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



# OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS, AND SCIENCE AND

#### ANALYSIS OF STUDENT SUBGROUP PERFORMANCE

for

**Worcester School** 

in

**Worcester Central School District** 

April 2006

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

#### **Regents of The University**

ROBERT M. BENNETT, Chancellor, B.A., M.S.	Tonawanda
ADELAIDE L. SANFORD, <i>Vice Chancellor</i> , B.A., M.A., P.D	Hollis
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., Ed. D.	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
CAROL BELLAMY, A.B., J.D.	Brooklyn
ROGER B. TILLES, B.A., J.D.	<b>Great Neck</b>

#### **President of The University and Commissioner of Education**

RICHARD P. MILLS

**Interim Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education**JEAN STEVENS

#### 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

The New York State School 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 school and district performance. Knowledge gained from the school report card on a school's strengths and weaknesses can be used to improve instruction and services to students.

The New York State School Report Card consists of three parts: the Overview of School 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 school 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 school, including general-education students and students with disabilities. In the *Overview*, each school's performance is compared with that of schools similar in grade level, district resources, and student needs as indicated by income and limited English proficiency (LEP) status. 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 school report card may be found in the glossary on the last page. Further information on the school report card may be found in the guide, *Understanding Your School Report Card: April 2006*, available on the Information and Reporting Services Web site at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

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

#### School Profile

Principal: Melissa Lane		Phone: (607)397-8785
Organization	Grade Range	Student Enrollment
2004–05	K-12	433

2003-04 School District-wide Total Expenditure per Pupil	\$12,329
--	----------

Similar
<b>Schools</b>
Group

This school is in Similar Schools Group 64. All schools in this group serve students from Kindergarden through Grade 12. Schoolwide measures like Attendance Rate are compared with all other schools in this group. Test results for schools in this group are compared with schools from comparable districts; elementary level schools for grades K-4, middle level schools for grades 5-8, and secondary schools for grades 9-12.

#### 2004–05 Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers\*

Total Number of Core Classes	Percent Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
115	92%


<sup>\*</sup>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.

#### 2004-05 Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate\*

Total Number of Teachers	Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate
40	0%

<sup>\*</sup>Includes teachers with a modified temporary license.

English Language Arts



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

Dorformonos et	Counts of Students					
Performance at This School	Level 1 455–602	Level 2 603-644	Level 3 645–691	Level 4 692–800	Total Tested	Mean Score
Feb 2003	1	13	18	4	36	658
Feb 2004	2	10	18	4	34	662
Feb 2005	3	12	16	6	37	660

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


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	Levels 3 & 4	Total Tested
2005	0	0	0	0

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
2004–05	#	#	#	#	1

#### **Mathematics**



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.


Dorformones et	Counts of Students					
Performance at This School	Level 1 448–601	Level 2 602–636	Level 3 637–677	Level 4 678–810	Total Tested	Mean Score
May 2003	0	6	26	4	36	658
May 2004	0	10	17	6	33	652
May 2005	0	14	12	11	37	653

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

# 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
2004–05	#	#	#	#	1

Science\*



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

Doufournous at						
Performance at This School	Level 1 0–44	Level 2 45-64	Level 3 65–84	Level 4 85–100	Total Tested	Mean Score
May 2004	0	1	16	16	33	81
May 2005	0	4	18	15	37	81


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

# 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
2004–05	#	#	#	#	1

<sup>\*</sup>Only two years of data are shown because a new assessment in elementary-level science was administered for the first time in 2003–04.

#### English Language Arts



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

Performance at This School						
	Level 1 527–657	Level 2 658–696	Level 3 697–736	Level 4 737–830	Total Tested	Mean Score
January 2003	1	22	11	4	38	699
January 2004	2	18	17	3	40	702
January 2005	0	11	19	2	32	704

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


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	Grade 8 Level 1		Levels 3 & 4	Total Tested	
2005	0	0	0	0	

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	
2004–05	0	0	0	0	0	

#### **Mathematics**



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.


