The New York State School Report Card

Accountability and Overview Report 2005 – 06

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES**
District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**
School ID **310200011500**
Principal **MARITZA TAMAYO**
Telephone **(212) 343-8038**
Grades **9-12**

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	0	0	0
Grade 1	0	0	0
Grade 2	0	0	0
Grade 3	0	0	0
Grade 4	0	0	0
Grade 5	0	0	0
Grade 6	0	0	0
Ungraded Elementary	0	0	0
Grade 7	0	0	0
Grade 8	0	0	0
Grade 9	105	127	102
Grade 10	36	43	58
Grade 11	33	22	21
Grade 12	22	10	22
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0
Total K–12	196	202	203

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			
Grade 8			
English			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			
Grade 10			
English		27	24
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.

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Demographic Factors

	2003–04		2004–05		2005–06	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Eligible for Free Lunch	129	66%	145	72%	148	73%
Reduced-Price Lunch	22	11%	19	9%	17	8%
Student Stability*		0%		0%		0%
Limited English Proficient	7	4%	10	5%	15	7%
Racial/Ethnic Origin						
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%
Black or African American	104	53%	99	49%	99	49%
Hispanic or Latino	87	44%	96	48%	97	48%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3	2%	4	2%	3	1%
White	1	1%	2	1%	3	1%

* Not available at the district level.

Attendance and Suspensions

	2002–03		2003–04		2004–05	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annual Attendance Rate		84%		84%		84%
Student Suspensions	7	N/A	7	4%	6	3%

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 **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Teacher Qualifications

	2003–04	2004–05	2005–06
Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers			
Total Number of Core Classes	15	56	64
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	27%	32%	9%
Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate			
Total Number of Teachers	3	0	0
Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate	20%	0%	0%
Individuals Teaching Out of Certification			
Number of Teachers	5	5	0
Percentage of Total	33%	42%	0%
Percent of Teachers with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate	47%	58%	60%

Staff Counts

	2003–04	2004–05	2005–06
Total Teachers	19	16	15
Total Other Professional Staff	2	2	2
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 **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

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 **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

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 **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Summary

Overall Accountability Status (2006–07)

Improvement (Year 2)

Elementary/Middle Level	Secondary Level	
ELA	ELA	Good Standing
Math	Math	Improvement (Year 2)
Science	Graduation Rate	Good Standing

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				✔ SH	✔ SH	✔
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native				–	–	
Black or African American				✔ SH	✔ SH	
Hispanic or Latino				–	–	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander				–	–	
White						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities				–	–	
Limited English Proficient				–	–	
Economically Disadvantaged				✔ SH	✔ SH	
Student groups making AYP in each subject				✔ 3 of 3	✔ 3 of 3	✔ 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 **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Secondary-Level English Language Arts

Accountability Status for This Subject (2006–07)	^	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	3 of 3	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 secondary-level English Language Arts accountability measures?

Student Group (12th Graders: 2002 Cohort)[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 (33:63)	✔SH	–	–	✔SH	137	142	133	20
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (1:1)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Black or African American (20:36)	✔SH	–	–	✔SH	133	138	20	20
Hispanic or Latino (12:26)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (1:0)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
White (0:0)								
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities (4:9)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient (2:2)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged (16:45)	✔SH	–	–	✔SH	127	140	20	20
Final AYP Determination	✔ 3 of 3							

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 12th graders in 2005–06 (used for Participation) followed by the count of students in the 2002 cohort (used for Performance).

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students in the 12th grade 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 the 2004–05 and 2005–06 Grade 12 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 For schools with fewer than 30 students in the 2002 cohort, data for 2001 and 2002 cohort members were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more students in the 2002 cohort in the All Students group, groups with fewer than 30 students in the 2002 cohort are not required to meet the performance criterion.

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

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Secondary-Level Mathematics

Accountability Status for This Subject (2006–07)	^	Improvement (Year 2)
Accountability Measures	3 of 3	Student groups making AYP in Mathematics
	✔	Made AYP
Prospective Status		To be removed from improvement status in Mathematics, this school must make AYP in this measure for two consecutive years. If this school fails to make AYP in 2006-07, the school will be In Corrective Action in 2007-08. If this school makes AYP in 2006-07, the school will be in good standing in 2007-08. [111]

How did students in each accountability group perform on secondary-level Mathematics accountability measures?

