9	4	11		0		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	6	10	0	3	0	1			0	1
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	8	14	7	39	1	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 2									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	11	23	6	20	2	2			0	1
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	7	14	11	20	0	1				0
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	4	21	64		0				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	4	11	31	3	4		0		0
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	5	3	30	1	4	0	1		0
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	0	7	4	19	0	2		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	8	16	6	27	0	7		0	0	2
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	3	10	4	24	2	6	1	1	0	1
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	7	26	3	28	4	10		0		0
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	4	17	3	21	0	1			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	20	53	1	6	1	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	12	34	2	7	2	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	14	50	4	12	0	1			0	1
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School		0	16	53						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	4	8	4	18	6	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	9	13	9	10	7	9				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School		0	5	18	1	5				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			10	27	2	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	16		0	0	2			0	1

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Vocabulary

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	23	74	2	3	1	4		0		0
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	7	92	0	4		0	1	2		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			16	67						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	11	23	5	16	20	84		0	1	1
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			12	51		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			34	134				0		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			15	67						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	0	1	8	73						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	5	10	74			0	1		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			7	80				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	8	51			0	3		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	1	3	4	50		0	0	1		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	4	22	8	46		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	2	20	0	8	0	43		0	1	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			5	49						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	16	43						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	4	21	0	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	9	120	0	1		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	1	7	58						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	1	8	2	8	7	56			1	2
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	2	59	0	1				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	2	44						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	4	0	11	0	21				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			10	37						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	12	17	0	1	2	21	0	3		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	3	9	1	2	3	31	2	5		
Holland	Washington Elem School	4	11	0	1	5	22		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	7	8	3	14	0	3	0	3	0	1
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	8	13	1	2		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	12	15	5	23	0	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	15	19	5	23	0	7			0	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	8	16	6	26	0	2			1	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	4	7	12	61	2	6				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	3	4	32	0	5		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	3	9	5	36	0	3	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	8	17	3	22	1	7		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	2	7	2	13	0	4	0	1		0
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	6	13	2	24	1	6		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	9	21	7	20	5	10		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	5	8	6	23		0			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	22	44	0	3	1	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	14	38	1	4		0	1	1	1	4
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	15	56	3	9	3	9			6	8
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	1	7	58						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	6	16	6	23	3	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	0	7	3	14	4	14				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	4	29	1	3				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			5	30	0	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	3	14		0	1	3				0

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Word Analysis

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	25	74	0	3	1	4		0		0
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	21	92	0	4		0	1	2		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			21	64						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	7	23	3	16	27	82		0	1	1
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			19	44		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			24	130				0		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			28	66						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	0	1	7	70						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	1	5	14	50			0	1		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			8	79				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	14	51			1	3		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	3	11	50		0	0	1		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	2	22	7	45		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	3	20	1	8	3	42		0	1	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			6	49						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0		0						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0		0		0				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	22	113	0	1		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	1	1	11	59						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	3	8	5	8	19	56			1	2
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	3	59	0	1				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	4	41						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	4	2	11	2	21				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			8	33						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	14	17	0	1	6	22	0	4		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	2	9	0	2	3	31	2	5		
Holland	Washington Elem School	5	11	0	1	4	22		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	5	8	3	14	1	3	0	3	0	1
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	5	13	0	2		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	11	15	4	23	0	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	10	19	4	23	0	7			1	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	6	16	5	26	0	2			0	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	2	7	15	60	1	6				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	3	7	32	0	5		0	2	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	3	9	4	38	1	3	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	8	17	1	22	0	7		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	1	7	1	13	0	4	0	1		0
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	6	13	1	23	0	6		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	6	21	3	20	3	10		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	1	8	4	23		0			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	13	45	0	3	0	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	12	38	1	4		0	1	1	1	4
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	11	55	2	9	0	9			2	8
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	1	6	57						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	4	16	5	23	2	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	0	6	5	13	3	14				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	3	29	0	3				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			5	30	0	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	14		0	1	3				0

