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

ACCOUNTABILITY STATUS REPORT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, AND GRADUATION RATE

for

SANDY CREEK HS

in

SANDY CREEK CSD

2004–05 Accountability Status:

School In Good Standing

Title I Funding

This school received Title I funding in:

2002–03: Yes

2003–04: Yes

2004–05: Yes

School Accountability Status Categories

The list below defines the school status categories under New York State's school accountability system, which is divided into a Federal Title I component and a State component. A school that does not receive Title I funding in a school year does not have a federal status in that year. Schools receiving Title I funds that are not in good standing must provide school choice for their students; those in need of improvement year 2 and beyond must also provide Supplemental Education Services to eligible students. Other consequences for schools not in good standing can be found at: **www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/nclb/accountability/siinfo.htm**. To be removed from any improvement status, a school must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the grade and subject for which it was identified for two consecutive years, or in the case of a School Under Registration Review, achieve the performance targets established for the school by the Commissioner.

School in Good Standing: A school is considered to be in good standing if it has not been identified as a School in Need of Improvement, Requiring Corrective Action, Planning for Restructuring, or Requiring Academic Progress, or as a School Under Registration Review.

School Requiring Academic Progress: Under the State component of New York's accountability system, a school that does not make AYP in the same grade and subject for two consecutive years is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) for the following year. In each succeeding year that the school fails to make AYP, the year designation is incremented by one.

School in Need of Improvement (Year 1): A school that has not made AYP for two consecutive years in the same grade and subject while receiving Title I funds is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for the following year.

School in Need of Improvement (Year 2): A School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that does not make AYP in the grade and subject for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) for the following year.

School Requiring Corrective Action: A School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that does not make AYP in the grade and subject for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a School Requiring Corrective Action for the following year.

School Planning for Restructuring: A School Requiring Corrective Action that does not make AYP in the grade and subject for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a School Planning for Restructuring for the following year.

School Restructuring: A School Planning for Restructuring that does not make AYP in the grade and subject for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a School Restructuring for the following year.

School Under Registration Review (SURR): Schools that are farthest from the State standard and that have been determined by the Commissioner to be most in need of improvement are Schools Under Registration Review. These schools must achieve performance targets specified by the Commissioner of Education in their area(s) of identification within a prescribed timeframe or risk having their registration revoked by the Board of Regents.

Secondary-Level English Language Arts

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make AYP.

For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04, 95 percent of seniors in each accountability group of 40 or more must have taken an English examination that meets the student graduation requirement. Each group must also meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (***2003–04 Performance*** and ***Standards***). To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more cohort members must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its ELA safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor. (See the graduation-rate page of this report for further information on meeting the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor.)

ELA Safe Harbor Targets: The secondary-level 2003–04 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

Accountability Group	2003–04 Participation		2003–04 Performance*		2003–04 Standards			Made AYP in ELA in 2003–04	2004–05
	Count of Seniors in 2003–04	Percent of Seniors Tested	Count of 2000 Accountability Cohort Members	Performance Index	Effective AMO	ELA Safe Harbor Target	Met the Graduation-Rate Qualification for Safe Harbor		ELA Safe Harbor Target
All Students	90	82%	84	155	131			**NO**	
Students with Disabilities	10		13						
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black									
Hispanic									
Asian or Pacific Islander									
White	90	82%	84	155	131			**NO**	
Limited English Proficient									
Economically Disadvantaged	35		32	119	125	125	***	**NO**	127
Final AYP Determination								**NO**	

*For schools with fewer than thirty 2000 accountability cohort members, 1999 and 2000 cohort data were combined to determine counts and PIs.

Groups with a "" are not required to meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor, because fewer than 30 members in the 1999 graduation-rate cohort were in those groups.

State accountability status in secondary-level English language arts: School In Good Standing

Title I accountability status in secondary-level English language arts: School In Good Standing

Secondary-Level Mathematics

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make AYP.

For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04, 95 percent of seniors in each accountability group of 40 or more must have taken a mathematics examination that meets the student graduation requirement. Each group must also meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (***2003–04 Performance*** and ***Standards***). To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more cohort members must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its math safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor. (See the graduation-rate page of this report for further information on meeting the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor.)

Math Safe Harbor Targets: The secondary-level 2003–04 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

Accountability Group	2003–04 Participation		2003–04 Performance*		2003–04 Standards			Made AYP in Math in 2003–04	2004–05
	Count of Seniors in 2003–04	Percent of Seniors Tested	Count of 2000 Accountability Cohort Members	Performance Index	Effective AMO	Math Safe Harbor Target	Met the Graduation-Rate Qualification for Safe Harbor		Math Safe Harbor Target
All Students	90	91%	84	162	121			**NO**	
Students with Disabilities	10		13						
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black									
Hispanic									
Asian or Pacific Islander									
White	90	91%	84	162	121			**NO**	
Limited English Proficient									
Economically Disadvantaged	35		32	131	115			**YES**	
Final AYP Determination								**NO**	

*For schools with fewer than thirty 2000 accountability cohort members, 1999 and 2000 cohort data were combined to determine counts and PIs.
Groups with a "" are not required to meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor, because fewer than 30 members in the 1999 graduation-rate cohort were in those groups.

