# The New York State School Report Card

## Accountability and Overview Report 2005 – 06

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**
School ID **261600010043**
Principal **ANNE MCANDREW**
Telephone **(585) 458-4200**
Grades **K-6**

# This School's Report Card

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 the school's status under the State and federal accountability systems, on student performance, and on 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.

State assessments are designed to help ensure that all students reach high learning standards. They show whether students are getting the knowledge and skills 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.

## Use this report to:

**1 Get School Profile information.**
This section shows comprehensive data relevant to this school's learning environment.

**2 Review School Accountability Status.**
This section indicates whether a school made adequate yearly progress (AYP) and identifies schools in need of improvement and subject to interventions under the federal No Child Left Behind Act as well as schools requiring academic progress and subject to interventions under Commissioner's Regulations.

**3 Review an Overview of School Performance.**
This section has information about the school's performance on state assessments in English, mathematics, and science, and on high school graduation rate.

For more information:
Office of Information and Reporting Services
New York State Education Department
Room 863 EBA
Albany, NY 12234
Email: RPTCARD@mail.nysed.gov

# School Profile

This section shows comprehensive data relevant to this school's learning environment, including information about enrollment, average class size, and teacher qualifications.

## Enrollment

| | 2003–04 | 2004–05 | 2005–06 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-K | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kindergarten | 84 | 82 | 84 |
| Grade 1 | 82 | 84 | 103 |
| Grade 2 | 79 | 82 | 79 |
| Grade 3 | 85 | 64 | 79 |
| Grade 4 | 96 | 111 | 79 |
| Grade 5 | 90 | 97 | 91 |
| Grade 6 | 95 | 92 | 94 |
| Ungraded Elementary | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ungraded Secondary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total K–12** | 639 | 612 | 609 |

## Enrollment Information

*Enrollment* counts are as of Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) day, which is typically the first Wednesday of October of the school year. Students who attend BOCES programs on a part-time basis are included in a school's enrollment. Students who attend BOCES on a full-time basis or who are placed full time by the district in an out-of-district placement are not included in a school's enrollment. Students classified by schools as "pre-first" are included in first grade counts.

## Average Class Size

| | 2003–04 | 2004–05 | 2005–06 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Common Branch** | 22 | 21 | 20 |
| **Grade 8** | | | |
| English | | | |
| Mathematics | | | |
| Science | | | |
| Social Studies | | | |
| **Grade 10** | | | |
| English | | | |
| Mathematics | | | |
| Science | | | |
| Social Studies | | | |

## Average Class Size Information

*Average Class Size* is the total registration in specified classes divided by the number of those classes with registration. *Common Branch* refers to self-contained classes in Grades 1–6.

## Demographic Factors

| | 2003–04 | | 2004–05 | | 2005–06 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Eligible for Free Lunch | 483 | 76% | 446 | 73% | 439 | 72% |
| Reduced-Price Lunch | 51 | 8% | 63 | 10% | 61 | 10% |
| Student Stability* | | 88% | | 87% | | 95% |
| Limited English Proficient | 30 | 5% | 40 | 7% | 33 | 5% |
| **Racial/Ethnic Origin** | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 2 | 0% |
| Black or African American | 301 | 47% | 315 | 51% | 317 | 52% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 120 | 19% | 113 | 18% | 104 | 17% |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 24 | 4% | 25 | 4% | 18 | 3% |
| White | 192 | 30% | 158 | 26% | 168 | 28% |

* Not available at the district level.

## Attendance and Suspensions

| | 2002–03 | | 2003–04 | | 2004–05 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Annual Attendance Rate | | 93% | | 93% | | 92% |
| Student Suspensions | 32 | N/A | 54 | 8% | 71 | 12% |

## Demographic Factors Information

*Eligible for Free Lunch* and *Reduced-Price Lunch* percentages are determined by dividing the number of approved lunch applicants by the Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) enrollment in full-day Kindergarten through Grade 12. *Eligible for Free Lunch* and *Limited English Proficient* counts are used to determine *Similar Schools* groupings within a *Need/Resource Capacity* category. *Student Stability* is the percentage of students in the highest grade in a school who were also enrolled in that school at any time during the previous school year. (For example, if School A, which serves Grades 6–8, has 100 students enrolled in Grade 8 this year, and 92 of those 100 students were also enrolled in School A last year, the stability rate for the school is 92 percent.)