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Listening

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	20	73	0	3	0	4		0		0
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	7	92	0	4		0	1	2		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			16	65						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	9	24	4	18	26	83		0	1	1
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			11	46		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			19	132				0		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			24	66						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	1	1	16	71						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	5	11	50			1	1		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			15	79				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	13	50			0	3		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	1	3	19	50		0	0	1		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	1	22	5	45		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	2	20	2	8	2	42		0	1	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			12	49						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0		0						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0		0		0				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	9	111	1	1		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	1	1	3	60						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	4	8	4	8	27	56			1	2
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	8	58	0	1				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	3	41						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	0	4	1	11	0	21				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			7	32						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	14	17	0	1	9	22	0	4		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	6	9	1	2	8	31	2	5		
Holland	Washington Elem School	5	11	0	1	3	22		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	5	8	2	14	1	3	0	3	1	1
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	5	13	0	2		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	12	15	5	23	2	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Listening (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	13	19	6	24	1	7			1	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	9	16	5	26	0	2			1	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	4	7	21	60	3	6				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	0	3	6	32	0	5		0	2	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	3	9	6	38	2	3	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	5	17	1	22	0	7		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	3	7	2	13	0	4	0	1		0
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	3	13	3	24	2	6		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	5	21	3	20	1	10		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	2	8	4	23		0			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	15	45	0	3	0	3		0	1	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	14	38	1	4		0	1	1	2	4
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	16	55	2	9	4	9			3	8
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	1	11	59						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	5	15	2	23	3	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	1	6	3	13	6	14				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	1	29	0	3				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			6	30	0	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	14		0	0	3				0

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Language

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	35	73	0	3	2	4		0		0
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	19	91	0	4		0	2	2		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			23	64						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	8	24	3	18	21	83		0	1	1
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			17	51		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			33	128				0		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			20	65						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School		0	9	73						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	4	12	70			0	1		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			8	79				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	13	49			3	3		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	1	3	12	50		0	0	1		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	10	22	9	46		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	3	20	1	8	2	42		0	1	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			13	49						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	10	41						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	4	21	1	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	20	114	0	1		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School		0	0	1						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	1	8	3	8	18	56			1	2
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	4	59	0	1				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	7	39						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	0	4	0	11	0	21				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			9	33						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	11	17	0	1	2	22	0	4		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	3	9	1	2	3	31	2	5		
Holland	Washington Elem School	5	11	0	1	3	22		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	2	8	0	14	0	3	0	3	0	1
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	4	13	0	2		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	7	15	5	23	0	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Language (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	13	19	6	23	1	7			0	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	5	16	3	26	0	2			0	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	2	7	12	60	2	6				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	3	3	32	0	5		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	3	8	5	36	0	3	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	5	17	1	22	1	7		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	0	7	0	13	0	4	0	1		0
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	3	11	1	22	1	5		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	3	20	3	20	4	10		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	8	5	22		0			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	18	43	0	3	0	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	11	38	0	4		0	1	1	1	4
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	7	56	1	9	2	9			4	7
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	1	7	55						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	6	15	3	23	3	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	0	6	5	13	4	13				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	4	29	0	3				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			2	30	0	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	14		0	1	3				0

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	32	74	2	3	2	4		0		0
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	19	92	1	4		0	2	2		0
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School			13	65						
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	10	23	3	18	19	84		0	1	1
Detroit City	Berry Elem School			18	51		0				
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School			21	129				0		0
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute			13	66						
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	0	1	6	71						
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	5	7	73			0	1		0
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School			6	79				0		0
Detroit City	Grant Elem School		0	10	51			0	3		
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	3	3	4	49		0	0	1		0
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	5	22	6	45		0				0
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	2	20	0	8	2	42		0	1	1
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School			6	49						
Detroit City	Jones Elem School		0	17	43						
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	3	21	0	1				
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	17	120	1	1		0		
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	1	1	5	55						
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	1	8	2	8	18	56			1	2
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School		0	4	57	0	1				
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School		0	6	44						
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	0	4	1	11	1	21				
Detroit City	Winship Elem School			4	35						
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	14	17	0	1	6	22	0	3		0
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	6	9	2	2	6	31	3	5		
Holland	Washington Elem School	6	11	0	1	5	22		0		
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	6	8	7	14	0	3	0	3	0	1
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	6	13	0	2		0				0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	11	15	9	24	0	5				

