

The University of the State of New York  
**The State Education Department**



**OVERVIEW OF DISTRICT PERFORMANCE IN  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS, AND SCIENCE  
AND  
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT SUBGROUP PERFORMANCE  
for  
Livonia Central School District**

**February 2004**

# THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

## Regents of The University

ROBERT M. BENNETT, <i>Chancellor</i> , B.A., M.S. ....	Tonawanda
ADELAIDE L. SANFORD, <i>Vice Chancellor</i> , B.A., M.A., P.D. ....	Hollis
DIANE O'NEILL MCGIVERN, B.S.N., M.A., Ph.D. . . . .	Staten Island
SAUL B. COHEN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. ....	New Rochelle
JAMES C. DAWSON, A.A., B.A., M.S., Ph.D. ....	Peru
ROBERT M. JOHNSON, B.S., J.D. ....	Huntington
ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D. ....	North Syracuse
MERRYL H. TISCH, B.A., M.A. ....	New York
GERALDINE D. CHAPEY, B.A., M.A., Ed.D. ....	Belle Harbor
ARNOLD B. GARDNER, B.A., LL.B. ....	Buffalo
HARRY PHILLIPS, 3rd, B.A., M.S.F.S. ....	Hartsdale
JOSEPH E. BOWMAN, JR., B.A., M.L.S., M.A., M.Ed., Ed.D. ....	Albany
LORRAINE A. CORTÉS-VÁZQUEZ, B.A., M.P.A. ....	Bronx
JUDITH O. RUBIN, A.B. ....	New York
JAMES R. TALLON, JR., B.A., M.A. ....	Binghamton
MILTON L. COFIELD, B.S., M.B.A., Ph.D. ....	Rochester

### President of The University and Commissioner of Education

RICHARD P. MILLS

### Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education

JAMES A. KADAMUS

### Coordinator, School Operations and Management Services

CHARLES SZUBERLA

### Coordinator, Information and Reporting Services

MARTHA P. MUSSER

---

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or sexual orientation in its educational programs, services and activities. Portions of this publication can be made available in a variety of formats, including braille, large print or audio tape, upon request. Inquiries concerning this policy of nondiscrimination should be directed to the Department's Office for Diversity, Ethics, and Access, Room 530, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234. **Requests for additional copies of this publication may be made by contacting the Publications Sales Desk, Room 309, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234.**

Please address all correspondence about this report that is not related to data corrections to:

**School Report Card Coordinator  
Information and Reporting Services Team  
New York State Education Department  
Room 863 EBA  
89 Washington Avenue  
Albany, NY 12234  
E-mail: [RPTCARD@mail.nysed.gov](mailto:RPTCARD@mail.nysed.gov)**

The *New York State District Report Card* is an important part of the Board of Regents effort to raise learning standards for all students. It provides information to the public on student performance and other measures of district performance. Knowledge gained from the district report card on a district's strengths and weaknesses can be used to improve instruction and services to students.

The *New York State District Report Card* consists of three parts: the *Overview of District Performance in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science and Analysis of Student Subgroup Performance*, the *Comprehensive Information Report*, and the *District Accountability Report*. The *Overview and Analysis* presents performance data on measures required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act: English, mathematics, science, and graduation rate. Performance data on other State assessments can be found in the *Comprehensive Information Report*. The *District Accountability Report* provides information as to whether a district is making adequate progress toward enabling all students to achieve proficiency in English and mathematics.

State assessments are designed to help ensure that all students reach high learning standards. They show whether students are getting the foundation knowledge they need to succeed at the elementary, middle, and commencement levels and beyond. The State requires that students who are not making appropriate progress toward the standards receive academic intervention services.

In the *Overview*, performance on the elementary- and middle-level assessments in English language arts and mathematics and on the middle-level science test is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of students scoring at each of the four levels. These levels indicate performance on the standards from seriously deficient to advanced proficiency. Performance on the elementary-level science test is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of students making appropriate progress. Regents examination scores are reported in four score ranges. Scores of 65 to 100 are passing; scores of 55 to 64 earn credit toward a local diploma (with the approval of the local board of education). Though each elementary- and middle-level assessment is administered to students in a specific grade, secondary-level assessments are taken by students when they complete the coursework for the core curriculum. Therefore, the performance of students at the secondary level is measured for a student cohort rather than a group of students at a particular grade level. Students are grouped in cohorts according to the year in which they first entered grade 9.