## Attendance and Suspensions Information

*Annual Attendance Rate* is determined by dividing the school's total actual attendance by the total possible attendance for a school year. A school's actual attendance is the sum of the number of students in attendance on each day the school was open during the school year. Possible attendance is the sum of the number of enrolled students who should have been in attendance on each day the school was open during the school year. *Student Suspension* rate is determined by dividing the number of students who were suspended from school (not including in-school suspensions) for one full day or longer anytime during the school year by the Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) day enrollments for that school year. A student is counted only once, regardless of whether the student was suspended one or more times during the school year.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## Teacher Qualifications

| | 2003–04 | 2004–05 | 2005–06 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers** | | | |
| Total Number of Core Classes | 59 | 52 | 179 |
| Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | 8% | 6% | 8% |
| **Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate** | | | |
| Total Number of Teachers | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate | 12% | 8% | 2% |
| **Individuals Teaching Out of Certification** | | | |
| Number of Teachers | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Percentage of Total | 15% | 8% | 2% |
| **Percent of Teachers with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate** | 12% | 10% | 12% |

## Staff Counts

| | 2003–04 | 2004–05 | 2005–06 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total Teachers | 39 | 39 | 43 |
| Total Other Professional Staff | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Total Paraprofessionals* | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Assistant Principals | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Principals | 1 | 1 | 1 |

* Not available at the school level.

## Teacher Qualifications Information

To be *Highly Qualified*, a teacher must have at least a Bachelor's degree, be certified to teach in the subject area, and show subject matter competency. The number of *Individuals Teaching Out of Certification* is the number doing so more than on an incidental basis; that is, teaching for five or fewer periods per week outside certification.

## Staff Counts Information

*Other Professionals* includes administrators, guidance counselors, school nurses, psychologists, and other professionals who devote more than half of their time to non-teaching duties. Teachers who are shared between buildings within a district are reported on the district report only.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# Understanding How Accountability Works in New York State

The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act requires that states develop and report on measures of student proficiency in 1) English language arts (ELA), in 2) mathematics, and on 3) a third indicator. In New York State in 2005–06, the third indicator is science at the elementary/middle level and graduation rate at the secondary level. Schools or districts that prove student proficiency on these measures are making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).




For more information about accountability in New York State, visit: **www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/accountability/home.shtml**

## 1 English Language Arts (ELA)

To make AYP in ELA, every accountability group must make AYP. For a group to make AYP, it must meet the participation *and* the performance criteria.

### A Participation Criterion

At the elementary/middle level, 95 percent of Grades 3–8 students enrolled during the test administration period in each group with 40 or more students must be tested on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) in ELA or, if appropriate, the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT), or the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in ELA. At the secondary level, 95 percent of seniors in 2005–06 in each accountability group with 40 or more students must have taken an English examination that meets the students' graduation requirement.

### B Performance Criterion

At the elementary/middle level, the Performance Index (PI) of each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled tested students must equal or exceed its Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) or the group must make Safe Harbor. At the secondary level, the PI of each group in the 2002 cohort with 30 or more members must equal or exceed its Effective AMO or the group must make Safe Harbor. To make Safe Harbor, the PI of the group must equal or exceed its Safe Harbor Target and the group must meet the qualification for Safe Harbor.

## 2 Mathematics

The same criteria for making AYP in ELA apply to mathematics. At the elementary/middle level, the measures used to determine AYP are the NYSTP and the NYSAA in mathematics. At the secondary level, the measures are mathematics examinations that meet the students' graduation requirement.

## 3 Third Indicator

In addition to English language arts and mathematics, the school must also make AYP in a third area of achievement. This means meeting the criteria in science at the elementary/middle level and the criteria in graduation rate at the secondary level.

**Elementary/Middle-Level Science:** To make AYP, the All Students group must meet the participation criterion *and* the performance criterion.

### A Participation Criterion

Eighty percent of students in Grades 4 and/or 8 enrolled during the test administration period in the All Students group, if it has 40 or more students, must be tested on an accountability measure. In Grade 4, the measures are the Grade 4 elementary-level science test and the Grade 4 NYSAA in science. In Grade 8 science, the measures are the Grade 8 middle-level science test, Regents science examinations, and the Grade 8 NYSAA in science.

### B Performance Criterion

The PI of the All Students group must equal or exceed the State Science Standard (100) or the Science Progress Target.