Performance at This School						
	Level 1 517–680	Level 2 681–715	Level 3 716–759	Level 4 760–882	Total Tested	Mean Score
May 2003	0	6	28	4	38	732
May 2004	1	12	23	5	41	728
May 2005	0	10	19	3	32	730

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

# 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
2004–05	0	0	0	0	0

Science



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

Performance at This School			Mean Score				
renonii	renormance at this School		Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested	Weari Score
January/	Middle-Level Science	0	2	20	15	37	82
June 2003	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
January/	Middle-Level Science	0	7	27	6	40	74
June 2004	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
January/	Middle-Level Science	0	4	17	11	32	78
June 2005	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0

Middle-L	evel Science Levels — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards*
Level 4	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.
Level 3	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.
Level 2	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.
Level 1	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.


<sup>\*</sup>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
2004–05	0	0	0	0	0

#### High School English Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graphs and tables below present performance of the 1999, 2000, and 2001 school accountability 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.



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

	English Graduation Requirement Achievement after Four Years of High School*										
	Cohort Members Highest Score Highest Score Highest Score Between 0 and 54 Between 55 and 64 Between 65 and 84 Between 85 and 100 Alternative Credit										
1999 Cohort	25	1	5	13	5	0					
2000 Cohort	29	3	1	14	10	0					
2001 Cohort	28	0	1	12	12	0					


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

Competenc		Took the Regents ng and Writing to equirement*						
	Passed the RCTs Failed RCT in Reading and/or Writing							
1999 Cohort	1	0						
2000 Cohort	2	1						
2001 Cohort	0	0						

<sup>\*</sup>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 graphs and tables below present performance of the 1999, 2000, and 2001 school accountability 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.



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

I	Mathematics Graduation Requirement Achievement after Four Years of High School*											
	Cohort Members   Highest Score   Highest Score   Highest Score   Approved											
	All Students	Between 0 and 54	Between 55 and 64	Between 65 and 84	Between 85 and 100	Alternative Credit						
1999 Cohort	25	1	2	8	13	0						
2000 Cohort	29	2	1	10	16	0						
2001 Cohort	28	0	0	16	9	0						

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


Competenc	Performance of Students Who Took the Regents Competency Test in Mathematics to Meet the Graduation Requirement*								
	Passed the RCT Failed at Least One RCT								
1999 Cohort	0	0							
2000 Cohort	2	0							
2001 Cohort	0	0							

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

47-25-06-04-0001 April 2006 12

#### **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, 1999, and 2000 school accountability cohorts for English and mathematics.



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

	Cohort Graduation Rates									
	Cohort Members* (a)	Transfers to GED (b)	Graduation Rate Cohort Members (a+b)	Number Graduated						
1998 Cohort	34	1	35	32						
1999 Cohort	25	0	25	24						
2000 Cohort	29	1	30	27						

<sup>\*</sup>Count as of August 31st 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 school 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 school and community 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 school did not report data for the 2004–05 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*.

English Language Arts

			3–04	<u> </u>		200	4–05	
Student Subgroup	Total	Perce Student	ntages of 1 s Scoring a	Tested at Levels	Total	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
	Tested	2–4	3–4	4	Tested	2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	1	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	31	S	S	S	37	92%	59%	16%
Total	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%
Small Group Totals (s)	34	94%	65%	12%	0	0%	0%	0%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	28	100%	71%	14%	33	S	S	S
Students with disabilities	6	67%	33%	0%	4	S	S	S
Total	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%
Results by Gender								
Female	16	100%	69%	6%	18	100%	67%	28%
Male	18	89%	61%	17%	19	84%	53%	5%
Total	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%
Results by English Proficiency	Status							
English proficient	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	13	92%	54%	8%	13	85%	69%	0%
Not disadvantaged	21	95%	71%	14%	24	96%	54%	25%
Total	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%
Total	34	94%	65%	12%	37	92%	59%	16%

#### Mathematics

		200	3–04			2004	4–05	
Student Subgroup	Total Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			
	Tested	2–4	3–4	4	Tested	2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	1	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	30	S	S	S	37	100%	62%	30%
Total	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%
Small Group Totals (s)	33	100%	70%	18%	0	0%	0%	0%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	27	100%	78%	22%	33	S	S	S
Students with disabilities	6	100%	33%	0%	4	S	S	S
Total	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%
Results by Gender								
Female	16	100%	63%	13%	18	100%	56%	39%
Male	17	100%	76%	24%	19	100%	68%	21%
Total	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%
<b>Results by English Proficiency</b>	Status							
English proficient	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	12	100%	50%	0%	13	100%	69%	31%
Not disadvantaged	21	100%	81%	29%	24	100%	58%	29%
Total	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%
Total	33	100%	70%	18%	37	100%	62%	30%

