

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  
Westbury Union Free School District**

**February 2005**

# 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
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
JAMES R. TALLON, JR., B.A., M.A. ....	Binghamton
MILTON L. COFIELD, B.S., M.B.A., Ph.D. ....	Rochester
JOHN BRADEMAS, B.A., Ph.D. ....	New York

### President of The University and Commissioner of Education

RICHARD P. MILLS

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

JAMES A. KADAMUS

### Assistant Commissioner for Standards, Assessment and Reporting

DAVID M. ABRAMS

### 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 *Accountability Status 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 *Accountability Status 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, mathematics, and science 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. 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, limited English proficient 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 2005*, 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: Constance R. Clark		Phone: (516)876-5016
<b>Organization</b> <b>2003–04</b>	Grade Range	Student Enrollment
	NA	3823

<b>2002–03 District-wide Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$16,650
<b>2002–03 NYS Public Schools Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$13,085

### 2003–04 Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers\*

Total Number of Core Classes	Percent Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
769	96%


\*To meet the federal definition of "highly qualified," public school teachers of core academic subjects must have at least a bachelor's degree and be State certified for and demonstrate subject matter competency in the core academic subject(s) they teach.

### 2003–04 Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate\*

Total Number of Teachers	Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate
307	3%

\*Includes teachers with a modified temporary license.

## Elementary Level English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 455–602	Level 2 603–644	Level 3 645–691	Level 4 692–800	Total Tested	
Jan–Feb 2002	7	69	122	52	250	665
Feb 2003	8	68	128	43	247	662
Feb 2004	12	99	143	32	286	652

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	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested
<b>2004</b>	18	5	4	14	41

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

Elementary Level	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4	Total Tested
<b>2003–04</b>	#	#	#	#	3

## Elementary Level Mathematics



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 448–601	Level 2 602–636	Level 3 637–677	Level 4 678–810	Total Tested	
May 2002	5	40	181	67	293	660
May 2003	11	18	188	82	299	664
May 2004	8	34	208	83	333	662


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	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
<b>2003-04</b>	#	#	#	#	3

# Elementary Level

## Science\*



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 0-44	Level 2 45-64	Level 3 65-84	Level 4 85-100	Total Tested	
May 2004	4	31	183	116	334	79


Elementary-Level Science 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 Science

Elementary Level	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
2003-04	#	#	#	#	3

\*Only one year of data is shown because a new assessment in elementary-level science was administered for the first time in 2003-04.

## Middle Level English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 527-659	Level 2 660-698	Level 3 699-737	Level 4 738-830	Total Tested	
March 2002	5	112	106	18	241	702
	Level 1 527-657	Level 2 658-696	Level 3 697-736	Level 4 737-830	Total Tested	
January 2003	2	75	126	34	237	709
January 2004	3	82	119	35	239	710

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	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested
2004	16	10	2	6	34

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

Middle Level	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
2003-04	0	1	2	2	5



## Middle Level Mathematics



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 517-680	Level 2 681-715	Level 3 716-759	Level 4 760-882	Total Tested	
May 2002	26	51	137	32	246	722
May 2003	41	92	121	19	273	713
May 2004	28	46	154	32	260	726


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	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
2003-04	0	1	2	2	5

# Middle Level

## Science



Performance at This District		Counts of Students					Mean Score
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested	
June 2002	Middle-Level Science	18	88	103	8	217	63
	Regents Science	6	12	34	4	56	69
January/ June 2003	Middle-Level Science	16	116	60	1	193	58
	Regents Science	9	3	42	12	66	72
January/ June 2004	Middle-Level Science	20	82	50	18	170	61
	Regents Science	11	12	44	7	74	68

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	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
<b>2003-04</b>	0	3	1	1	5

# High School English Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graphs and tables below present performance of the 1998, 1999, and 2000 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in English. 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. The data in these tables and charts 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 and 2000 cohorts 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 the cohort 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>1998 Cohort</b>	142	11	31	84	5	0
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	228	20	30	103	31	0
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	194	25	21	108	21	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>1998 Cohort</b>	11	1
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	10	12
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	2	0

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative. Some students in the "Passed the RCTs" counts are also included in the 0-54 counts in the graph above.