Qualifying for Safe Harbor in Elementary/Middle-Level ELA and Math: To qualify, the PI must equal or exceed the State Science Standard or the Science Progress Target in elementary/middle-level science for that group.

**Secondary-Level Graduation Rate:** For a school to make AYP in graduation rate, the percent of students in the 2001 graduation-rate cohort in the All Students group earning a high school diploma by August 31, 2005 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard (55%) or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target.

Qualifying for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math: To qualify, the percent of the 2001 graduation-rate cohort earning a local diploma by August 31, 2005 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard (55%) or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target for that group.

# Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability

### Accountability Cohort

The 2002 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2002–03 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2002–03 school year, who were enrolled on October 6, 2005 and did not transfer to a diploma granting program. Students who earned a high school equivalency diploma or enrolled in an approved high school equivalency preparation program by June 30, 2006, are not included in the 2002 school accountability cohort. The 2002 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 Committee on Special Education or district administrators and who met the other requirements for cohort membership. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (16) 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 Performance Index (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 secondary-level AMO will be increased as specified in CR100.2(p)(14) and will reach 200 in 2013–14. (See Effective AMO for further information.)

### Continuously Enrolled Students

At the elementary/middle level, continuously enrolled students are those enrolled in the school or district on BEDS day (usually the first Wednesday in October) of the school year until the test administration period. At the secondary level, all students who meet the criteria for inclusion in the accountability cohort are considered to be continuously enrolled.

### Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO)

The Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO) is the Performance Index (PI) value that each accountability group within a school or district is expected to achieve to make Adequate Yearly Progress (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**.

### 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 performance levels, from Level 1 (indicating no proficiency) to Level 4 (indicating advanced proficiency). At the elementary/middle level, 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 alternate method for making Adequate Yearly Progress (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 alternate means to demonstrate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for accountability groups that do not achieve their Effective Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in English or mathematics.

### Safe Harbor Targets

The original 2005–06 safe harbor targets were calculated using the following equation:

2005–06 PI + (200 – the 2005–06 PI) × 0.10

The resulting targets were adjusted so that their proportion of the 2005–06 AMO was the same as the original target's proportion of the 2004–05 AMO.

### Science Progress Target

The elementary/middle-level 2005–06 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2004–05 PI. The 2006–07 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2005–06 PI. The 2006–07 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the State Science Standard in 2005–06.

### Science Standard

The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory performance in science. In 2005–06, the State Science Standard at the elementary/middle level is a Performance Index (PI) of 100. The Commissioner may raise the State Science Standard at his discretion in future years.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# Understanding Your School Accountability Status

The list below defines the school status categories applied to each accountability measure under New York State's accountability system, which is divided into a Federal Title I component and a State component. Accountability measures for schools at the elementary/middle level are English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science; at the secondary level, they are ELA, mathematics, and graduation rate. A school may be assigned a different status for different accountability measures. The overall status of a school is the status assigned to the school for the accountability measure with the most advanced designation in the hierarchy. If the school receives Title I funds, it is the most advanced designation in the Title I hierarchy, unless the school is in good standing under Title I but identified as SRAP under the State hierarchy. A school that does not receive Title I funding in a school year does not have a federal status in that year; however, all schools receive a state status even if they do not receive Title I funding. Schools in improvement status under Title I must provide school choice for their students; those in need of improvement in 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/irts/school-accountability/about.shtml**.

## Federal Title I Status

(Applies to all New York State schools receiving Title I funds)

**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, in Corrective Action, Planning for Restructuring, Restructuring, Requiring Academic Progress, or as a School Under Registration Review.

**School in Need of Improvement (Year 1)**
A school that has not made AYP on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years 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 on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

**School in Corrective Action**
A School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School in Corrective Action for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

**School Planning for Restructuring**
A School in Corrective Action that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Planning for Restructuring for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

**School Restructuring (Year 1)**
A School Planning for Restructuring that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 1) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

**School Restructuring (Year 2)**
A School Restructuring (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 2) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

## New York State Status

(Applies to all New York State public schools)

**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1)**
A school that has not made AYP on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) for the following year.

**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2)**
A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) for the following year.

**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3)**
A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) for the following year.

**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4)**
A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4) for the following year.

**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 and above)**
A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4 and above) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 and above) for the following year.

