

# The New York State School Report Card

Accountability and Overview Report 2006 – 07 School IS 73 THE FRANK SANSIVIERIS INTERMEIDATE SCHOOL District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT #24 School ID 34-24-00-01-0073 Principal PATRICIA REYNOLDS Telephone (718) 639-3817 Grades 6-8, UE, US

# **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:

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.

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

	2004–05	2005-06	2006-07
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	372	351	303
Ungraded Elementary	14	16	29
Grade 7	701	677	632
Grade 8	764	686	656
Grade 9	0	0	0
Grade 10	0	0	0
Grade 11	0	0	0
Grade 12	0	0	0
Ungraded Secondary	42	47	66
Total K–12	1893	1777	1686

### 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**

	2004–05	2005-06	2006–07
Common Branch	20	28	24
Grade 8			
English	21	24	25
Mathematics	23	22	26
Science	29	27	26
Social Studies	29	26	26
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**

	2004-05		200	2005-06		6-07
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Eligible for Free Lunch	277	15%	1162	65%	1139	68%
Reduced-Price Lunch	247	13%	288	16%	264	16%
Student Stability*		94%		94%		92%
Limited English Proficient	353	19%	313	18%	274	16%
Racial/Ethnic Origin						
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	0%	2	0%	3	0%
Black or African American	25	1%	23	1%	20	1%
Hispanic or Latino	1143	60%	1110	62%	1037	62%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	469	25%	422	24%	411	24%
White	253	13%	220	12%	215	13%
Multiracial**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%

\* Not available at the district level.

\*\* Multiracial enrollment data were not collected statewide in the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years.

### **Attendance and Suspensions**

	2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annual Attendance Rate		93%		92%		92%
Student Suspensions	85	4%	35	2%	130	7%

### 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.

### **Teacher Qualifications**

	2004–05	2005-06	2006–07
Total Number of Teachers	125	112	118
Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate	2%	3%	3%
Percent Teaching Out of Certification	8%	13%	7%
Percent with Fewer Than Three Years of Experience	21%	16%	17%
Percentage with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate	38%	38%	41%
Total Number of Core Classes*	N/A	355	438
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	N/A	10%	8%
Total Number of Classes	445	442	563
Percent Taught by Teachers Without Appropriate Certification	8%	12%	7%

\* Data for 2004–05 were not weighted, so are not shown.

### **Teacher Turnover Rate**

	2003-04	2004–05	2005-06
Turnover Rate of Teachers with Fewer than Five Years of Experience	5%	30%	14%
Turnover Rate of All Teachers	15%	22%	13%

### **Staff Counts**

	2004–05	2005-06	2006–07
Total Other Professional Staff	9	10	10
Total Paraprofessionals*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant Principals	5	6	6
Principals	1	1	1

\* Not available at the school level.

### Teacher Qualifications Information

The *Percent Teaching Out of Certification* is the percent doing so more than on an incidental basis; that is, the percent teaching for more than five periods per week outside certification.

*Core Classes* are primarily K-6 common branch, English, mathematics, science, social studies, art, music, and foreign languages. The number of K-6 common branch core classes is multiplied by five so that these core class counts are weighted the same as counts for middle- and secondary-level teachers who report five classes per day. 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.

### Teacher Turnover Rate Information

Teacher Turnover Rate for a specified school year is the number of teachers in that school year that were not teaching in the following school year divided by the number of teachers in the specified school year, expressed as a percentage.

### 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.

### 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 2006–07, the third indicator is science at the elementary/middle level and graduation rate at the secondary level. Schools or districts that meet predefined goals 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 2006–07 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. (NYSESLAT is used only for participation.) At the secondary level, the PI of each group in the 2003 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 qualify for Safe Harbor using the third indicator, science or graduation rate.