State accountability status in secondary-level mathematics: School In Good Standing

Title I accountability status in secondary-level mathematics: School In Good Standing

Graduation Rate

Definitions of terms, such as Progress Target and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

Made AYP in Graduation Rate in 2003–04: For a school or a district to make AYP in graduation rate, the Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003 for the "All Students" group must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target.

Qualification for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math: For an accountability group to be considered Qualified for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math, the Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target for that group.

Graduation-Rate Progress Targets: The 2003–04 Graduation-Rate Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the Percent of the 1998 Cohort Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2002. The 2004–05 Graduation-Rate Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the Percent of the 1999 Cohort Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003. This target is provided for each group whose Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003 is below the Graduation-Rate Standard in 2003–04 (55). Groups with fewer than 30 cohort members are not subject to this criterion.

Accountability Group	2003–04 Performance		2003–04 Standards		Made AYP in Graduation Rate in 2003–04	2003–04	2004–05
	Count of 1999 Graduation-Rate Cohort Members	Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003	Graduation-Rate Standard	Graduation-Rate Progress Target		Qualified for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math	Graduation-Rate Progress Target
All Students	86	80	55		YES	YES	
Students with Disabilities	11						
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
Black							
Hispanic	1						
Asian or Pacific Islander							
White	85	80	55			YES	
Limited English Proficient							
Economically Disadvantaged	27						
Final AYP Determination					YES		

State accountability status for graduation rate: School In Good Standing

Title I accountability status for graduation rate: School In Good Standing

Glossary

Accountability Cohort: The 2000 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 2000, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2000–01 school year, who were enrolled on October 2, 2002. Students who transferred to programs leading to a high school diploma or high school equivalency diploma were not included in the 2000 school accountability cohort. The 2000 district accountability cohort consists of all students in each school accountability cohort plus students who transferred within the district after BEDS day *plus* students who were placed outside the district by the CSE or district administrators and who met the other requirements for cohort membership. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (8) of the Commissioner's Regulations.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) indicates satisfactory progress by a district or a school toward the goal of proficiency for all students.

Annual Measurable Objective (AMO): The Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) is the PI value that signifies that an accountability group is making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will be proficient in the State's learning standards for English language arts and mathematics by 2013–14. The AMO will be increased in regular increments beginning in 2004–05 until it reaches 200 in 2013–14. (See Effective AMO for further information.)

Continuously Enrolled Students: Students enrolled in the school or district on BEDS day (usually the first Wednesday in October) of the school year and until the day of testing.

Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO): The Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO) is the PI value that each accountability group within a school or district is expected to achieve to make AYP. The Effective AMO is the lowest PI that an accountability group of a given size can achieve in a subject for the group's PI not to be considered significantly different from the AMO for that subject. If an accountability group's PI equals or exceeds the Effective AMO, it is considered to have made AYP. A more complete definition of Effective AMO and a table showing the PI values that each group size must equal or exceed to make AYP are available at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

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. Certain students with severe disabilities and new immigrants were excluded from the 1999 graduation-rate cohort.

Graduation-Rate Standard: The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory percentage of cohort members earning a local diploma. The State Graduation-Rate Standard is 55 percent. The Commissioner may raise the Graduation-Rate Standard at his discretion in future years.

Performance Index (PI): A Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group, indicating how that group performed on a required State test (or approved alternative) in English language arts, mathematics, or science. Student scores on the tests are converted to four achievement levels, from Level 1 (indicating no proficiency) to Level 4 (indicating advanced proficiency). ***At the elementary and middle levels, the PI is calculated using the following equation: 100 × [(Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) ÷ Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students]. At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: 100 × [(Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) ÷ Count of All Cohort Members].*** A list of tests used to measure student performance for accountability is available at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

Progress Target: For accountability groups below the State Standard in science or graduation rate, the Progress Target is an alternative method for making AYP or qualifying for safe harbor in English language arts and mathematics based on improvement over the previous year's performance.

Safe Harbor: Safe Harbor provides an alternative means to demonstrate AYP for accountability groups that do not achieve their Effective AMOs in English or mathematics.

Science Standard: The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory performance in science. In 2003–04, the State Science Standard at the elementary and middle levels was a PI of 100. The Commissioner may raise the State Science Standard at his discretion in future years.