The assessment data in the *Overview and Analysis* are for all tested students in the district, including general-education students and students with disabilities. In the *Overview*, each district's performance is compared with that of all public schools statewide. In the *Analysis*, performance is disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability status, gender, LEP status, income level, and migrant status.

Explanations of terms referred to or symbols used in this part of the district report card may be found in the glossary on the last page. Further information on the district report card may be found in the guide, *Understanding Your School Report Card: February 2004*, available on the Information and Reporting Services Web site at [www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts](http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts).

# Overview of District Performance in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science

## District Profile

Superintendent: David Deloria		Phone: (585)346-4000
<b>Organization</b> <b>2002-03</b>	Grade Range	Student Enrollment
	NA	2180

<b>2001-02 District-wide Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$11,275
<b>2001-02 NYS Public Schools Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$12,265

### 2002-03 Percentage of Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers\*

Number of Core Classes	Percent Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
382	100%


\*For the 2002-03 school year, SED is reporting that teachers of core classes are highly qualified if they are certified to teach those classes. However, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) imposes requirements beyond certification for some teachers to be considered highly qualified. In future years, when New York State uses the NCLB criteria for reporting, certified teachers must fulfill all NCLB requirements to be counted as highly qualified.

### 2002-03 Percentage of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate\*

Number of Teachers	Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate
183	1%

\*This count includes teachers with temporary licenses who do not have a valid permanent, provisional, or transitional teaching certificate.

## Elementary Level English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 455–602	Level 2 603–644	Level 3 645–691	Level 4 692–800	Total	
Jan–Feb 2001	4	32	90	45	171	671
Jan–Feb 2002	3	51	83	43	180	672
Feb 2003	6	26	84	54	170	675

Elementary-Level English Language Arts Levels — Listening, Reading, and Writing Standards	
<b>Level 4</b>	These students <b>exceed the standards</b> and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examination.
<b>Level 3</b>	These students <b>meet the standards</b> and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 2</b>	These students <b>need extra help</b> to meet the standards and pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 1</b>	These students have <b>serious academic deficiencies</b> .


### Performance of Limited English Proficient Students Taking the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) as the Measure of English Language Arts Achievement

Grade 4	Number Tested	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
2003	0	0	0	0	0

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in English

Elementary Level	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2002–03	0	0	0	0	0

## Elementary Level Mathematics




Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 448–601	Level 2 602–636	Level 3 637–677	Level 4 678–810	Total	
May 2001	6	41	88	39	174	657
May 2002	2	34	107	37	180	658
May 2003	3	25	86	56	170	666

Elementary-Level Mathematics Levels — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards	
<b>Level 4</b>	These students <b>exceed the standards</b> and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examination.
<b>Level 3</b>	These students <b>meet the standards</b> and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 2</b>	These students <b>need extra help</b> to meet the standards and pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 1</b>	These students have <b>serious academic deficiencies</b> .

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Mathematics

Elementary Level	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
<b>2002–03</b>	0	0	0	0	0

## Elementary Level Science Multiple-Choice



### All Students

	Number Tested	Number Above SDL	Mean Score
May 2001	172	133	34
May 2002	177	147	35
May 2003	169	142	35

Grade 4 Science — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards	
<b>Multiple-Choice Test Component</b>	This component contains 45 multiple-choice questions based upon the New York State <i>Elementary Science Syllabus</i> and referenced to the New York State <i>Learning Standards for Mathematics, Science and Technology</i> (Elementary Level).
<b>State Designated Level (SDL)</b>	Students who correctly answer fewer than 30 of the 45 questions of the multiple-choice test component must receive academic intervention services in the following term of instruction.
<b>Mean Scores</b>	For the multiple-choice test component, the mean score is the average number of correct answers for students tested. If all tested students answered all questions correctly, this score would be 45.