Student Group (12th Graders: 2002 Cohort)[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 (33:63)	✔SH	–	–	✔SH	114	134	97	20
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (1:1)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Black or African American (20:36)	✔SH	–	–	✔SH	114	130	20	20
Hispanic or Latino (12:26)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (1:0)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
White (0:0)								
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities (4:9)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient (2:2)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged (16:45)	✔SH	–	–	✔SH	109	132	20	20
Final AYP Determination	✔ 3 of 3							

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 12th graders in 2005–06 (used for Participation) followed by the count of students in the 2002 cohort (used for Performance).

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students in the 12th grade 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 the 2004–05 and 2005–06 Grade 12 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 For schools with fewer than 30 students in the 2002 cohort, data for 2001 and 2002 cohort members were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more students in the 2002 cohort in the All Students group, groups with fewer than 30 students in the 2002 cohort are not required to meet the performance criterion.

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

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Graduation Rate

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

How did students in each accountability group perform on graduation rate accountability measures?

Student Group (Cohort Count)[1]	Graduation AYP	Graduation Met Criterion	Graduation Graduation Rate[2]	Objectives State Standard	Progress Target 2005–06	Progress Target 2006-07
All Students (37)	✔	✔	32%	55%	1%	33%
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native (1)		–	–	–	–	–
Black or African American (20)		–	–	–	–	–
Hispanic or Latino (16)		–	–	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0)						
White (0)						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities (3)		–	–	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient (1)		–	–	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged (20)		–	–	–	–	–
Final AYP Determination	✔ 1 of 1					

NOTES

1 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 high school equivalency preparation program, approved under Commissioner's Regulations 100.7.

2 Percentage of the 2001 cohort that earned a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2005.

Graduation Rate Information

For a school or a district to make AYP in graduation rate, the percentage of 2001 graduation-rate cohort members earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2005 for the "All Students" group must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target for 2005–06.

The Graduation Rate Standard is the criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory percentage of cohort members earning a local diploma. The State Graduation-Rate Standard for the 2001 cohort is 55 percent. The Commissioner may raise the Graduation-Rate Standard at his discretion in future years.

The 2005–06 Graduation-Rate Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the percentage of the 2000 cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2004. The 2006–07 Graduation-Rate Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the percentage of the 2001 cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2005. This target is provided for each group whose percentage earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2005 is below the Graduation-Rate Standard in 2005–06 (55%). Groups with fewer than 30 cohort members are not subject to this criterion.

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

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.

Secondary Level	Percentage of students that scored at or above Level 3 (0% – 50% – 100%)	2002 Cohort
English	47%	47
Mathematics	43%	47

Graduation Rate	Percentage of students who graduated (0% – 50% – 100%)	2002 Cohort
2002 Cohort	32%	47

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: 39

All schools in this group are New York City secondary level schools. The schools in this group are in the higher range of student needs for secondary level schools in this district.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

This School's Total Cohort Results in Secondary-Level English after Four Years of Instruction



Results by Student Group

	2002 Cohort*				2001 Cohort*			
	Number of Students	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Number of Students	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**47**	**55%**	**47%**	**2%**	**45**	**64%**	**49%**	**9%**
Female	22	45%	32%	5%	16	69%	50%	6%
Male	25	64%	60%	0%	29	62%	48%	10%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	29	59%	45%	0%	23	57%	39%	9%
Hispanic or Latino	17	–	–	–	20	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					1	–	–	–
White	1	–	–	–				
Small Group Totals	18	50%	50%	6%	22	73%	59%	9%
General-Education Students	42	60%	50%	2%	40	68%	50%	10%
Students with Disabilities	5	20%	20%	0%	5	40%	40%	0%
English Proficient	46	–	–	–	44	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	31	48%	39%	3%				
Not Disadvantaged	16	69%	63%	0%				
Migrant								
Not Migrant	47	55%	47%	2%				

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

	2002 Cohort*				2001 Cohort*			
	Number of Students	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Number of Students	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): High School Equivalent	0				0			

* A total cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 in a particular year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in that year, and were enrolled in the school/district for five months. Students are excluded from the cohort if they transferred to another school district, nonpublic school, or criminal justice facility, or left the U.S. and its territories or died before the report date. Statewide total cohort also includes students who were enrolled for fewer than five months.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