# High School Mathematics Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graphs and tables below present performance of the 1998, 1999, and 2000 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in mathematics. 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. The data in these tables and charts 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 and 2000 cohorts 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 the cohort 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
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	142	7	25	60	35	0
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	228	29	17	93	44	0
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	194	6	25	91	26	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
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	10	1
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	22	1
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	8	3

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative. Some students in the "Passed the RCTs" counts are also included in the 0-54 counts in the graph above.

## 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 and 1999 school accountability cohort for English and mathematics.



Cohort Graduation Rates				
	Cohort Members* (a)	Transfers to GED (b)	Graduation Rate Cohort Members (a+b)	Number Graduated
1998 Cohort	140	14	154	134
1999 Cohort	208	17	225	178

\*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 2003–04 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	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total 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	125	98%	73%	16%	132	95%	63%	14%
Hispanic	108	96%	65%	17%	144	97%	60%	8%
Asian or Pacific Islander	12	s	s	s	3	s	s	s
White	2	s	s	s	7	s	s	s
Total	247	97%	69%	17%	286	96%	61%	11%
Small Group Totals (s)	14	93%	71%	36%	10	90%	60%	20%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	227	98%	74%	19%	253	100%	67%	13%
Students with disabilities	20	85%	20%	0%	33	64%	15%	0%
Total	247	97%	69%	17%	286	96%	61%	11%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	126	98%	74%	21%	144	97%	64%	13%
Male	121	96%	64%	14%	142	94%	58%	9%
Total	247	97%	69%	17%	286	96%	61%	11%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	246	s	s	s	284	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	1	s	s	s	2	s	s	s
Total	247	97%	69%	17%	286	96%	61%	11%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	179	98%	67%	16%	211	98%	63%	8%
Not disadvantaged	68	93%	75%	21%	75	91%	57%	21%
Total	247	97%	69%	17%	286	96%	61%	11%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Not migrant family	247	97%	69%	17%	285	s	s	s
Total	247	97%	69%	17%	286	96%	61%	11%

## Elementary Level Mathematics

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total 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	134	96%	90%	23%	136	97%	85%	26%
Hispanic	153	97%	90%	29%	185	98%	90%	24%
Asian or Pacific Islander	11	s	s	s	5	100%	100%	40%
White	1	s	s	s	7	100%	57%	29%
Total	299	96%	90%	27%	333	98%	87%	25%
Small Group Totals (s)	12	100%	100%	58%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	270	99%	94%	29%	295	100%	93%	27%
Students with disabilities	29	72%	55%	10%	38	82%	47%	5%
Total	299	96%	90%	27%	333	98%	87%	25%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	150	97%	92%	27%	166	98%	89%	27%
Male	149	96%	89%	28%	167	97%	86%	23%
Total	299	96%	90%	27%	333	98%	87%	25%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	249	98%	94%	29%	289	98%	88%	26%
Limited English proficient	50	88%	74%	20%	44	98%	86%	16%
Total	299	96%	90%	27%	333	98%	87%	25%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	212	99%	95%	28%	250	99%	88%	22%
Not disadvantaged	87	91%	79%	26%	83	93%	86%	33%
Total	299	96%	90%	27%	333	98%	87%	25%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Not migrant family	299	96%	90%	27%	332	s	s	s
Total	299	96%	90%	27%	333	98%	87%	25%



# Elementary Level

## Science\*

Student Subgroup	2003–04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	136	99%	90%	39%
Hispanic	186	99%	90%	32%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	100%	100%	60%
White	7	100%	57%	14%
Total	334	99%	90%	35%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>				
General-education students	297	100%	93%	37%
Students with disabilities	37	92%	59%	16%
Total	334	99%	90%	35%
<b>Results by Gender</b>				
Female	167	99%	91%	34%
Male	167	98%	88%	35%
Total	334	99%	90%	35%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>				
English proficient	289	99%	91%	36%
Limited English proficient	45	100%	78%	27%
Total	334	99%	90%	35%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>				
Economically disadvantaged	251	100%	91%	33%
Not disadvantaged	83	96%	84%	40%
Total	334	99%	90%	35%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>				
Migrant family	1	s	s	s
Not migrant family	333	s	s	s
Total	334	99%	90%	35%

\*Only one year of data is shown because a new assessment in elementary-level science was administered for the first time in 2003–04.