Science

		2003	3–04			200	4–05	
Student Subgroup	Total Tested		ntages of s		Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
	resteu	2-4	3-4	4	Testeu	2-4	3-4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	1	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	30	S	s	s	37	100%	89%	41%
Total	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%
Small Group Totals (s)	33	100%	97%	48%	0	0%	0%	0%
Results by Disability Status	•		•	•				
General-education students	27	100%	96%	56%	33	s	s	s
Students with disabilities	6	100%	100%	17%	4	S	s	s
Total	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%
Results by Gender					•		•	•
Female	16	100%	94%	31%	18	100%	89%	50%
Male	17	100%	100%	65%	19	100%	89%	32%
Total	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%
Results by English Proficiency	Status				•		•	•
English proficient	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%
Results by Income Level	•		•	•				
Economically disadvantaged	12	100%	92%	17%	13	100%	85%	38%
Not disadvantaged	21	100%	100%	67%	24	100%	92%	42%
Total	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%
Results by Migrant Status			•		•		•	•
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%
Total	33	100%	97%	48%	37	100%	89%	41%

**English Language Arts** 

			3–04	<u> </u>		2004	4–05	
Student Subgroup	Total	Perce Student	ntages of 7 s Scoring a	Tested at Levels	Total	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
	Tested	2–4	3–4	4	Tested	2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	1	S	s	s	1	S	s	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	S	S	S	0	0%	0%	0%
White	38	S	S	S	31	S	S	S
Total	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Small Group Totals (s)	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	35	100%	57%	9%	31	S	S	S
Students with disabilities	5	60%	0%	0%	1	S	S	S
Total	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Results by Gender								
Female	24	100%	50%	13%	17	100%	71%	12%
Male	16	88%	50%	0%	15	100%	60%	0%
Total	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Results by English Proficiency	Status							
English proficient	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	18	94%	39%	6%	9	100%	89%	11%
Not disadvantaged	22	95%	59%	9%	23	100%	57%	4%
Total	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%
Total	40	95%	50%	8%	32	100%	66%	6%

#### Mathematics

		200	3–04			2004	<del>1</del> –05	
Student Subgroup	Total Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			
	Tested	2–4	3–4	4	Tested	2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	1	S	S	S	1	S	S	S
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	S	S	S	0	0%	0%	0%
White	39	S	S	S	31	S	S	S
Total	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Small Group Totals (s)	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	36	100%	72%	14%	31	S	S	S
Students with disabilities	5	80%	40%	0%	1	S	S	S
Total	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Results by Gender								
Female	25	100%	68%	16%	18	100%	72%	6%
Male	16	94%	69%	6%	14	100%	64%	14%
Total	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Results by English Proficiency	Status							
English proficient	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	19	95%	63%	16%	9	100%	78%	11%
Not disadvantaged	22	100%	73%	9%	23	100%	65%	9%
Total	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%
Total	41	98%	68%	12%	32	100%	69%	9%

#### Science

			3–04		2004–05				
Student Subgroup	Total Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels				Total	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			
	restea	2–4	3–4	4	Tested	2–4	3–4	4	
Results by Race/Ethnicity									
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Black	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Hispanic	1	S	S	S	1	S	S	S	
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	S	S	S	0	0%	0%	0%	
White	38	S	S	S	31	S	S	S	
Total	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Small Group Totals (s)	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Results by Disability Status									
General-education students	35	100%	89%	17%	31	S	s	s	
Students with disabilities	5	100%	40%	0%	1	S	s	s	
Total	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Results by Gender		•					•		
Female	24	100%	83%	17%	18	100%	83%	22%	
Male	16	100%	81%	13%	14	100%	93%	50%	
Total	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Results by English Proficiency State	us	I.					l .	l .	
English proficient	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Total	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Results by Income Level			•	•	•	•	•		
Economically disadvantaged	18	100%	83%	6%	9	100%	89%	56%	
Not disadvantaged	22	100%	82%	23%	23	100%	87%	26%	
Total	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Results by Migrant Status		•	•	•	•	•	•	T.	
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Not migrant family	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	
Total	40	100%	83%	15%	32	100%	88%	34%	