# 2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## Summary

### Overall Accountability Status (2006–07)

**Good Standing**

| Elementary/Middle Level | | Secondary Level |
|---|---|---|
| ELA | Good Standing | ELA |
| Math | Good Standing | Math |
| Science | Good Standing | Graduation Rate |

### Title I Part A Funding

**Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding**

| 2004–05 | 2005–06 | 2006–07 |
|---|---|---|
| YES | YES | YES |

### On which accountability measures did this school make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and which groups made AYP on each measure?

| Student Groups | Elementary/Middle Level: English Language Arts | Elementary/Middle Level: Mathematics | Elementary/Middle Level: Science | Secondary Level: English Language Arts | Secondary Level: Mathematics | Secondary Level: Graduation Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **All Students** | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | | | |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | | |
| Black or African American | ✔ | ✔ | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | ✔ | ✔ | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | – | – | | | | |
| White | ✔ | ✔ | | | | |
| **Other Groups** | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | ✔ | ✔ | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | – | – | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | ✔ | ✔ | | | | |
| **Student groups making AYP in each subject** | ✔ 6 of 6 | ✔ 6 of 6 | ✔ 1 of 1 | | | |

**AYP Status**

- ✔ Made AYP
- ✔SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
- ✘ Did Not Make AYP
- – Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

**Accountability Status Levels**

| Federal | State |
|---|---|
| Good Standing | Good Standing |
| Improvement (Year 1) | Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) |
| Improvement (Year 2) | Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) |
| Corrective Action | Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) |
| Planning for Restructuring | Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4) |
| Restructuring (Year 1) | Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 & Above) |
| Restructuring (Year 2 & Above) | |

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Accountability Status for This Subject (2006–07)** | ^ | Good Standing |
| **Accountability Measures** | 6 of 6 | Student groups making AYP in English Language Arts |
| | ✔ | Made AYP |
| **Prospective Status** | | This school will be in good standing in 2007-08. [101] |

## How did students in each accountability group perform on elementary/middle-level English Language Arts accountability measures?

| Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)[1] | AYP Status | Participation[2] Met Criterion | Participation[2] Percentage Tested | Test Performance[3] Met Criterion | Test Performance[3] Performance Index | Performance Objectives Effective AMO | Safe Harbor Target 2005–06 | Safe Harbor Target 2006–07 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **All Students** (342:332) | ✔ | ✔ | 99% | ✔ | 153 | 116 | | |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0) | | | | | | | | |
| Black or African American (175:171) | ✔ | ✔ | 100% | ✔ | 148 | 114 | | |
| Hispanic or Latino (59:56) | ✔ | ✔ | 98% | ✔ | 159 | 109 | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (12:11) | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| White (96:94) | ✔ | ✔ | 99% | ✔ | 157 | 112 | | |
| **Other Groups** | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities[4] (56:54) | ✔ | ✔ | 98% | ✔ | 119 | 109 | | |
| Limited English Proficient (11:11) | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| Economically Disadvantaged (289:280) | ✔ | ✔ | 99% | ✔ | 150 | 116 | | |
| **Final AYP Determination** | ✔ 6 of 6 | | | | | | | |

**AYP Status**

- ✔ Made AYP
- ✔SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
- ✘ Did Not Make AYP
- – Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

**NOTES**

1 These data show the count of students enrolled during the test administration period (used for Participation) followed by the count of continuously enrolled tested students (used for Performance). For accountability calculations, students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count.

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the participation rate of a group fell below 95 percent in 2005–06, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2004–05 and 2005–06 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in the All Students group in 2005–06, data for 2004–05 and 2005–06 were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students in the All Students group in 2005–06, student groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion.

4 If the school failed to make AYP solely because of the performance of students with disabilities, met the 95% participation requirement for this group, and would meet or exceed the AMO for this subject if 34 points were added to the PI, then the school is considered to have made AYP for students with disabilities.