## Elementary Level Science Performance Test

The elementary-level science test is composed of two sections, the multiple-choice section (described above) and the performance test. The performance test is not used to determine the need for academic intervention services or for accountability purposes because not all students are administered the same three tasks.


### All Students

	Number Tested	Mean Score
May 2001	172	35
May 2002	176	37
May 2003	169	38

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Science

Elementary Level	Number Tested	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4
2002-03	0	0	0	0	0

## Middle Level English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 527-661	Level 2 662-700	Level 3 701-738	Level 4 739-830	Total	
May 2001	5	57	73	39	174	715
	Level 1 527-659	Level 2 660-698	Level 3 699-737	Level 3 738-830	Total	
March 2002	1	64	86	36	187	713
	Level 1 527-657	Level 2 658-696	Level 3 697-736	Level 4 737-830	Total	
January 2003	2	53	103	32	190	712

Middle-Level English Language Arts Levels – Listening, Reading, and Writing Standards	
<b>Level 4</b>	These students <b>exceed the standards</b> and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examination.
<b>Level 3</b>	These students <b>meet the standards</b> and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 2</b>	These students <b>need extra help</b> to meet the standards and pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 1</b>	These students have <b>serious academic deficiencies</b> .

### Performance of Limited English Proficient Students Taking the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) as the Measure of English Language Arts Achievement


Grade 8	Number Tested	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
2003	0	0	0	0	0

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in English

Grade 8	Number Tested	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4
2002-03	1	#	#	#	#



## Middle Level Mathematics




Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 517-680	Level 2 681-715	Level 3 716-759	Level 4 760-882	Total	
May 2001	16	69	78	11	174	716
May 2002	10	57	103	18	188	725
May 2003	8	44	128	11	191	727

Middle-Level Mathematics Levels — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards	
<b>Level 4</b>	These students <b>exceed the standards</b> and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examination.
<b>Level 3</b>	These students <b>meet the standards</b> and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 2</b>	These students <b>need extra help</b> to meet the standards and pass the Regents examination.
<b>Level 1</b>	These students have <b>serious academic deficiencies</b> .

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Mathematics

Middle Level	Number Tested	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4
2002-03	1	#	#	#	#

## Middle Level Science



Performance at This District		Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	
June 2002	Middle-Level Science	0	6	83	90	179	83
	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
January/ June 2003	Middle-Level Science	0	13	109	59	181	80
	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0

Middle-Level Science Levels — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards*	
<b>Level 4</b>	These students <b>exceed the standards</b> on the middle-level science test and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examinations <u>or</u> score 85–100 on a Regents science examination.
<b>Level 3</b>	These students <b>meet the standards</b> on the middle-level science test and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examinations <u>or</u> score 65–84 on a Regents science examination.
<b>Level 2</b>	These students <b>need extra help</b> to meet the standards for middle-level science and to pass the Regents examinations <u>or</u> score 55–64 on a Regents science examination.
<b>Level 1</b>	These students have <b>serious academic deficiencies</b> as evidenced in the middle-level science test <u>or</u> score 0–54 on a Regents science examination.


\*Students may demonstrate proficiency in middle-level science by scoring at Level 3 or above on the middle-level science test or by scoring 65 or above on a Regents examination in science.

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Science

Middle-Level	Number Tested	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4
<b>2002-03</b>	1	#	#	#	#

# High School English Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graph and table below present performance of the 1997, 1998, and 1999 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in English. A score of 65 or above on the Regents comprehensive examination in English is considered passing. Only the highest score of each student is counted, regardless of how many times the student took the examination. In the graph, students passing approved alternatives to this examination are counted as scoring in the 65 to 84 range. RCT results are not included in the graph. In the first table, the numbers of students who met the graduation requirement by passing an approved alternative are listed separately. The second table shows the competency test performance of students with disabilities eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or above on a Regents examination or approved alternative. Students who score 55 to 64 on the Regents examination in comprehensive English may be given credit towards a local high school diploma if allowed by the district board of education. The data in these tables and chart show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. Data for the 1999 cohort include all students in cohorts in the district's schools, students continuously enrolled in the district who transferred between schools within the district, and students placed outside the district but who are the reporting responsibility of the district. Data for the 1998 cohort include all students in cohorts in the district's schools.



