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</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Michigan Association of Public School Academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Autistic Impaired</td>
<td>MAT</td>
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</tr>
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<td>ANSI</td>
<td>American National Standards Institute</td>
<td>MDE</td>
<td>Michigan Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System</td>
<td>MEAP</td>
<td>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>California Achievement Test</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Mentally Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>current operating expenditures</td>
<td>MPSERS</td>
<td>Michigan Public Schools Employee Retirement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTBS</td>
<td>Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills</td>
<td>NHA</td>
<td>National Heritage Academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Emotionally Impaired</td>
<td>POHI</td>
<td>Physically or Otherwise Health Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>Educable Mentally Impaired</td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>Preprimary Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>Michigan Employment Skills System</td>
<td>PSAs</td>
<td>Public School Academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOIR</td>
<td>Freedom of Information Request</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Stanford Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalents</td>
<td>SCANS</td>
<td>Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRCS</td>
<td>Grand Rapids Christian Schools</td>
<td>SLI</td>
<td>Speech and Language Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRPS</td>
<td>Grand Rapids Public Schools</td>
<td>SXI</td>
<td>Severely Multiply Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS</td>
<td>Holland Christian Schools</td>
<td>TABE</td>
<td>Test of Academic Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>TMI</td>
<td>Trainable Mentally Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPs</td>
<td>Individual Education Plans</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISDs</td>
<td>Intermediate School Districts</td>
<td>WMU</td>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBS</td>
<td>Iowa Tests of Basic Skills</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>Local Education Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPS</td>
<td>Kalamazoo or Kentwood Public Schools</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>Local Education Agencies</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAP</td>
<td>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</td>
<td>MAPSA</td>
<td>Michigan Association of Public School Academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Mentally Impaired</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>Metropolitan Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPSERS</td>
<td>Michigan Public Schools Employee Retirement System</td>
<td>NHA</td>
<td>National Heritage Academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POHI</td>
<td>Physically or Otherwise Health Impaired</td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>Preprimary Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAs</td>
<td>Public School Academies</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Stanford Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCANS</td>
<td>Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills</td>
<td>SLI</td>
<td>Speech and Language Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SXI</td>
<td>Severely Multiply Impaired</td>
<td>TABE</td>
<td>Test of Academic Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMI</td>
<td>Trainable Mentally Impaired</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMU</td>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>Local Education Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT</td>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>