#### 2000 and 2001 High School Cohorts

General-education students who first entered ninth grade in 2000 or 2001 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

		nort		2001 Cohort						
	Count of Students				Percent		Count of Students			Percent
Student Subgroup	Otrode at a	by Score		Meeting	Students	by Score		Meeting		
	Students in Cohort	Regents		Pass-	Gradu- ation	in	Regents		Pass-	Gradua- tion
		55– 64	65– 100	ed RCTs	Require- ment	Cohort	55– 64	65– 100	ed RCTs	Require- ment
Results by Race/Ethnicity										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	S	s	S	S	0	0	0	0	0%
White	28	S	s	S	S	28	1	24	0	89%
Total	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%
Small Group Totals (s)	29	1	24	2	93%	0	0	0	0	0%
Results by Disability Status										
General-education students	26	S	s	S	s	23	0	23	0	100%
Students with disabilities	3	s	s	s	S	5	1	1	0	40%
Total	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%
Results by Gender										
Female	18	1	15	1	94%	12	1	10	0	92%
Male	11	0	9	1	91%	16	0	14	0	88%
Total	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%
Results by English Proficiency	/ Status									
English proficient	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%
Results by Income Level										
Economically disadvantaged	11	0	8	2	91%	7	0	6	0	86%
Not disadvantaged	18	1	16	0	94%	21	1	18	0	90%
Total	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%
Results by Migrant Status										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%
Total	29	1	24	2	93%	28	1	24	0	89%

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

		hort		2001 Cohort						
	Count of Students   Perce					Count of Students			Percent	
Student Subgroup	Ctualouto	by Score			Meeting Gradu-	Students	by Score		Meeting	
	Students in	Pagante		Regents				Gradua-		
	Cohort	55- 65-		Pass- ed	ation	Cohort	55-	65-	Pass- ed	tion
	Conort	64	100	RCTs	Require-	Conort	64	100	RCTs	Require-
		04	100	NO10	ment		0-7	100	11010	ment
Results by Race/Ethnicity										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	S	S	S	S	0	0	0	0	0%
White	28	S	S	S	S	28	0	25	0	89%
Total	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%
Small Group Totals (s)	29	1	26	2	100%	0	0	0	0	0%
Results by Disability Status										
General-education students	26	S	S	S	s	23	0	23	0	100%
Students with disabilities	3	s	s	S	S	5	0	2	0	40%
Total	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%
Results by Gender										
Female	18	1	16	1	100%	12	0	11	0	92%
Male	11	0	10	1	100%	16	0	14	0	88%
Total	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%
Results by English Proficiency	Status									
English proficient	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%
Results by Income Level										
Economically disadvantaged	11	1	9	1	100%	7	0	6	0	86%
Not disadvantaged	18	0	17	1	100%	21	0	19	0	90%
Total	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%
Results by Migrant Status										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%
Total	29	1	26	2	100%	28	0	25	0	89%

#### **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.

	1999 Col	nort as of	2000 Cohort as of				
	August	31, 2003	August	31, 2004			
Student Subgroup	Graduation Rate Cohort	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate Cohort	Graduation Rate			
Results by Race/Ethnicity							
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0	0%			
Black	0	0%	0	0%			
Hispanic	0	0%	0	0%			
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	1	S			
White	25	96%	29	S			
Total	25	96%	30	90%			
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	30	90%			
Results by Disability Status							
General-education students	23	S	27	S			
Students with disabilities	2	S	3	S			
Total	25	96%	30	90%			
Results by Gender							
Female	14	93%	19	89%			
Male	11	100%	11	91%			
Total	25	96%	30	90%			
Results by English Proficiency S	tatus						
English proficient	25	96%	30	90%			
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0	0%			
Total	25	96%	30	90%			
Results by Income Level							
Economically disadvantaged	4	S	12	83%			
Not disadvantaged	21	S	18	94%			
Total	25	96%	30	90%			
Results by Migrant Status							
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%			
Not migrant family	25	96%	30	90%			
Total	25	96%	30	90%			

#### 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 2001 accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 2001 who were enrolled on October 8, 2003). Certain students are not included in the school accountability cohort. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (16) 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. 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 cognitive 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 <u>not</u> 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.