Table 2: Students from Racial/Ethnic Groups: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency									
		Grade 3									
		White		African-American		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	14	19	8	23	1	7			0	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	6	16	4	26	0	2			1	1
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	3	7	15	61	2	6				0
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	3	5	32	0	5		0	0	2
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	5	9	10	35	0	3	0	1	0	1
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	8	17	4	22	0	7		0		
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	2	7	3	13	0	4	0	1		0
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	9	13	3	24	2	6		0		0
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	7	21	7	20	4	10		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	2	8	5	23		0			0	1
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	22	44	0	3	0	3		0	0	1
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	12	38	1	4		0	1	1	1	4
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	12	56	2	9	2	9			3	8
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	1	12	58						
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	9	16	8	23	3	13				
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	0	6	2	14	5	14				0
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	1	5	29	1	3				
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School			5	30	0	3				
Threshold	Threshold Academy	4	14		0	1	3				0

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School		0	3	4	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	0	3	0	4	0	5
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	0	1	0	1	1	9
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	1	7	1	11	1	7
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	6	1	2	0	3
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	2	8	1	8	1	14
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	2	2		0	0	2
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	1	3	0	4	1	11
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	1	0	1	0	10
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	1	4	0	5	0	9
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	6		0	0	2
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	3	0	5	0	7
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	0	7	0	4	1	6
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	3	8	0	5	0	12
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	1	1	0	4	0	4
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	2	1	2	1	5
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	0	1	0	1		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	4	0	3	0	9
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	1	8	1	6	0	2
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	0	2	1	3	0	6
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	0	4	0	4	0	4
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	6	0	1	1	1
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	3	0	4	0	4
Detroit City	Winship Elem School		0	0	4	0	5
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	1	2	0	1	1	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School		0	1	1		0
Holland	Washington Elem School		0	1	3		0
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	0	1	0	9	0	5
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	3	0	2		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	2	3	9	2	5

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	4	0	7	1	3
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	1	3	0	4	0	2
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	2	1	7	0	4
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	6	0	3	1	6
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	6	0	4	0	6
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	0	5	0	2	0	9
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	0	5	0	12	0	6
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	0	6	0	4	0	5
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	0	2	0	6	0	6
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	6	1	1	0	2
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	1	5	1	5	3	10
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	1	2	1	4	0	7
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	0	3	0	4	3	17
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	5	1	7	0	2
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	1	4	0	7	1	10
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	0	9	1	6	1	7
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	5	0	3	0	6
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	0	10	0	4	0	4
Threshold	Threshold Academy	0	3	0	5	1	8

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School		0	3	4	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	0	3	0	4	0	5
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	1	1	0	1	2	8
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	0	7	1	11	0	7
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	6	1	2	0	3
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	0	8	0	8	0	12
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	1	2		0	1	2
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	1	3	0	4	0	10
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	1	0	1	1	6
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	1	4	0	5	0	8
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	6		0	0	2
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	3	0	5	1	7
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	1	7	1	4	1	5
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	2	8	1	5	0	11
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	1	1	0	4	0	4
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	2	0	2		0
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	1	1	0	1		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	4	0	3	0	6
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	8	0	6	0	2
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	0	2	2	3	0	6
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	1	4	1	4	0	4
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	5	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	4	1	4	0	4
Detroit City	Winship Elem School		0	0	3	0	3
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	1	2	0	1	1	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School		0	1	1		0
Holland	Washington Elem School		0	2	3		0
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0	0	9	0	5
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	3	0	2		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	2	2	9	1	5

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	1	4	1	7	0	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	1	3	1	4	0	2
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	2	1	7	1	4
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	2	6	0	3	3	6
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	6	0	4	0	7
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	0	5	0	2	0	9
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	0	5	0	12	0	6
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	0	7	2	4	0	4
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	0	2	0	6	0	6
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	1	6	1	1	0	2
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	0	5	1	5	2	10
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	1	2	0	4	0	7
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	1	3	0	4	2	17
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	1	5	1	9	0	2
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	1	4	0	7	1	10
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	1	9	5	6	0	7
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	5	0	3	0	6
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	0	10	0	4	0	4
Threshold	Threshold Academy	0	3	0	5	1	8