#### 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 2002 graduation-rate cohort in the All Students group earning a high school diploma by August 31, 2006 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 2002 graduation-rate cohort earning a local diploma by August 31, 2006 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 for English

#### and Mathematics

The 2003 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2003-04 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2003-04 school year, who were enrolled on October 4, 2006 and did not transfer to a diploma granting program. Students who earned a high school equivalency diploma or were enrolled in an approved high school equivalency preparation program on June 30, 2007, are not included in the 2003 school accountability cohort. The 2003 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 AMOs for each grade level 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**.

#### **Graduation-Rate Cohort**

This term is defined on the graduation-rate accountability page.

#### **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 to Level 4. (See performance level definitions on the Overview Summary page.) 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)  $\div$  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)  $\div$  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 2006–07 safe harbor targets were calculated using the following equation:  $2005 = 0.6 \text{ pL} \cdot (200 \text{ the } 2005 \text{ OC PL} \cdot 0.10 \text{ safe})$ 

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

#### **Science Progress Target**

The elementary/middle-level 2006–07 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2005–06 PI. The 2007–08 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2006–07 PI. The 2006–07 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the State Science Standard in 2006–07.

#### **Science Standard**

The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory performance in science. In 2006–07, 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.

### **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 (except charter 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)	<b>New York State Status</b> (Applies to all New York State public schools except charter schools)
<ul> <li>School in Good Standing</li> <li>A school is considered to be in good standing if it has not be Restructuring, Restructuring, Requiring Academic Progress,</li> </ul>	en identified as a School in Need of Improvement, in Corrective Action, Planning for 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 fun is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for t following year.	
School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) A School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that does not mak 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.	d make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified
<b>School in Corrective Action</b> A School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that does not mak AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified considered a School in Corrective Action for the following yea if it continues to receive Title I funds.	d is make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified
School Planning for Restructuring A School in Corrective Action that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is conside a School Planning for Restructuring for the following year, if continues to receive Title I funds.	red make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified
<ul> <li>School Restructuring (Year 1)</li> <li>A School Planning for Restructuring that does not make</li> <li>AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified considered a School Restructuring (Year 1) for the following if it continues to receive Title I funds.</li> </ul>	
School Restructuring (Year 2 and above) A School Restructuring (Year 1 and above) that does not mak AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 2 and above) for t following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.	d

Pending – A school's status is "Pending" if the school requires special evaluation procedures and they have not yet been completed.

# 2 School Accountability


School IS 73 THE FRANK SANSIVIERIS INTERMEIDATE SCHOOL School ID 34-24-00-01-0073

### Summary

<b>Overall Accountability</b>	<ul> <li>Restructuring (Year 1)</li> </ul>				
Status (2007–08)	Element	tary/Middle Level	Secondary Lev	rel	
	ELA	A Restructuring (Year 1)	ELA		
	Math 🔥 Good Standing		Math		
	Science	▲ Good Standing	Graduation Rate	9	
Title I Part A Funding	Yearst	he School Received Tit	le I Part A Funding		
	2005-0	200	6–07	2007-08	
	YES	YES		YES	

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

	Elementary/I	Middle Level		Secondary Le	evel	
Student Groups	English Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	English Language Arts	Mathematics	Graduation Rate
All Students	~	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<b>v</b>			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	_				
Black or African American	–	_	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Hispanic or Latino	~	~		••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	<b>v</b>	<ul> <li></li> </ul>			••••	
White	<	<b>V</b>	••••	• ••••••	••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
Multiracial	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	X	~				
Limited English Proficient	X	<ul> <li></li> </ul>	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Economically Disadvantaged	<ul> <li></li> </ul>	~	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Student groups making AYP in each subject	<b>X</b> 5 of 7	🗸 7 of 7	🖌 1 of 1			



### Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

Accountability Status for This Subject (2007–08)	^	Restructuring (Year 1)
Accountability Measures	5 of 7	Student groups making AYP in English Language Arts
	X	Did not make AYP
Prospective Status		To be removed from improvement status in English Language Arts, this school must make AYP in this measure for two consecutive years. If this school fails to make AYP in 2007-08, the school will be Restructuring (Year 2) in 2008-09. If this school makes AYP in 2007-08, the school will remain Restructuring (Year 1) in 2008-09. [108]