‡ This student group did not make AYP in science; therefore, it did not qualify for Safe Harbor.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# Elementary/Middle-Level Mathematics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Accountability Status for This Subject (2006–07)** | ^ | Good Standing |
| **Accountability Measures** | 6 of 6 | Student groups making AYP in Mathematics |
| | ✔ | Made AYP |
| **Prospective Status** | | This school will be in good standing in 2007-08. [101] |

## How did students in each accountability group perform on elementary/middle-level Mathematics accountability measures?

| Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)[1] | AYP Status | Participation[2] Met Criterion | Participation[2] Percentage Tested | Test Performance[3] Met Criterion | Test Performance[3] Performance Index | Performance Objectives Effective AMO | Safe Harbor Target 2005–06 | Safe Harbor Target 2006–07 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **All Students** (338:328) | ✔ | ✔ | 99% | ✔ | 141 | 80 | | |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0) | | | | | | | | |
| Black or African American (173:168) | ✔ | ✔ | 99% | ✔ | 136 | 78 | | |
| Hispanic or Latino (57:54) | ✔ | ✔ | 98% | ✔ | 139 | 73 | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (12:11) | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| White (96:95) | ✔ | ✔ | 100% | ✔ | 148 | 76 | | |
| **Other Groups** | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities[4] (56:54) | ✔ | ✔ | 98% | ✔ | 91 | 73 | | |
| Limited English Proficient (11:11) | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| Economically Disadvantaged (285:276) | ✔ | ✔ | 99% | ✔ | 139 | 79 | | |
| **Final AYP Determination** | ✔ 6 of 6 | | | | | | | |

**AYP Status**

- ✔ Made AYP
- ✔SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
- ✘ Did Not Make AYP
- – Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

**NOTES**

1 These data show the count of students enrolled during the test administration period (used for Participation) followed by the count of continuously enrolled tested students (used for Performance). For accountability calculations, students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count.

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the participation rate of a group fell below 95 percent in 2005–06, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2004–05 and 2005–06 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in the All Students group in 2005–06, data for 2004–05 and 2005–06 were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students in the All Students group in 2005–06, student groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion.

4 If the school failed to make AYP solely because of the performance of students with disabilities, met the 95% participation requirement for this group, and would meet or exceed the AMO for this subject if 34 points were added to the PI, then the school is considered to have made AYP for students with disabilities.

‡ This student group did not make AYP in science; therefore, it did not qualify for Safe Harbor.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# Elementary/Middle-Level Science

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Accountability Status for This Subject (2006–07)** | ^ | Good Standing |
| **Accountability Measures** | 1 of 1 | Student groups making AYP in Science |
| | ✔ | Made AYP |
| **Prospective Status** | | This school will be in good standing in 2007-08. [101] |

## How did students in each accountability group perform on elementary/middle-level science accountability measures?

| Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)[1] | AYP Status | AYP Safe Harbor Qualification | Participation[2] Met Criterion | Participation[2] Percentage Tested | Test Performance[3] Met Criterion | Test Performance[3] Performance Index | Performance Objectives State Standard | Progress Target 2005–06 | Progress Target 2006–07 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **All Students** (81:75) | ✔ | Qualified | ✔ | 96% | ✔ | 187 | 100 | | |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0) | | | | | | | | | |
| Black or African American (42:40) | | Qualified | ✔ | 98% | ✔ | 180 | 100 | | |
| Hispanic or Latino (16:15) | | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (3:1) | | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| White (20:19) | | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| **Other Groups** | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities (10:8) | | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| Limited English Proficient (5:4) | | – | – | – | – | – | – | | – |
| Economically Disadvantaged (68:63) | | Qualified | ✔ | 96% | ✔ | 184 | 100 | | |
| **Final AYP Determination** | ✔ 1 of 1 | | | | | | | | |

**AYP Status**

- ✔ Made AYP
- ✔SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
- ✘ Did Not Make AYP
- – Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

**NOTES**

1 These data show the count of students enrolled during the test administration period (used for Participation) followed by the count of continuously enrolled tested students (used for Performance). For accountability calculations, students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count.

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the participation rate of a group fell below 80 percent in 2005–06, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2004–05 and 2005–06 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 Groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion. For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2005–06, data for 2004–05 and 2005–06 were combined to determine counts and performance indices.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## Summary of 2005–06 School Performance

Performance on the State assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science at the elementary and middle levels is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of tested students scoring at or above Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4. Performance on the State assessments in ELA and mathematics at the secondary level is reported in terms of the percentage of students in a cohort scoring at these levels.

| | Percentage of students that scored at or above Level 3 | Total Tested |
|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | | |
| Grade 3 | 47% | 77 |
| Grade 4 | 60% | 77 |
| Grade 5 | 59% | 90 |
| Grade 6 | 61% | 90 |
| **Mathematics** | | |
| Grade 3 | 73% | 79 |
| Grade 4 | 58% | 79 |
| Grade 5 | 43% | 91 |
| Grade 6 | 51% | 87 |
| **Science** | | |
| Grade 4 | 88% | 78 |