English Graduation Requirement Achievement after Four Years of High School*						
	Cohort Members All Students	Highest Score Between 0 and 54	Highest Score Between 55 and 64	Highest Score Between 65 and 84	Highest Score Between 85 and 100	Approved Alternative Credit
<b>1997 Cohort</b>	159	0	36	101	15	0
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	154	3	11	84	51	0
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	156	1	6	43	90	0


\*Assessments used to determine counts in this table include the Regents examination in comprehensive English, the component retest in English, and approved alternatives.

Performance of Students Who Took the Regents Competency Tests in Reading and Writing to Meet the Graduation Requirement*		
	Passed the RCTs	Failed RCT in Reading and/or Writing
<b>1997 Cohort</b>	3	0
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	1	0
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	0	0

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative.

# High School Mathematics Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graph and table below present performance of the 1997, 1998, and 1999 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in mathematics. A score of 65 or above on a Regents examination in mathematics is considered passing. Only the highest score of each student is counted, regardless of how many times the student took the examination. In the graph, students passing approved alternatives to these examinations are counted as scoring in the 65 to 84 range. RCT results are not included in the graph. In the first table, the numbers of students who met the graduation requirement by passing an approved alternative are listed separately. The second table shows the competency test performance of students with disabilities eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or above on a Regents examination or approved alternative. Students who score 55 to 64 on a Regents examination in mathematics may be given credit towards a local high school diploma if allowed by the district board of education. The data in these tables and chart show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. Data for the 1999 cohort include all students in cohorts in the district's schools, students continuously enrolled in the district who transferred between schools within the district, and students placed outside the district but who are the reporting responsibility of the district. Data for the 1998 cohort include all students in cohorts in the district's schools.



Mathematics Graduation Requirement Achievement after Four Years of High School*						
	Cohort Members All Students	Highest Score Between 0 and 54	Highest Score Between 55 and 64	Highest Score Between 65 and 84	Highest Score Between 85 and 100	Approved Alternative Credit
1997 Cohort	159	0	17	66	53	1
1998 Cohort	154	12	14	42	79	0
1999 Cohort	156	7	12	40	81	0


\*Assessments used to determine counts in this table include a Regents examination in mathematics, the component retest in mathematics, and approved alternatives.

Performance of Students Who Took the Regents Competency Test in Mathematics to Meet the Graduation Requirement*		
	Passed the RCT	Failed at Least One RCT
1997 Cohort	17	0
1998 Cohort	3	0
1999 Cohort	5	0

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative.

## Cohort Graduation Rates

Students were counted as graduates if they earned a local diploma with or without a Regents endorsement by August 31<sup>st</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. The graduation-rate cohort includes students who transferred to general education development (GED) programs. These students were not counted in the 1998 school accountability cohort for English and mathematics.



<b>Cohort Graduation Rates</b>				
	<b>Cohort Members* (a)</b>	<b>Transfers to GED (b)</b>	<b>Graduation Rate Cohort Members (a+b)</b>	<b>Number Graduated</b>
1998 Cohort	154	2	156	137

\*Count as of August 31<sup>st</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9.

## Analysis of Student Subgroup Performance

Historically, on State assessments the average performance of Black, Hispanic, and Native American students has been lower than that of White and Asian students. Similarly, students from low-income families have not performed as well as those from higher income families. A high priority of the Board of Regents is to eliminate these gaps in student performance. In addition, Title I of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act includes explicit requirements “to ensure that students served by Title I are given the same opportunity to achieve to high standards and are held to the same high expectations as all students in each State.”