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Listening

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School		0	1	4	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	0	3	0	4	0	5
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	0	1	0	1	2	8
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	2	7	1	11	0	7
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	6	1	2	0	3
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	0	8	2	8	1	13
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	0	2		0	1	2
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	0	3	0	4	2	10
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	1	1	1	2	6
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	0	3	1	5	1	8
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	6		0	0	2
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	3	0	5	0	7
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	1	7	1	4	1	5
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	1	7	1	5	0	11
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	1	1	1	4	0	4
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	2	0	2		0
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	0	1	1	1		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	0	4	0	3	0	6
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	2	8	1	6	0	2
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	1	2	1	3	2	6
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	2	4	1	4	0	4
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	2	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	0	4	2	4	0	4
Detroit City	Winship Elem School		0	0	5	1	3
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	1	2	0	1	1	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School		0	1	1		0
Holland	Washington Elem School		0	1	3		0
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	0	1	0	9	0	5
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	3	0	2		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	2	1	9	2	5

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Listening (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	4	2	7	0	3
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	2	3	1	3	0	2
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	2	0	7	1	4
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	2	6	0	3	3	6
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	1	6	0	4	1	7
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	0	5	1	2	0	9
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	0	5	0	12	1	6
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	0	7	0	4	0	5
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	0	2	0	6	0	6
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	6	0	1	0	2
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	1	5	1	5	3	10
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	0	2	1	4	0	7
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	0	3	1	4	6	17
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	5	0	9	1	2
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	2	4	2	7	0	10
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	2	9	3	6	2	7
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	5	1	3	0	6
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	0	10	1	4	1	4
Threshold	Threshold Academy	0	3	2	5	1	8

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Language

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School		0	3	4	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	1	3	0	4	0	5
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	1	1	0	1	2	9
Detroit City	Beard Elem School		0	0	6	0	7
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	6	1	2	0	3
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	0	9	0	8	0	12
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	1	1		0	0	2
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	1	3	0	4	0	11
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	1	1	0	1	0	8
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	0	3	0	5	0	9
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	1	6		0	0	2
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	3	0	3	0	7
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	0	7	0	4	0	6
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	2	8	1	5	0	11
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	0	1	0	4	0	4
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	2	0	2	0	4
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	0	1	1	1		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	1	4	0	3	0	6
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	1	8	1	6	0	1
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	0	2	0	3	0	6
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	0	3	1	4	0	4
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	0	6	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	4	0	4	0	4
Detroit City	Winship Elem School		0	0	4	0	3
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	0	2	0	1	1	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School		0	1	1		0
Holland	Washington Elem School		0	1	3		0
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0	0	8	0	5
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	3	0	2		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	2	2	9	1	5

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Language (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	3	1	7	0	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	0	3	0	3	0	2
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	2	0	7	1	4
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	1	6	0	3	1	6
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	6	0	4	0	6
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	0	5	0	2	0	9
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	1	5	0	12	0	6
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	0	6	0	4	0	4
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	0	2	0	6	0	6
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	4	0	1	0	2
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	0	5	1	5	5	10
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	1	1	0	4	0	7
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	0	1	1	4	1	17
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	5	0	9	0	2
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	1	4	0	7	2	9
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	1	9	1	6	1	6
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	5	0	3	0	6
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	0	10	1	4	0	4
Threshold	Threshold Academy	0	3	1	5	1	8

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBSComponents Measured: Reading Comprehension