### About the Performance Level Descriptors

**Level 1**: **Not Meeting Learning Standards**. Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

**Level 2**: **Partially Meeting Learning Standards**. Student performance demonstrates a partial understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

**Level 3**: **Meeting Learning Standards**. Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

**Level 4**: **Meeting Learning Standards with Distinction**. Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

### How are Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) categories determined?

Districts are divided into high, average, and low need categories based on their ability to meet the special needs of their students with local resources. Districts in the high need category are subdivided into four categories based on enrollment size and, in some cases, number of students per square mile. More information about the categories can be found in the *Report to the Governor and the Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools* at **www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts**.

In this section, this school's performance is compared with that of similar schools.

### What are Similar Schools?

Within each N/RC category, the Department identifies Similar Schools: schools that serve similar students and have similar resources. Each school report card compares the school's performance with that of similar schools. The following factors are considered in grouping schools: a) the grade level served by the school and b) rates of student poverty and limited English proficiency. Student poverty levels are indicated by determining the percentage of children in each school who participate in the free-lunch program. By combining these factors, a measure of student need is created and used to place schools into relatively low (lowest quartile), relatively high (highest quartile), and typical (mid-range) groups.

### This School's Similar Schools Group: 5

All schools in this group are elementary level schools in large cities other than New York City. The schools in this group are in the middle range of student needs for elementary level schools in these districts.

# 3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## This School's Results in Grade 3 English Language Arts

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 651 | Range: | 616–780 | 650–780 | 730–780 | | | |
| | | 94% | 47% | 3% | 81% | 43% | 2% |
| Number of Students: | | 72 | 36 | 2 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **77** | **94%** | **47%** | **3%** | | | | |
| Female | 49 | 96% | 53% | 2% | | | | |
| Male | 28 | 89% | 36% | 4% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| Black or African American | 38 | 89% | 39% | 3% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 16 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 1 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 22 | 95% | 55% | 5% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 17 | 100% | 53% | 0% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 66 | 95% | 48% | 3% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 11 | 82% | 36% | 0% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 76 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 1 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 65 | 94% | 45% | 3% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 12 | 92% | 58% | 0% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 77 | 94% | 47% | 3% | | | | |

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent | 0 | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 3 | 3 | – | – | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

† Results in this report are shown for students who took the NYSESLAT in lieu of the New York State Testing Program assessment for accountability purposes.

# 3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## This School's Results in Grade 3 Mathematics

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 663 | Range: | 624–770 | 650–770 | 703–770 | | | |
| | | 96% | 73% | 6% | 80% | 51% | 6% |
| Number of Students: | | 76 | 58 | 5 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **79** | **96%** | **73%** | **6%** | | | | |
| Female | 49 | 96% | 69% | 4% | | | | |
| Male | 30 | 97% | 80% | 10% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| Black or African American | 38 | 97% | 68% | 11% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 16 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 3 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 22 | 91% | 77% | 0% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 19 | 100% | 79% | 5% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 68 | 97% | 78% | 6% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 11 | 91% | 45% | 9% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 75 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 4 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 66 | 97% | 71% | 8% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 13 | 92% | 85% | 0% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 79 | 96% | 73% | 6% | | | | |

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent | 0 | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# This School's Results in Grade 4 English Language Arts

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 654 | Range: | 612–775 | 650–775 | 716–775 | | | |
| | | 91% | 60% | 3% | 79% | 47% | 3% |
| Number of Students: | | 70 | 46 | 2 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **77** | **91%** | **60%** | **3%** | | | | |
| Female | 35 | 97% | 66% | 6% | | | | |
| Male | 42 | 86% | 55% | 0% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | | | | |
| Black or African American | 41 | 88% | 56% | 2% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 14 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 2 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 20 | 95% | 65% | 0% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 16 | 94% | 63% | 6% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 68 | 91% | 60% | 3% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 9 | 89% | 56% | 0% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 74 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 3 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 65 | 89% | 57% | 3% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 12 | 100% | 75% | 0% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 77 | 91% | 60% | 3% | | | | |

New assessments for elementary- and middle-level English language arts and mathematics were administered in 2006. Results from these assessments cannot be directly compared to results from previously administered assessments.