This section of the district report card provides performance data for two years by racial/ethnic group, disability status, gender, English proficiency status, income level, and migrant status. The purpose of the student subgroup analyses is to determine if students who perform below the standards in any school tend to fall into particular groups, such as minority students, limited English proficient students, or economically disadvantaged students. If these analyses provide evidence that students in one of the groups achieve at a lower level than other students, the district should examine the reasons for this lower performance and make necessary changes in curriculum, instruction, and student support services to remedy these performance gaps. If your district did not report data for the 2002-03 school year for a subject and grade, a table showing data for subgroups in that subject and grade will not be included in the *Analysis*.

## Elementary Level English Language Arts

Student Subgroup	2001-02				2002-03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Hispanic	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	2	s	s	s
White	180	98%	70%	24%	167	s	s	s
Total	180	98%	70%	24%	170	96%	81%	32%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	170	96%	81%	32%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	176	s	s	s	157	100%	87%	34%
Students with disabilities	4	s	s	s	13	54%	15%	0%
Total	180	98%	70%	24%	170	96%	81%	32%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	82	99%	76%	30%	92	100%	85%	38%
Male	98	98%	65%	18%	78	92%	77%	24%
Total	180	98%	70%	24%	170	96%	81%	32%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	180	98%	70%	24%	169	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Total	180	98%	70%	24%	170	96%	81%	32%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	25	96%	56%	8%	25	88%	44%	12%
Not disadvantaged	155	99%	72%	26%	145	98%	88%	35%
Total	180	98%	70%	24%	170	96%	81%	32%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	180	98%	70%	24%	170	96%	81%	32%
Total	180	98%	70%	24%	170	96%	81%	32%

## Elementary Level Mathematics

Student Subgroup	2001-02				2002-03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Hispanic	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	2	s	s	s
White	180	99%	80%	21%	167	s	s	s
Total	180	99%	80%	21%	170	98%	84%	33%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	170	98%	84%	33%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	175	99%	81%	21%	157	99%	88%	35%
Students with disabilities	5	80%	60%	0%	13	85%	31%	8%
Total	180	99%	80%	21%	170	98%	84%	33%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	82	99%	82%	24%	93	99%	84%	34%
Male	98	99%	79%	17%	77	97%	83%	31%
Total	180	99%	80%	21%	170	98%	84%	33%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	180	99%	80%	21%	169	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Total	180	99%	80%	21%	170	98%	84%	33%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	24	96%	50%	8%	25	92%	48%	16%
Not disadvantaged	156	99%	85%	22%	145	99%	90%	36%
Total	180	99%	80%	21%	170	98%	84%	33%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	180	99%	80%	21%	170	98%	84%	33%
Total	180	99%	80%	21%	170	98%	84%	33%



**Elementary Level**  
Science Multiple-Choice

Student Subgroup	2001-02		2002-03	
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring above the SDL	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring above the SDL
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0	0%
Black	0	0%	1	s
Hispanic	0	0%	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	2	s
White	177	83%	166	s
Total	177	83%	169	84%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	169	84%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>				
General-education students	172	84%	156	88%
Students with disabilities	5	40%	13	38%
Total	177	83%	169	84%
<b>Results by Gender</b>				
Female	81	84%	93	85%
Male	96	82%	76	83%
Total	177	83%	169	84%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>				
English proficient	177	83%	168	s
Limited English proficient	0	0%	1	s
Total	177	83%	169	84%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>				
Economically disadvantaged	24	71%	25	60%
Not disadvantaged	153	85%	144	88%
Total	177	83%	169	84%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>				
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%
Not migrant family	177	83%	169	84%
Total	177	83%	169	84%

**Middle Level**  
English Language Arts

Student Subgroup	2001-02				2002-03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	3	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	2	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	182	99%	65%	20%	190	99%	71%	17%
Total	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%
Small Group Totals (s)	5	100%	60%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	158	99%	72%	23%	168	100%	79%	19%
Students with disabilities	29	100%	28%	0%	22	91%	14%	0%
Total	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	80	100%	68%	25%	98	99%	73%	20%
Male	107	99%	64%	15%	92	99%	68%	13%
Total	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	21	100%	38%	0%	12	92%	50%	8%
Not disadvantaged	166	99%	69%	22%	178	99%	72%	17%
Total	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%
Total	187	99%	65%	19%	190	99%	71%	17%