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

	AYP	Participat	ion <sup>2</sup>	Test Perfo	rmance <sup>3</sup>	Performa	Performance Objectives	
<b>Student Group</b> (Total: Continuous Enrollment) <sup>1</sup>		Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	Effective	Safe Harbo	
	Status	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	AMO	2006-07	2007-08
All Students (1664:1556)	~	<b>~</b>	100%	<b>V</b>	139	119		
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (3:3)	_	_	-	-	-	-		-
Black or African American (18:17)	-	-	-	-	-	-	••••	_
Hispanic or Latino (1018:962)	<	✓	100%	~	129	118	••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (412:377)	~	~	100%	~	153	116	••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
White (213:197)	<	✓	98%	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	159	114	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
Multiracial (0:0)	••••••••••••••••		••••		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities <sup>4</sup> (135:127)	x	~	98%	x	97	113	85‡	107
Limited English Proficient <sup>5</sup>	•••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••		••••	•••••	••••	•••••
(296:328)	X	<b>~</b>	100%	X	90	116	112	101
Economically Disadvantaged (1429:1334)	<b>/</b>	<b>~</b>	100%	~	135	119		
Final AYP Determination	🗙 5 of 7							

#### NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> 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.
- <sup>2</sup> 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 2006–07, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2005–06 and 2006–07 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.
- <sup>3</sup> For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in the All Students group in 2006–07, data for 2005–06 and 2006–07 were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students in the All Students group in 2006–07, student groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion.
- <sup>4</sup> 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.
- If the count of LEP students is equal to or greater than 30, former LEP students are also included in the performance calculations.
- $\ddagger$  This student group did not make AYP in science; therefore, it did not qualify for Safe Harbor.

#### **AYP Status**

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

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT #24

### **Elementary/Middle-Level Mathematics**

Accountability Status for This Subject (2007–08)	^	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	7 of 7	Student groups making AYP in Mathematics
	~	Made AYP
Prospective Status		This school will be in good standing in 2008-09. [101]

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

	AYP Participation <sup>2</sup>		ion <sup>2</sup>	Test Perfo	rmance <sup>3</sup>	Performance Objectives			
Student Group	Ctatus	Met	Percentage Tested	Met Criterion	Performance	Effective	Safe Harbo		
(Total: Continuous Enrollment) <sup>1</sup>	Status	Criterion	lesteu	Criterion	Index	AMO	2006-07	2007-08	
All Students (1674:1590)	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	100%	~	165	83			
Ethnicity									
American Indian or Alaska Native (3:3)	_	_	-	-	-	-		-	
Black or African American (18:17)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
Hispanic or Latino (1028:979)	<	✓	100%	~	158	82	•••••••••••••••	••••	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (411:391)	✓	~	100%	~	185	80			
White (214:200)	<	✓	98%	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	165	78	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••	
Multiracial (0:0)	•••••••	•••••••	••••		••••	•••••••••		···· •·····	
Other Groups									
Students with Disabilities <sup>4</sup> (133:124)	~	~	99%	~	112	77			
Limited English Proficient <sup>5</sup> (300:372)	✓	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	100%	<b>v</b>	146	80		••••	
Economically Disadvantaged (1438:1368)	<b>~</b>	~	100%	~	165	83	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Final AYP Determination	🗸 7 of 7								

#### NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> 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 excueed from testing for medical reasons are not included in the accurate
- students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count.
   <sup>2</sup> 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 2006–07, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2005–06 and 2006–07 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.
- <sup>3</sup> For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in the All Students group in 2006–07, data for 2005–06 and 2006–07 were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students in the All Students group in 2006–07, student groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion.
- <sup>4</sup> 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.
- If the count of LEP students is equal to or greater than 30, former LEP students are also included in the performance calculations.
- ‡ This student group did not make AYP in science; therefore, it did not qualify for Safe Harbor.