This School's Total Cohort Results in Secondary-Level Mathematics after Four Years of Instruction



Results by Student Group

	2002 Cohort*				2001 Cohort*			
	Number of Students	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Number of Students	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**47**	**55%**	**43%**	**9%**	**45**	**42%**	**29%**	**4%**
Female	22	45%	32%	5%	16	50%	31%	0%
Male	25	64%	52%	12%	29	38%	28%	7%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	29	62%	45%	3%	23	39%	22%	4%
Hispanic or Latino	17	–	–	–	20	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					1	–	–	–
White	1	–	–	–				
Small Group Totals	18	44%	39%	17%	22	45%	36%	5%
General-Education Students	42	57%	48%	10%	40	45%	33%	5%
Students with Disabilities	5	40%	0%	0%	5	20%	0%	0%
English Proficient	46	–	–	–	44	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	31	52%	39%	13%				
Not Disadvantaged	16	63%	50%	0%				
Migrant								
Not Migrant	47	55%	43%	9%				

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

	2002 Cohort*				2001 Cohort*			
	Number of Students	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Number of Students	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): High School Equivalent	0				0			

* A total cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 in a particular year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in that year, and were enrolled in the school/district for five months. Students are excluded from the cohort if they transferred to another school district, nonpublic school, or criminal justice facility, or left the U.S. and its territories or died before the report date. Statewide total cohort also includes students who were enrolled for fewer than five months.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Graduation Rate and Other Outcomes for Total Cohort

Students are included in the State total cohort based on the year they entered Grade 9 or, if ungraded, the school year in which they reached their seventeenth birthday. Students are included in the cohort of the school where they were last enrolled if they were enrolled for a minimum of five months. Students were counted as graduates if they earned a local or a Regents diploma.

Total Cohort Outcomes after Four Years of School

Percentage of students who:



	Cohort	Number of Students	Graduated	Earned an IEP Diploma	Transferred to GED	Were Still Enrolled	Dropped Out
All Students	**2002**	**47**	**32%**	**0%**	**32%**	**28%**	**9%**
	2001	**45**	**29%**	**0%**	**18%**	**51%**	**2%**
Female	2002	22	27%	0%	32%	27%	14%
	2001	16	38%	0%	6%	50%	6%
Male	2002	25	36%	0%	32%	28%	4%
	2001	29	24%	0%	24%	52%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2002	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2001	1	–	–	–	–	–
Black or African American	2002	29	31%	0%	31%	31%	7%
	2001	23	26%	0%	17%	57%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	2002	17	–	–	–	–	–
	2001	20	–	–	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	2002	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2001	1	–	–	–	–	–
White	2002	1	–	–	–	–	–
Small Group Totals	2002	18	33%	0%	33%	22%	11%
	2001	22	32%	0%	18%	45%	5%
General-Education Students	2002	42	36%	0%	33%	24%	7%
	2001	40	33%	0%	20%	45%	3%
Students with Disabilities	2002	5	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%
	2001	5	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
English Proficient	2002	46	–	–	–	–	–
	2001	44	–	–	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	2002	1	–	–	–	–	–
	2001	1	–	–	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	2002	31	26%	0%	35%	32%	6%
Not Disadvantaged	2002	16	44%	0%	25%	19%	13%
Migrant	2002	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Not Migrant	2002	47	32%	0%	32%	28%	9%

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.

School **UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES** District **NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 2**

Total 2001 Cohort Outcomes after Five Years of School

Percentage of students who:



	Number of Students	Graduated	Earned an IEP Diploma	Transferred to GED	Were Still Enrolled	Dropped Out
All Students	**45**	**40%**	**0%**	**27%**	**20%**	**13%**
Female	15	53%	0%	20%	13%	13%
Male	30	33%	0%	30%	23%	13%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–	–	–
Black or African American	23	35%	0%	35%	22%	9%
Hispanic or Latino	20	–	–	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	–	–	–	–	–
White	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Small Group Totals	22	45%	0%	18%	18%	18%
General-Education Students	41	–	–	–	–	–
Students with Disabilities	4	–	–	–	–	–
English Proficient	43	–	–	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	2	–	–	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	26	50%	0%	27%	12%	12%
Not Disadvantaged	19	26%	0%	26%	32%	16%
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Not Migrant	45	40%	0%	27%	20%	13%

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.