**Middle Level**  
English Language Arts

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total 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	147	99%	73%	12%	138	100%	62%	12%
Hispanic	82	100%	55%	17%	94	97%	66%	17%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	s	s	s	6	s	s	s
White	3	s	s	s	1	s	s	s
Total	237	99%	68%	14%	239	99%	64%	15%
Small Group Totals (s)	8	100%	88%	25%	7	100%	100%	29%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	197	100%	71%	15%	219	99%	66%	16%
Students with disabilities	40	95%	50%	10%	20	100%	45%	0%
Total	237	99%	68%	14%	239	99%	64%	15%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	120	100%	68%	16%	109	99%	66%	21%
Male	117	98%	67%	13%	130	98%	63%	9%
Total	237	99%	68%	14%	239	99%	64%	15%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	233	s	s	s	239	99%	64%	15%
Limited English proficient	4	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	237	99%	68%	14%	239	99%	64%	15%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	160	99%	62%	13%	162	98%	62%	14%
Not disadvantaged	77	99%	79%	17%	77	100%	70%	17%
Total	237	99%	68%	14%	239	99%	64%	15%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	237	99%	68%	14%	239	99%	64%	15%
Total	237	99%	68%	14%	239	99%	64%	15%

**Middle Level  
Mathematics**

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total 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	153	90%	54%	7%	145	90%	71%	10%
Hispanic	113	78%	46%	6%	108	88%	70%	14%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	s	s	s	6	s	s	s
White	3	s	s	s	1	s	s	s
Total	273	85%	51%	7%	260	89%	72%	12%
Small Group Totals (s)	7	100%	86%	14%	7	100%	100%	43%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	233	84%	48%	7%	243	88%	70%	12%
Students with disabilities	40	93%	68%	5%	17	100%	88%	12%
Total	273	85%	51%	7%	260	89%	72%	12%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	145	84%	53%	6%	124	86%	69%	14%
Male	128	86%	49%	9%	136	92%	74%	11%
Total	273	85%	51%	7%	260	89%	72%	12%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	229	94%	59%	7%	226	93%	78%	14%
Limited English proficient	44	39%	14%	5%	34	65%	29%	3%
Total	273	85%	51%	7%	260	89%	72%	12%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	195	81%	45%	6%	177	87%	70%	11%
Not disadvantaged	78	96%	67%	10%	83	94%	75%	14%
Total	273	85%	51%	7%	260	89%	72%	12%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	273	85%	51%	7%	260	89%	72%	12%
Total	273	85%	51%	7%	260	89%	72%	12%

## Middle Level

### Science

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total 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	101	93%	33%	1%	99	89%	38%	7%
Hispanic	90	s	s	s	69	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	s	s	s	2	s	s	s
White	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	193	92%	32%	1%	170	88%	40%	11%
Small Group Totals (s)	92	90%	30%	0%	71	87%	42%	15%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	157	90%	26%	1%	153	87%	35%	7%
Students with disabilities	36	97%	56%	0%	17	100%	88%	47%
Total	193	92%	32%	1%	170	88%	40%	11%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	99	87%	24%	1%	77	86%	35%	9%
Male	94	97%	39%	0%	93	90%	44%	12%
Total	193	92%	32%	1%	170	88%	40%	11%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	157	97%	37%	1%	142	92%	46%	13%
Limited English proficient	36	67%	8%	0%	28	68%	7%	0%
Total	193	92%	32%	1%	170	88%	40%	11%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	152	91%	30%	0%	121	86%	34%	12%
Not disadvantaged	41	93%	37%	2%	49	94%	55%	8%
Total	193	92%	32%	1%	170	88%	40%	11%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	193	92%	32%	1%	170	88%	40%	11%
Total	193	92%	32%	1%	170	88%	40%	11%

