



Superintendent
John E. Hagel

Associate Superintendent
Cynthia O. Shinsky

Business Manager
Lee Kleinjans

Innovative Projects Director
Christine M. Callahan

**Associate Superintendent
Educational Services**
David E. Schulte

Career Education Director
Patricia K. Jackson

1013 South U.S. 27, Suite A · St. Johns, Michigan 48879
Phone: (989) 224-6831 · Fax: (989) 224-9574 www.ccreesa.org

August 12, 2010

Dear Parents and Community Members:

We are pleased to present you with the **Annual Education Report (AER)** which provides key information on the 2009-2010 educational progress for the Clinton County Turning Point Youth Center. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and state laws. The school's report contains information about student assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact Deb Nowland at (989)224-1177 for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the Clinton County Regional Educational Service Agency (CCRESA) website at: www.ccreesa.org (click Annual Report tab at the top of the web page) or you may review a copy from the Administrator at your child's school.

For 2009-2010, the Clinton County RESA Turning Point Youth Center did make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) because students made sufficient academic improvement to attain target achievement goals. State law requires that we also report additional information:

Our School and Process:

The Clinton County Turning Point Youth Center is a facility for adjudicated youth serving 60 boys between the ages of 12 and 21. Students placed into this facility by the courts also have diagnosed emotional and learning challenges. The primary focus of instruction is based on Michigan's Grade Level Content Expectations and the Michigan Merit Curriculum/High School Content Expectations. The goal is for all students to be proficient in all content areas and successfully meet graduation requirements.

Students are placed at Turning Point Youth Center by the courts. Individual student and/or educational plans (IEP) are developed to address the unique needs of each student so that areas of academic challenge can be appropriately addressed and core skills improved based on student need(s).

School Improvement Plan Status

Teaching staff reviewed the State Assessment data from 2008-2009 to analyze student achievement in Math and ELA. From that analysis, ELA, Math and Curriculum specific goals were added to the School Improvement Plan.

The School Improvement Plan will be reviewed annually and updated reflecting adjustment of goals as is indicated by student data.

Curriculum

Our ELA and Math Curriculums are based on Grade level Content Expectations and High School Content Expectations. All students are assessed and based on assessment results an individual plan is developed to maximize student learning and proficiency. Progress monitoring data will be collected in the area of ELA and math with targeted interventions implemented to promote student skill development.

Our goals are: All students will be proficient in English Language Arts, Math, and Writing.

Parent-Teacher Conferences

CCRESA TPYC staff is available to participate in a parent teacher conferences based on parents need and request.

Teacher Qualifications

One hundred percent of the teachers are Highly Qualified in the Core Academic subject areas. 100% of the paraprofessional meet the NCLB highly qualified criteria.

The Clinton County RESA staff at Turning Point Youth Center would like to thank the students and families for striving to successfully achieve their full potential. Our mission is to equip all students with the knowledge, skills and motivation that will enable them to generously serve others in society, lead purposefully, live responsibly and become individuals who think critically. Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,



Deb Nowland
Principal/Supervisor of Special Education
Clinton County RESA

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
African American									
White	2008-09	<10	80.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	86.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	35.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	48.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	62.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics									
Grade: 06									
All Students	2008-09	<10	79.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	78.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	45.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 07									

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	42.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	42.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	61.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Michigan Merit Examination (MME)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Language Arts / Reading									
Grade: 11									
All Students	2008-09	100%	59.9%	8.3%	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%
All Students	2009-10	100%	65.2%	23.1%	30%	0%	30%	20%	50%
Male	2008-09	100%	55.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%

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)
Male	2009-10	100%	62.3%	25%	30%	0%	30%	20%	50%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	33.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	37.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	44.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	66.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	71.5%	25%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	23.5%	8.3%	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	23.6%	23.1%	30%	0%	30%	20%	50%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	48.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics									
Grade: 11									
All Students	2008-09	100%	49.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
All Students	2009-10	100%	50.4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

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)
Male	2008-09	100%	51.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Male	2009-10	100%	52.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	16.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	16.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	32.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	56.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	57.9%	0%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	10.2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	100%	11.2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	30.4%	<10	<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 Clinton County RESA, Clinton County RESA - District created from ISD, Turning Point Youth Center

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

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	109.5%	56.8%
Mathematics	109.5%	64.9%
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
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
White		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	108.8%	60.6%
Mathematics	108.8%	69.7%
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%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
Students with Disabilities		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	115%	56.8%
Mathematics	115%	64.9%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
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%
School	
	<5%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
School	

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

<10

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

65%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

84.47%

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

White

State

81.85%

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

School

<10

Multiracial

State

71.12%

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

School

<5%

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

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

School

<10

Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)

All Students

State

94.7%

School

100%

Black or African American

State

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
	91%
School	
	100%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	93.7%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	96.5%
School	
	100%
Hispanic or Latino	
State	
	94.1%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

School

100%

White

State

95.7%

School

100%

Multiracial

State

94.8%

Limited English Proficient

State

94.6%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
Students with Disabilities	
State	93.5%
School	100%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	94.8%
School	100%

* 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%
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%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
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 Clinton County RESA, Clinton County RESA - District created from ISD, Turning Point Youth Center

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	N/A	0

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Clinton County RESA, Clinton County RESA - District

created from ISD, Turning Point Youth Center

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	4	1	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	63.2%

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					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Program Eligibility	43	36	47	16	1
Eligible	56	11	40	40	9
Not Eligible	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	14	43	37	6
Black	20	52	39	9	0
Hispanic	5	29	51	19	1
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	13	32	36	19
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	12	42	39	17	2
Not SD	88	19	44	31	6
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	48	40	11	1
Not ELL	97	21	43	31	5

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Program Eligibility	38	50	37	12	1
Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Not Eligible	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	23	40	29	8
Black	18	68	27	4	1
Hispanic	4	38	45	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	11	30	31	28
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	10	75	22	2	1
Not SD	90	27	39	27	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	2	58	32	10	0
Not ELL	98	32	37	24	7

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	36	34	23	6
Male	50	39	35	21	5
Female	50	32	34	26	8
National Lunch					

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Program Eligibility	43	52	33	13	2
Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Not Eligible	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
Info not available		‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	28	36	28	8
Black	19	65	26	7	1
Hispanic	5	49	34	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	21	37	25	17
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	10	66	24	8	3
Not SD	90	32	36	25	7
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	3	65	26	9	1
Not ELL	97	35	35	24	7

Rounds to zero

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

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	28	41	28	3
Male	51	33	42	23	2
Female	49	23	41	32	4

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
National Lunch Program Eligibility	37	44	41	14	1
Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Not Eligible	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	21	32	32	3
Black	18	54	37	9	#
Hispanic	4	40	34	24	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	‡	‡	‡	‡
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability					
SD	9	73	22	4	#
Not SD	91	23	43	30	3
Student is an English Language Learner					
ELL	2	60	33	8	#
Not ELL	98	27	42	28	3

Rounds to zero

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

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