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 4 | 2 | – | – | N/A | 4 | – | – | N/A |

† Results in this report are shown for students who took the NYSESLAT in lieu of the New York State Testing Program assessment for accountability purposes.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# This School's Results in Grade 4 Mathematics

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 657 | Range: | 622–800 | 650–800 | 702–800 | | | |
| | | 87% | 58% | 11% | 81% | 56% | 9% |
| Number of Students: | | 69 | 46 | 9 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **79** | **87%** | **58%** | **11%** | | | | |
| Female | 37 | 89% | 59% | 11% | | | | |
| Male | 42 | 86% | 57% | 12% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | | | | |
| Black or African American | 41 | 85% | 54% | 10% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 15 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 3 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 20 | 90% | 75% | 15% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 18 | 89% | 50% | 11% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 70 | 90% | 60% | 11% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 9 | 67% | 44% | 11% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 74 | 89% | 61% | 12% | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 5 | 60% | 20% | 0% | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 67 | 87% | 60% | 10% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 12 | 92% | 50% | 17% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 79 | 87% | 58% | 11% | | | | |

New assessments for elementary- and middle-level English language arts and mathematics were administered in 2006. Results from these assessments cannot be directly compared to results from previously administered assessments.

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# This School's Results in Grade 4 Science

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 77 | Range: | 45–100 | 65–100 | 85–100 | | | |
| 2005–06 | | 97% | 88% | 32% | 96% | 78% | 30% |
| 2004–05 | | 95% | 78% | 28% | 92% | 69% | 25% |
| Number of Students: | | 76 102 | 69 83 | 25 30 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **78** | **97%** | **88%** | **32%** | **107** | **95%** | **78%** | **28%** |
| Female | 35 | 100% | 94% | 31% | 59 | 98% | 78% | 29% |
| Male | 43 | 95% | 84% | 33% | 48 | 92% | 77% | 27% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | | | | |
| Black or African American | 41 | 95% | 85% | 22% | 50 | 96% | 76% | 24% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 15 | – | – | – | 19 | 95% | 79% | 26% |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 2 | – | – | – | 5 | 80% | 80% | 40% |
| White | 20 | 100% | 95% | 50% | 33 | 97% | 79% | 33% |
| Small Group Totals | 17 | 100% | 88% | 35% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 70 | 97% | 90% | 31% | 100 | 96% | 79% | 28% |
| Students with Disabilities | 8 | 100% | 75% | 38% | 7 | 86% | 57% | 29% |
| English Proficient | 74 | – | – | – | 101 | 96% | 77% | 28% |
| Limited English Proficient | 4 | – | – | – | 6 | 83% | 83% | 33% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 65 | 97% | 86% | 28% | 95 | 95% | 76% | 23% |
| Not Disadvantaged | 13 | 100% | 100% | 54% | 12 | 100% | 92% | 67% |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 78 | 97% | 88% | 32% | 107 | 95% | 78% | 28% |

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# This School's Results in Grade 5 English Language Arts

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 657 | Range: | 608–795 | 650–795 | 711–795 | | | |
| | | 94% | 59% | 6% | 85% | 43% | 3% |
| Number of Students: | | 85 | 53 | 5 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **90** | **94%** | **59%** | **6%** | | | | |
| Female | 52 | 96% | 63% | 4% | | | | |
| Male | 38 | 92% | 53% | 8% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| Black or African American | 44 | 98% | 55% | 7% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 16 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 3 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 27 | 93% | 63% | 7% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 19 | 89% | 63% | 0% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 71 | 99% | 68% | 7% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 19 | 79% | 26% | 0% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 89 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 1 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 75 | 93% | 56% | 4% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 15 | 100% | 73% | 13% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 90 | 94% | 59% | 6% | | | | |

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent | 0 | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 5 | 1 | – | – | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

† Results in this report are shown for students who took the NYSESLAT in lieu of the New York State Testing Program assessment for accountability purposes.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# This School's Results in Grade 5 Mathematics

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 645 | Range: | 619–780 | 650–780 | 699–780 | | | |
| Number of Students: | | 76 | 39 | 1 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **91** | **84%** | **43%** | **1%** | | | | |
| Female | 52 | 83% | 44% | 2% | | | | |
| Male | 39 | 85% | 41% | 0% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| Black or African American | 46 | 83% | 39% | 0% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 15 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 3 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 27 | 93% | 41% | 4% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 18 | 72% | 56% | 0% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 72 | 86% | 51% | 1% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 19 | 74% | 11% | 0% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 89 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 2 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 76 | 83% | 43% | 0% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 15 | 87% | 40% | 7% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 91 | 84% | 43% | 1% | | | | |