## 1999 and 2000 High School Cohorts

General-education students who first entered ninth grade in 1999 or 2000 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	1999 Cohort					2000 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	146	23	91	7	83%	130	17	92	1	85%
Hispanic	70	6	32	3	59%	56	4	31	1	64%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	0	5	0	100%	6	s	s	s	s
White	7	1	6	0	100%	2	s	s	s	s
Total	228	30	134	10	76%	194	21	129	2	78%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	8	0	6	0	75%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	207	28	133	3	79%	171	18	127	0	85%
Students with disabilities	21	2	1	7	48%	23	3	2	2	30%
Total	228	30	134	10	76%	194	21	129	2	78%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	126	16	76	5	77%	97	8	68	0	78%
Male	102	14	58	5	75%	97	13	61	2	78%
Total	228	30	134	10	76%	194	21	129	2	78%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	195	28	131	9	86%	157	17	115	1	85%
Limited English proficient	33	2	3	1	18%	37	4	14	1	51%
Total	228	30	134	10	76%	194	21	129	2	78%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	85	14	52	3	81%	90	10	62	1	81%
Not disadvantaged	143	16	82	7	73%	104	11	67	1	76%
Total	228	30	134	10	76%	194	21	129	2	78%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	228	30	134	10	76%	194	21	129	2	78%
Total	228	30	134	10	76%	194	21	129	2	78%

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

Student Subgroup	1999 Cohort					2000 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	146	10	94	17	83%	130	16	81	6	79%
Hispanic	70	7	32	4	61%	56	8	30	2	71%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	0	5	0	100%	6	s	s	s	s
White	7	0	6	1	100%	2	s	s	s	s
Total	228	17	137	22	77%	194	25	117	8	77%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	8	1	6	0	88%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	207	17	135	11	79%	171	25	111	1	80%
Students with disabilities	21	0	2	11	62%	23	0	6	7	57%
Total	228	17	137	22	77%	194	25	117	8	77%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	126	9	82	10	80%	97	12	60	3	77%
Male	102	8	55	12	74%	97	13	57	5	77%
Total	228	17	137	22	77%	194	25	117	8	77%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	195	16	129	22	86%	157	23	98	5	80%
Limited English proficient	33	1	8	0	27%	37	2	19	3	65%
Total	228	17	137	22	77%	194	25	117	8	77%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	85	9	53	11	86%	90	10	56	6	80%
Not disadvantaged	143	8	84	11	72%	104	15	61	2	75%
Total	228	17	137	22	77%	194	25	117	8	77%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	228	17	137	22	77%	194	25	117	8	77%
Total	228	17	137	22	77%	194	25	117	8	77%

## 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 district accountability cohort for English and mathematics.

Student Subgroup	1998 Cohort as of August 31, 2002		1999 Cohort as of August 31, 2003	
	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	108	89%	141	89%
Hispanic	39	79%	72	57%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	s	5	100%
White	5	s	7	100%
Total	154	87%	225	79%
Small Group Totals (s)	7	100%	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>				
General-education students	142	88%	204	81%
Students with disabilities	12	75%	21	57%
Total	154	87%	225	79%
<b>Results by Gender</b>				
Female	78	94%	122	84%
Male	76	80%	103	74%
Total	154	87%	225	79%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>				
English proficient	139	88%	193	87%
Limited English proficient	15	73%	32	31%
Total	154	87%	225	79%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>				
Economically disadvantaged	0	0%	82	96%
Not disadvantaged	154	87%	143	69%
Total	154	87%	225	79%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>				
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%
Not migrant family	154	87%	225	79%
Total	154	87%	225	79%

## 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 first entered grade 9, or, in the case of ungraded students with disabilities, the year in which they reached their seventeenth birthday. (For example, the 1999 accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 1999 who were enrolled on October 3, 2001). Certain students 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 certain students 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 on the Regents examination, as determined by the component retest results.

**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. Beginning in 2003–04, students are considered LEP if, by reason of foreign birth or ancestry, they speak a language other than English and (1) either understand and speak little or no English or (2) score below a state-designated level of proficiency on the Language Assessment Battery-Revised (LAB-R) or the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). The United States Department of Education has approved the use of the 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.