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School		0	3	4	0	3
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	0	3	0	4	0	5
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	1	1	0	1	0	9
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	1	7	1	11	1	7
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	6	0	2	0	3
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	2	9	1	8	0	12
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	2	2		0	0	2
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	1	3	0	4	0	11
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	1	0	1	0	9
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	1	4	0	5	0	9
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	6		0	0	2
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	3	0	5	0	6
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	2	7	0	4	1	6
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	2	8	1	4	0	11
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	0	1	0	4	0	4
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	1	2	0	2	1	5
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	0	1	1	1		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	1	4	0	3	0	9
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	2	7	1	6	0	2
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	0	2	1	3	0	6
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	0	4	1	4	1	4
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	1	5	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	3	2	4	0	4
Detroit City	Winship Elem School		0	1	4	0	3
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	1	2	0	1	1	1
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School		0	1	1		0
Holland	Washington Elem School		0	1	3		0
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0	0	8	0	5
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	3	0	2		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	2	2	9	1	5

Table 3: Students with Disabilities: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003 (con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	3	3	7	0	2
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	1	3	0	3	0	2
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	0	2	1	6	0	4
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	2	6	0	3	1	6
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	0	6	0	4	0	6
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	0	5	0	2	0	9
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	0	5	1	12	0	6
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	1	6	0	4	0	5
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	0	2	0	6	0	6
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	6	1	1	0	2
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	1	5	1	5	2	10
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	1	2	2	4	0	7
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	0	3	0	4	3	17
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	0	5	1	8	0	2
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	2	4	0	7	1	10
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	1	8	2	5	1	7
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	0	5	0	3	0	6
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	1	10	1	4	0	4
Threshold	Threshold Academy	1	3	1	5	2	8

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	5	23	11	27	10	31
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	2	16	1	27	2	24
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	6	25	8	30	8	37
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	50	99	19	88	30	100
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	2	37	11	24	10	42
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	29	60	25	77	18	84
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	19	36	12	38	8	46
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	22	42	8	49	5	62
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	19	41	6	33	9	60
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	2	49	4	45	6	69
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	7	52	4	51	7	39
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	10	31	2	31	3	40
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	8	67	11	59	11	64
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	16	38	5	40	2	60
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	16	23	5	32	0	32
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	22	29	3	24	15	41
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	5	11	4	24	4	16
Detroit City	Law Elem School	21	59	2	54	3	80
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	7	41	5	51	6	52
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	9	35	18	60	8	65
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	7	28	1	37	1	36
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	1	38	2	28	1	38
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	6	37	3	29	1	23
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	1	13	1	14	5	21
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	7	38	7	22	2	21
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	14	39	7	53	5	35
Holland	Washington Elem School	8	24	4	20	4	28
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	2	7	3	17	7	21
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	5	17	3	12	8	14
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	4	19	7	44	5	26

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	6	28	6	30	8	32
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	17	32	13	25	9	31
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	11	39	8	40	11	50
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	4	43	6	34	5	41
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	6	51	4	34	7	38
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	4	52	4	28	8	41
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	6	42	9	49	3	23
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	6	42	8	39	7	40
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	10	39	11	50	18	42
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	6	33	5	37	10	31
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	6	34	11	36	7	27
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	4	38	10	29	11	29
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	15	43	12	55	17	60
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	7	54	10	47	6	55
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	15	31	6	32	11	39
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	3	48	16	30	4	28
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	1	34	1	25	5	32
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	8	33	7	26	4	30
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	18	0	18	3	14

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	5	23	12	27	7	31
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	6	16	6	26	3	24
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	18	25	12	30	11	36
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	41	97	28	88	34	99
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	6	37	18	24	16	36
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	25	59	21	77	12	82
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	12	36	10	38	21	45
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	22	42	4	49	5	59
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	16	41	11	32	11	42
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	5	49	3	45	8	68
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	10	52	8	50	9	39
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	11	31	2	31	7	40
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	22	67	19	59	9	63
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	15	38	7	40	7	59
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	5	23	10	32	2	32
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	20	29	5	24		0
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	7	11	7	24		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	24	59	1	54	12	75
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	7	40	7	51	10	52
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	15	35	23	60	23	65
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	6	28	10	37	3	36
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	6	38	1	29	4	37
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	6	39	6	29	3	23
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	2	13	3	14	4	20
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	13	38	2	22	4	23
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	21	39	14	53	3	35
Holland	Washington Elem School	9	24	5	20	4	28
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	4	6	3	17	6	21
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	8	17	2	12	4	14
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	3	19	6	44	6	26