#### **AYP Status**

- Made AYP
- ✓<sup>SH</sup> Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
- X Did Not Make AYP
- Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT #24

### **Elementary/Middle-Level Science**

Accountability Status for This Subject (2007–08)	^	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 2008-09. [101]

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

	AYP		Participat	ion <sup>2</sup>	Test Perfo	rmance <sup>3</sup>	Performance Objectives		
<b>Student Group</b> (Total: Continuous Enrollment) <sup>1</sup>	Status	Safe Harbor Qualification	Met Criterion	Percentage Tested	Met Criterion	Performance Index	State Standard	Progress 2006–07	Target 2007–08
All Students (696:644)	~	Qualified	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	97%	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	142	100		
Ethnicity									
American Indian or Alaska Native (2:2)		-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Black or African American (4:4)		-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Hispanic or Latino (399:368)	••••••	Qualified	~	97%	~	125	100	•••••	•••••
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (187:172)		Qualified	~	99%	~	163	100		
White (104:98)	••••••	Qualified	<	96%	<ul> <li></li> </ul>	164	100		•••••
Multiracial (0:0)	••••••		••••••	••••		••••			
Other Groups									
Students with Disabilities (55:47)		Did not qualify	~	85%	x	85	100	91	86
Limited English Proficient <sup>4</sup> (124:144)		Qualified	~	95%	~	107	100		
Economically Disadvantaged (589:543)		Qualified	~	97%	~	138	100		
Final AYP Determination	🖌 1 o	of 1							
AYP Status		followed by students wh <sup>2</sup> Groups with	the count of co to were excuse fewer than 40	ontinuously enrolle d from testing for r students enrolled	ed tested studer nedical reasons during the test	est administration p nts (used for Perforn 5 are not included ir administration peri- 0 fell below 80 perc	mance). For a the enrollme od are not rec	ccountabilit ent count. juired to me	y calculation et

participation rates over those two years.

were combined to determine counts and performance indices.

- Made AYP

✓<sup>SH</sup> Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target

X Did Not Make AYP

 Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

<sup>4</sup> If the count of LEP students is equal to or greater than 30, former LEP students are also included in the performance calculations.

shown is the sum of 2005–06 and 2006–07 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the

<sup>3</sup> 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 2006–07, data for 2005–06 and 2006–07

### Summary of 2006–07 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 o scored at or	Total Tested	
English Language Arts	0%	50%	100%
Grade 6	46%		311
Grade 7	49%		634
Grade 8	41%		647
Mathematics			
Grade 6	79%		326
Grade 7	72%		650
Grade 8	63%		684
Science			
Grade 8	50%		674

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT #24

#### 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**.

#### What are Similar Schools?

In this section, this school's performance is compared with that of 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: 20

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

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

		This School			Similar Schools				
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):				
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
2007 Mean Score: 650	Range:	598-785	650-785	705-785					
2006 Mean Score: 645	100%	96% 91%	46% 46%		97% 91%	48% 49%			
2005-06				4% 5%			4% 6%		
Number of Tested Students:		299 298	144 152	13 17					

Poculte by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005-06 <b>S</b>	2005–06 School Year			
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	311	<b>96</b> %	<b>46</b> %	4%	328	<b>91</b> %	<b>46</b> %	5%
Female	169	98%	52%	5%	144	92%	47%	6%
Male	142	94%	39%	4%	184	90%	46%	4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	-	-	-				
Black or African American	2	-	-	-	8	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	228	97%	40%	1%	261	90%	42%	3%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	68	93%	65%	15%	55	95%	69%	16%
White	12	-	–	-	4	-	–	-
Multiracial		••••		•••••				•••••
Small Group Totals	15	100%	60%	0%	12	83%	42%	8%
General-Education Students	277	98%	51%	5%	304	94%	50%	6%
Students with Disabilities	34	82%	9%	0%	24	54%	4%	0%
English Proficient	250	100%	56%	5%	275	94%	53%	6%
Limited English Proficient	61	82%	5%	0%	53	74%	13%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	277	96%	43%	4%	303	94%	50%	6%
Not Disadvantaged	34	97%	71%	6%	25	56%	4%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	311	96%	46%	4%	328	91%	46%	5%