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent | 0 | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |

# 3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## This School's Results in Grade 6 English Language Arts

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 659 | Range: | 598–785 | 650–785 | 705–785 | | | |
| | | 99% | 61% | 10% | 87% | 40% | 3% |
| Number of Students: | | 89 | 55 | 9 | | | |




## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **90** | **99%** | **61%** | **10%** | | | | |
| Female | 41 | 100% | 61% | 12% | | | | |
| Male | 49 | 98% | 61% | 8% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| Black or African American | 51 | 98% | 59% | 4% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 10 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 3 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 26 | 100% | 58% | 23% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 13 | 100% | 77% | 8% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 74 | 100% | 69% | 12% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 16 | 94% | 25% | 0% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 90 | 99% | 61% | 10% | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 77 | 99% | 58% | 6% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 13 | 100% | 77% | 31% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 90 | 99% | 61% | 10% | | | | |

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent | 0 | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 6 | 0 | | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

† Results in this report are shown for students who took the NYSESLAT in lieu of the New York State Testing Program assessment for accountability purposes.

# 3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## This School's Results in Grade 6 Mathematics

| | | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Mean Score: 646 | Range: | 616–780 | 650–780 | 696–780 | | | |
| | | 75% | 51% | 10% | 72% | 35% | 4% |
| Number of Students: | | 65 | 44 | 9 | | | |

## Results by Student Group

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| **All Students** | **87** | **75%** | **51%** | **10%** | | | | |
| Female | 37 | 73% | 54% | 14% | | | | |
| Male | 50 | 76% | 48% | 8% | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |
| Black or African American | 47 | 72% | 47% | 9% | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 10 | – | – | – | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 3 | – | – | – | | | | |
| White | 27 | 74% | 59% | 19% | | | | |
| Small Group Totals | 13 | 85% | 46% | 0% | | | | |
| General-Education Students | 71 | 82% | 59% | 13% | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 16 | 44% | 13% | 0% | | | | |
| English Proficient | 87 | 75% | 51% | 10% | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 74 | 72% | 46% | 5% | | | | |
| Not Disadvantaged | 13 | 92% | 77% | 38% | | | | |
| Migrant | | | | | | | | |
| Not Migrant | 87 | 75% | 51% | 10% | | | | |

**NOTES**

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students has been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

## Other Assessments

| | 2005–06 School Year | | | | 2004–05 School Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent | 0 | | | | This test was not given in 2004-05. | | | |

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# Previous Years' Results for English Language Arts

Standards for elementary- and middle-level English language arts and mathematics assessments administered in 1999 through 2005 are different from those for the 2006 assessments. As such, valid comparisons between 2006 data and data from previous years cannot be made.

## Grade 4

| | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Range: | 603–800 | 645–800 | 692–800 | | | |




**Number of students scoring at each performance level:**

| Test Date | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Total Tested | Mean Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Feb 2005 | 8 | 34 | 47 | 15 | 104 | 653 |
| Feb 2004 | 8 | 52 | 31 | 8 | 99 | 641 |
| Feb 2003 | 2 | 35 | 45 | 8 | 90 | 651 |

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT** District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

# Previous Years' Results for Mathematics

Standards for elementary- and middle-level English language arts and mathematics assessments administered in 1999 through 2005 are different from those for the 2006 assessments. As such, valid comparisons between 2006 data and data from previous years cannot be made.

## Grade 4

| | This School | | | Similar Schools | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | | Percentage scoring at level(s): | | |
| | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 | 2–4 | 3–4 | 4 |
| Range: | 602–810 | 637–810 | 678–810 | | | |
| 2004–05 | 99% | 77% | 17% | 95% | 74% | 22% |
| 2003–04 | 95% | 65% | 14% | 95% | 69% | 16% |
| 2002–03 | 98% | 66% | 20% | 94% | 65% | 15% |




| | Number of students scoring at each performance level: | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Test Date | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Total Tested | Mean Score |
| May 2005 | 1 | 24 | 64 | 18 | 107 | 654 |
| May 2004 | 5 | 29 | 49 | 13 | 96 | 647 |
| May 2003 | 2 | 31 | 44 | 19 | 96 | 652 |