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	6	28	5	30	5	32
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	14	32	17	25	7	31
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	8	39	15	40	12	49
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	11	43	10	34	10	41
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	4	51	5	34	5	40
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	6	53	1	28	7	41
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	5	42	6	49	1	23
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	6	42	8	39	5	39
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	12	39	8	49	10	42
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	9	33	5	37	5	31
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	8	34	8	36	3	28
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	7	38	5	29	9	29
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	18	43	9	55	12	60
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	12	54	8	48	5	54
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	13	31	8	32	7	39
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	9	48	22	29	5	26
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	1	34	1	25	3	32
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	5	33	8	26	5	30
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	18	1	18	2	14

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Listening

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	2	23	8	27	7	31
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	5	16	2	27	2	24
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	12	25	15	29	9	36
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	37	99	26	88	33	102
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	8	37	13	24	10	38
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	16	59	21	76	11	83
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	6	35	20	38	15	45
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	15	42	5	48	15	60
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	10	41	12	33	8	42
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	9	50	9	44	12	68
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	4	52	7	51	10	37
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	11	32	0	31	13	40
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	10	67	13	58	6	63
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	14	38	7	40	7	59
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	13	23	8	32	6	32
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	15	29	5	24		0
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	3	11	8	24		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School	17	59	7	53	7	73
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	11	41	5	51	4	53
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	11	35	19	60	32	65
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	9	28	12	36	3	35
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	5	32	4	29	2	37
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	5	36	8	29	1	23
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	4	13	0	15	3	20
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	11	38	8	22	8	23
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	11	39	11	53	10	35
Holland	Washington Elem School	3	23	4	20	4	28
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	3	7	2	17	5	21
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	5	17	3	12	5	14
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	7	19	6	43	6	26

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Listening (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	5	27	5	30	10	33
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	16	32	15	25	8	31
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	8	39	9	40	19	49
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	8	43	3	34	8	41
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	4	50	4	34	8	40
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	7	53	4	28	4	41
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	5	42	6	49	5	23
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	8	42	4	39	6	40
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	8	39	5	50	7	42
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	4	33	3	37	6	31
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	11	34	14	36	4	28
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	12	38	11	29	11	29
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	15	43	25	55	18	60
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	4	53	11	48	10	56
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	14	31	8	32	7	38
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	12	48	21	30	6	26
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	2	35	1	25	1	32
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	4	33	8	26	5	30
Threshold	Threshold Academy	7	18	5	17	2	14

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Language

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	9	23	15	27	11	31
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	7	16	6	27	3	24
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	13	25	9	30	12	35
Detroit City	Beard Elem School		0	10	54	29	102
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	5	37	14	24	13	42
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	16	57	16	75	19	81
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	11	26	16	36	14	44
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	20	42	6	45	6	61
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	10	41	6	33	11	57
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	3	48	4	44	7	67
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	10	51	6	50	12	37
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	9	32	1	29	9	40
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	7	67	15	59	19	64
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	7	38	6	40	6	59
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	2	23	8	32	9	32
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	20	29	5	24	9	39
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	3	11	11	24	5	16
Detroit City	Law Elem School	24	58	7	52	11	75
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	3	41	6	50	0	1
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	8	35	19	60	21	65
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	3	26	9	33	2	36
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	3	31	3	28	7	34
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	1	39	4	28	0	23
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	1	13	5	15	4	19
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	6	36	6	22	1	23
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	16	39	13	53	6	35
Holland	Washington Elem School	4	23	4	20	3	28
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	3	6	5	16	2	21
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	7	17	1	12	3	14
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	4	19	5	43	6	26

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Language (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	8	27	6	30	7	32
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	11	32	10	25	5	31
Linden Academy	Linden Charter Academy	7	39	11	40	12	49
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	9	43	7	34	3	41
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	6	49	6	34	5	37
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	7	52	6	28	5	41
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	7	42	8	49	0	23
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	12	40	10	39	3	35
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	10	39	11	50	8	42
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	7	24	5	37	5	30
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	7	34	9	36	4	26
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	4	18	4	15	8	29
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	6	16	15	54	9	59
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	11	51	9	48	7	52
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	12	31	9	31	8	38
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	14	48	11	29	6	26
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	2	35	2	25	4	32
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	3	32	8	26	2	30
Threshold	Threshold Academy	1	18	2	17	2	14

