

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for St. Joseph County ISD, Centreville Public Schools, Covered Bridge School

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
No records to display.									

Michigan Merit Examination (MME)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Language Arts / Reading									

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Grade: 11									
All Students	2008-09	<10	59.9%	52.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	65.2%	63.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	64.2%	57.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	68%	70.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	55.5%	47.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	62.3%	57.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	66.1%	52.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	71.5%	62.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	23.5%	0%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	42.4%	48.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	48.5%	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics									
Grade: 11									
All Students	2008-09	<10	49.3%	32.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	50.4%	38.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	47.2%	31.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Female	2009-10	<10	48.3%	38.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	51.5%	32.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	52.5%	39.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	56.5%	33.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	57.9%	39.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	10.2%	0%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	28.9%	25.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	30.4%	25%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

MI-Access

Functional Independence

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

Supported Independence

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

Participation

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

MEAP-Access

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

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for St. Joseph County ISD, Centreville Public Schools, Covered Bridge School

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.8%	97.1%
Mathematics	99.8%	94.9%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	<30	<30
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.8%	97.2%
Mathematics	99.8%	94.6%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
Limited English Proficient		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	123.6%	86.9%
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
Students with Disabilities		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	105.3%	83.6%
Mathematics	105.3%	85.2%
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.2%	97.3%
Mathematics	102.2%	94.6%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30

Note: 467 Recently arrived LEP students took part in the State's ELPA instead of the MEAP/MME/MI-Access.

* [AYP Targets \(Annual Measurable Objectives\)](#)

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

All Students

State

75.39%

District

78.02%

School

31.25%

Black or African American

State

56.59%

District

<10

American Indian or Alaska Native

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

State

65%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

84.47%

District

<10

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

District

<10

School

<10

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

White

State

81.85%

District

80.25%

School

33.33%

Multiracial

State

71.12%

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

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

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

<10

School

<10

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

62.5%

School

50%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

All Students

State

94.7%

District

94.9%

School

93.8%

Black or African American

State

91%

District

95.4%

School

100%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

93.7%

District

95.7%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

96.5%

District

99.4%

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

District

97%

White

State

95.7%

District

94.9%

School

93.5%

Multiracial

State

94.8%

District

90.3%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

Students with Disabilities

State

93.5%

District

94.9%

School

93.8%

Economically Disadvantaged

State

94.8%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
District	95.6%
School	93.2%

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

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

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

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		38%			31%		42%
2002-03		38%			31%		42%
2003-04		38%			31%		42%
2004-05		48%			43%		52%
2005-06	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%
2006-07	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%
2007-08	60%	59%	57%	56%	54%	53%	61%
2008-09	60%	59%	57%	56%	54%	53%	61%
2009-10	70%	69%	68%	67%	66%	65%	71%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2010-11	78%	77%	76%	75%	74%	73%	79%
2011-12	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	82%	86%
2012-13	93%	92%	92%	91%	91%	91%	93%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Mathematics

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		47%				31%	33%
2002-03		47%				31%	33%
2003-04		47%				31%	33%
2004-05		56%				43%	44%
2005-06	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2006-07	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2007-08	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2008-09	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2009-10	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2010-11	75%	74%	71%	70%	67%	66%	67%
2011-12	83%	82%	81%	80%	78%	77%	78%
2012-13	91%	91%	90%	90%	89%	89%	89%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for St. Joseph County ISD, Centreville Public Schools,

Covered Bridge School

School AYP Status

Title 1 Status	AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	Education Yes Report Card Grade	School Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
No	Met	Met	Met	No Grade	School Improvement	1

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for St. Joseph County ISD, Centreville Public Schools, Covered Bridge School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	2	0	0

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

Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School with Emergency Certification	0%
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

	School Aggregate
Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	0%

Michigan Report Card for the National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	22	43	30	5
Male	50	22	41	30	7
Female	50	22	45	29	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	36	47	16	1
Not Eligible	56	11	40	40	9
Info not available	†	†	†	†	†
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	14	43	37	6
Black	20	52	39	9	0
Hispanic	5	29	51	19	1
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	13	32	36	19
American Indian	1	†	†	†	†
Unclassified	1	†	†	†	†
Student classified as having a disability	12	42	39	17	2
SD	88	19	44	31	6

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	48	40	11	1
ELL	97	21	43	31	5
Not ELL					

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	38	50	37	12	1
Not Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	23	40	29	8
Black	18	68	27	4	1
Hispanic	4	38	45	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	11	30	31	28
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability	10	75	22	2	1
SD	90	27	39	27	7

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	2	58	32	10	0
ELL	98	32	37	24	7
Not ELL					

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	36	34	23	6
Male	50	39	35	21	5
Female	50	32	34	26	8
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	52	33	13	2
Not Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Info not available	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	28	36	28	8
Black	19	65	26	7	1
Hispanic	5	49	34	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	21	37	25	17
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability	10	66	24	8	3
SD	90	32	36	25	7

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	65	26	9	1
ELL	97	35	35	24	7
Not ELL					

Rounds to zero

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	28	41	28	3
Male	51	33	42	23	2
Female	49	23	41	32	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	37	44	41	14	1
Not Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	21	32	32	3
Black	18	54	37	9	#
Hispanic	4	40	34	24	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	‡	‡	‡	‡
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability	9	73	22	4	#

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
SD Not SD	91	23	43	30	3
Student is an English Language Learner	2	60	33	8	#
ELL Not ELL	98	27	42	28	3

Rounds to zero

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

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