**Middle Level  
Mathematics**

Student Subgroup	2001-02				2002-03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	3	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	2	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	183	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
Total	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
Small Group Totals (s)	5	100%	60%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	160	97%	72%	11%	170	98%	78%	6%
Students with disabilities	28	82%	21%	0%	21	76%	29%	0%
Total	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	81	96%	67%	12%	97	97%	73%	6%
Male	107	93%	63%	7%	94	95%	72%	5%
Total	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	23	100%	48%	4%	12	75%	50%	0%
Not disadvantaged	165	94%	67%	10%	179	97%	74%	6%
Total	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%
Total	188	95%	64%	10%	191	96%	73%	6%

## Middle Level

### Science

Student Subgroup	2001-02				2002-03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	3	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	2	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	174	100%	97%	51%	181	100%	93%	33%
Total	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%
Small Group Totals (s)	5	100%	100%	20%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	154	100%	97%	56%	160	100%	95%	36%
Students with disabilities	25	100%	92%	16%	21	100%	76%	5%
Total	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	77	100%	96%	48%	93	100%	92%	24%
Male	102	100%	97%	52%	88	100%	93%	42%
Total	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	23	100%	83%	26%	12	100%	92%	8%
Not disadvantaged	156	100%	99%	54%	169	100%	93%	34%
Total	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%
Total	179	100%	97%	50%	181	100%	93%	33%

## 1998 and 1999 High School Cohorts

General-education students who first entered ninth grade in 1998 or 1999 must score 55 or higher on Regents English and mathematics examinations to graduate. During the phase-in of the Regents examination graduation requirements, all students (with district board of education approval) may qualify for a local diploma by earning a score of 55–64 on the required Regents examinations; a score of 65 or higher is required for a Regents diploma. Students with disabilities and certain students with a Section 504 Accommodation Plan may qualify for a local diploma by passing Regents competency tests. The data in these tables show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9.

### Performance on the English Assessment Requirement for Graduation after Four Years of High School

Student Subgroup	1998 Cohort					1999 Cohort				
	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement
		Regents		Pass-ed RCTs			Regents		Pass-ed RCTs	
		55–64	65–100				55–64	65–100		
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	0	0	0	0	0%	1	s	s	s	s
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0%	1	s	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
White	154	11	135	1	95%	154	s	s	s	s
Total	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	156	6	133	0	89%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	149	9	135	0	97%	145	3	129	0	91%
Students with disabilities	5	2	0	1	60%	11	3	4	0	64%
Total	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	80	5	75	0	100%	81	2	71	0	90%
Male	74	6	60	1	91%	75	4	62	0	88%
Total	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	10	1	8	0	90%	17	3	10	0	76%
Not disadvantaged	144	10	127	1	96%	139	3	123	0	91%
Total	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%
Total	154	11	135	1	95%	156	6	133	0	89%

**Performance on the Mathematics Assessment Requirement  
for Graduation after Four Years of High School**

Student Subgroup	1998 Cohort					1999 Cohort				
	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement
		Regents		Pass-ed RCTs			Regents		Pass-ed RCTs	
		55-64	65-100				55-64	65-100		
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	0	0	0	0	0%	1	s	s	s	s
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0%	1	s	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
White	154	14	121	3	90%	154	s	s	s	s
Total	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	156	12	121	5	88%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	149	14	121	0	91%	145	10	120	0	90%
Students with disabilities	5	0	0	3	60%	11	2	1	5	73%
Total	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	80	7	67	1	94%	81	4	68	1	90%
Male	74	7	54	2	85%	75	8	53	4	87%
Total	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	10	1	7	1	90%	17	4	9	1	82%
Not disadvantaged	144	13	114	2	90%	139	8	112	4	89%
Total	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%
Total	154	14	121	3	90%	156	12	121	5	88%

## Cohort Graduation Rates

Students were counted as graduates in the first two columns of this table if they earned a local diploma with or without a Regents endorsement by June 30<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9 and in the second two columns if they earned a local diploma with or without a Regents endorsement by August 31<sup>st</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. The graduation-rate cohort includes students who transferred to general education development (GED) programs. These students were not counted in the 1998 district accountability cohort for English and mathematics.