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	8	23	15	27	14	31
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	5	16	4	27	5	24
Detroit City	Barbara Jordan Elem School	12	25	8	29	5	36
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	51	97	20	87	29	102
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	4	37	13	24	14	42
Detroit City	Carleton Elem School	25	55	23	75	10	80
Detroit City	Catherine Blackwell Institute	19	35	16	38	10	45
Detroit City	Clinton Elem School	23	42	11	48	4	61
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	14	41	5	33	4	59
Detroit City	Damon Keith Elem School	2	49	5	45	4	68
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	8	52	13	44	9	39
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	10	32	5	31	7	39
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	15	67	24	58	11	63
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	17	38	5	39	5	59
Detroit City	Hutchinson Elem School	8	23	6	32	3	32
Detroit City	Jones Elem School	16	27	3	24	16	41
Detroit City	Larned Elem School	6	11	10	24	3	16
Detroit City	Law Elem School	28	58	6	54	10	80
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	23	40	7	51	6	48
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	9	35	23	60	20	65
Detroit City	Rutherford Elem School	3	26	5	33	3	36
Detroit City	Sherrard Elem School	4	33	3	28	5	38
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	2	34	10	28	1	23
Detroit City	Winship Elem School	2	14	3	13	1	21
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	9	36	10	22	5	22
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	15	39	13	53	10	35
Holland	Washington Elem School	7	23	3	20	7	28
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School	3	6	5	16	9	21
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	8	17	4	12	5	14
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	5	19	8	44	9	27

Table 4: Students with Economic Disadvantage: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension (con't)

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	7	24	8	30	9	32
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	14	32	14	25	6	31
Linden	Linden Charter Academy	13	39	13	40	15	50
Muskegon	Angell Elem School	6	42	15	34	6	41
Muskegon	Marquette Elem School	10	48	2	34	11	37
Muskegon	McLaughlin Elem School	5	51	4	27	8	41
Muskegon	Moon Elem School	5	41	12	49	3	23
Muskegon	Nelson Elem School	6	38	9	39	12	40
Muskegon	Oakview Elem School	10	39	7	50	16	42
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	10	33	6	36	7	31
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	6	34	10	36	7	27
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	4	33	12	29	9	29
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch	15	40	14	53	12	60
Saginaw	Heavenrich Elem School	15	53	15	48	9	55
Saginaw	Herig Elem School	19	31	8	32	12	39
Saginaw	Jerome Elem School	8	46	21	28	4	27
Saginaw	Longfellow Elem School	3	35	6	23	6	32
Saginaw	Nelle Haley Elem School	9	33	9	26	4	30
Threshold	Threshold Academy	2	18	2	18	4	14

Table 5: Students with Limited English Proficiency: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Vocabulary

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	10	64	11	48	12	57
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	10	87	7	101	7	91
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	24	63	6	52	14	63
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	7	13	0	6	0	4
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	2	0	1	0	3
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	0	2		0	0	4
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	3	21	4	22	4	21
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	6	12	5	22	0	30
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	0	1	0	1
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	0	2		0
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	1		0	0	1
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	4	18	10	36	7	54
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	5	29	4	26	0	20
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	6	31	3	12	0	7
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	7	23	4	25	0	21
Holland	Washington Elem School	8	21	2	17	0	9
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0		0	0	6
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	1		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	3	1	5	0	2
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	1		0	1	6
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	0	1		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	2	0	1		0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	0	1	0	1		0
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	0	1		0		0
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch		0	0	1		0

Table 5: Students with Limited English Proficiency: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Word Analysis