Student Subgroup	1998 Cohort as of June 30, 2002		1998 Cohort as of August 31, 2002	
	Graduation Rate Cohort	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate Cohort	Graduation Rate
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0	0%
Black	0	0%	0	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%
White	156	89%	156	88%
Total	156	89%	156	88%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>				
General-education students	151	91%	151	89%
Students with disabilities	5	40%	5	40%
Total	156	89%	156	88%
<b>Results by Gender</b>				
Female	81	93%	81	91%
Male	75	85%	75	84%
Total	156	89%	156	88%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>				
English proficient	156	89%	156	88%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0	0%
Total	156	89%	156	88%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>				
Economically disadvantaged	10	90%	10	90%
Not disadvantaged	146	89%	146	88%
Total	156	89%	156	88%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>				
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%
Not migrant family	156	89%	156	88%
Total	156	89%	156	88%

## Glossary

**Accountability Cohort:** An accountability cohort is all students, regardless of grade status, who were enrolled in school on BEDS day two years after the year in which they entered grade 9, or, in the case of ungraded students with disabilities, the year in which they reached their seventeenth birthday. (For example, the 1998 accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 1998 who were enrolled on October 4, 2000). Certain students with severe disabilities, new immigrants, and students who transfer to programs leading to a high school diploma or high school equivalency diploma are not included in the school accountability cohort. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (8) of the Commissioner's Regulations.

**Component Retests:** Component retests were offered in Regents English and Mathematics A to graduating seniors who were at risk of not meeting the State learning standards. Component retesting is the process by which a student who has failed a Regents examination in English or Mathematics A twice is retested only on the areas of the learning standards in which the student has been proven deficient. Component retesting eliminates the need for the student to retake the full Regents examination multiple times. Students who earn credit through component retesting are counted as if they scored in the 55–64 range or in the 65–84 range, as determined by the results of the component retest.

**Counts of Students Tested:** "Counts of Students Tested" includes only students who completed sufficient test questions to receive a score.

**Graduation-Rate Cohort:** Graduation-rate cohort for each year includes all students in the accountability cohort in the previous year plus all students excluded from that accountability cohort solely because they transferred to a general education development (GED) program.

**Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students:** Schools provide special English instruction to students for whom English is a second language so they can participate effectively in the academic program. In 2002–03 and in previous years, students were considered LEP if, by reason of foreign birth or ancestry, they spoke a language other than English and (1) either understood and spoke little or no English or (2) scored at or below the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile on an English language assessment instrument. The United States Department of Education has approved the use of the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) as the required measure of language arts proficiency for LEP students in grades 4 and 8 who have attended school in the United States (not including Puerto Rico) for fewer than three consecutive years and for LEP students who have attended for four or five years and have received an exemption from the general assessment requirement.

**New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA):** The district Committee on Special Education designates students with severe disabilities who meet criteria established in Commissioner's Regulations to take the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA).

**Student Confidentiality/Suppressed Data (# and s):** To ensure student confidentiality, the Department does *not* publish data for groups with fewer than five students or data that would allow readers to easily determine the performance of a group with fewer than five students. In the *Overview*, the pound character (#) appears when fewer than five students in a group were tested. In the *Analysis*, when fewer than five students in a group (e.g., Hispanic) were tested, percentages of tested students scoring at various levels are suppressed for that group and the next smallest group. Suppressed data are indicated with an (s). However, the performance of tested students in these groups is aggregated and shown in the Small Group Total row.

**Validity and Reliability of Small Group Data:** It is important that programmatic decisions are based on valid and reliable data. Data for fewer than 30 students in a group may be neither valid nor reliable. If a school does not have 30 students in a grade or a subgroup in a given year, the school should evaluate results for students in this group over a period of years to make programmatic decisions.