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	19	64	15	48	19	57
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	28	87	24	100	21	91
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	19	63	13	53	21	63
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	6	13	1	6	1	4
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	2	0	1	1	3
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	1	2		0	0	4
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	8	21	9	22	2	21
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	4	12	8	22	5	30
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	1	1		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	0	2		0
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	1		0	1	1
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	9	18	11	36	19	54
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	8	29	7	26	2	20
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	12	31	2	12	0	8
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	14	23	7	25	0	21
Holland	Washington Elem School	8	21	2	17	0	9
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0		0	1	6
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	1		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	3	0	5	0	2
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	1		0	0	6
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	1	1		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	2	2	0	1		0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	1	1	0	1		0
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	0	1		0		0
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch		0	1	1		0

Table 5: Students with Limited English Proficiency: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Listening

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	8	64	10	48	14	57
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	11	87	8	101	7	91
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	22	63	14	53	21	63
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	0	13	2	6	0	4
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	2	0	1	0	3
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	1	2		0	1	4
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	1	21	8	22	2	21
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	5	12	6	22	3	30
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	1	1		0
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	0	2		0
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	1		0	1	1
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	5	18	10	36	28	54
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	5	29	5	26	0	20
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	7	31	3	12	2	8
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	3	23	2	25	4	21
Holland	Washington Elem School	3	21	5	17	1	9
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0		0	1	6
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	1		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	2	3	1	5	0	2
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	1		0	2	6
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	0	1		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	2	0	1		0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	1	1	0	1		0
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	0	1		0		0
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch		0	1	1		0

Table 5: Students with Limited English Proficiency: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)
 Name of Assessment: ITBS Components Measured: Language

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	24	64	15	48	26	57
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	35	86	21	100	20	90
Detroit City	Beard Elem School		0	2	34	18	62
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	1	13	0	6	0	4
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	2	0	1	3	3
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	1	2		0	1	4
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	3	21	7	22	11	21
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	3	12	7	22	4	30
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	1	1	1	1
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	0	2		0
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	1		0		0
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	5	18	11	36	18	54
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	3	29	7	26	0	20
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	5	30	2	12	0	8
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	7	23	7	25	0	21
Holland	Washington Elem School	4	21	2	17	0	9
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0		0	0	6
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	1		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	2	3	0	5	0	2
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	1		0	1	6
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	0	1		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	1	2	0	1		0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	0	1	0	1		0
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School		0		0		0
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch		0	0	1		0

Table 5: Students with Limited English Proficiency: Performance Report School Year 2002-2003(con't)

Name of Assessment: ITBS

Components Measured: Reading Comprehension

LEA/District	School Name	Number of Students with Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level/Proficiency					
		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Number	Total	Number	Total	Number	Total
Dearborn	Miller Elem School	23	64	20	48	22	57
Dearborn	Salina Elem School	19	85	24	101	21	91
Detroit City	Beard Elem School	25	63	7	52	17	63
Detroit City	Berry Elem School	1	1		0		0
Detroit City	Cooper Elem School	4	13	0	6	0	4
Detroit City	Grant Elem School	0	2	0	1	0	3
Detroit City	Grayling Elem School	1	2		0	2	4
Detroit City	Greenfield Union School	7	21	12	22	5	21
Detroit City	Higgins Elem School	7	12	6	22	3	30
Detroit City	Larned Elem School		0	1	1	0	1
Detroit City	Law Elem School		0	0	2		0
Detroit City	Macomb Elem School	0	1		0	1	1
Detroit City	Maybury Elem-ITBS	5	18	12	36	19	54
Detroit City	Webster Elem School	4	26	7	25	1	20
Holland	Longfellow Elem School	8	30	3	12	0	8
Holland	Van Raalte Elem School	7	23	5	25	1	21
Holland	Washington Elem School	7	21	1	17	0	9
Kalamazoo	Greenwood Elem School		0		0	0	6
Kalamazoo	Lakewood Elem School	0	1		0		0
Kalamazoo	Lincoln Intntl Studies Schl	1	3	1	5	0	2
Kalamazoo	Milwood Elem School	0	1		0	1	6
Kalamazoo	Northeastern Elem School	0	1		0	0	1
Port Huron	Cleveland Elem School	0	2	0	1		0
Port Huron	Garfield Elem School	0	1	0	1		0
Port Huron	Harrison Elem School	0	1		0		0
Port Huron	Woodrow Wilson Elem Sch		0	0	1		0