**NOTES** The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students have 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	2006–07 <b>Sc</b>	chool Year			2005–06 School Year			
Assessments	Total	Number sco	Number scoring at level(s):			Number scoring at level(s):		
	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment	1		_	_	New NYSAA	were deve	eloped in	2007, so
(NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent	ـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ			-	2006 and 2	007 results	s cannot b	e compared
New York State English as a Second								
Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†:	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 6								

\* These counts represent recently arrived LEP students who used the NYSESLAT to fulfill the English language arts participation requirement.

### This School's Results in Grade 6 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools				
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):				
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
2007 Mean Score: 673	Range:	616-780	650-780	696-780					
2006 Mean Score: 655	100%	94% 90%	79%		89% 84%	64% 54%			
<ul><li>■ 2006-07</li><li>■ 2005-06</li></ul>				22%	н.		15% 11%		
Number of Tested Students:		308 327	256 214	71 38					

Poculto by	2006-07 9	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by Student Group	Total Tested	Percentage 2–4	e scoring at 3–4	level(s): 4	Total Tested	Percentage 2–4	e scoring at 3–4	level(s): 4
All Students	326	94%	<b>79</b> %	22%	365	90%	59%	10%
Female	177	95%	78%	24%	158	87%	56%	11%
Male	149	94%	79%	19%	207	91%	61%	10%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	-	-	-				
Black or African American	2	-	-	-	8	88%	50%	25%
Hispanic or Latino	237	94%	74%	14%	279	89%	53%	6%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	74	99%	93%	47%	70	94%	83%	27%
White	12	-	-	-	8	75%	50%	13%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	15	87%	80%	13%				
General-Education Students	291	96%	83%	24%	340	93%	62%	11%
Students with Disabilities	35	83%	43%	3%	25	44%	16%	0%
English Proficient	253	98%	85%	26%	281	94%	65%	13%
Limited English Proficient	73	84%	55%	5%	84	75%	36%	2%
Economically Disadvantaged	292	95%	78%	20%	339	93%	62%	11%
Not Disadvantaged	34	94%	82%	35%	26	46%	15%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	326	94%	79%	22%	365	90%	59%	10%

Other	2006–07 <b>Sc</b>	hool Year:			2005–06 School Year			
Assessments	Total	Number scoring at level(s):			Total	Number scoring at level(s):		
	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent	1	-	-	-	New NYSAA were developed in 2007, so 2006 and 2007 results cannot be compare			

### This School's Results in Grade 7 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar Schools Percentage scoring at level(s):				
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):						
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
2007 Mean Score: 648	Range:	600-790	650-790	712-790					
2006 Mean Score: 646	100%	92% 93%			93% <sub>90%</sub>				
<b>2</b> 006–07 <b>2</b> 005–06			49% 48%	3% 4%		46% 45%	3% 4%		
Number of Tested Students:		586 573	310 297	21 26					

Poculto by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	634	92%	49%	3%	619	93%	<b>48</b> %	4%
Female	287	90%	52%	6%	312	96%	53%	6%
Male	347	95%	47%	1%	307	89%	43%	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native					2	-	-	-
Black or African American	12	100%	25%	8%	4	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	380	90%	41%	2%	360	90%	38%	3%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	150	94%	64%	6%	152	96%	60%	7%
White	92	99%	61%	5%	101	97%	64%	6%
Multiracial	••••••	••••					•••••	
Small Group Totals	•••••••	••••	•••••••••		6	100%	50%	0%
General-Education Students	591	94%	51%	4%	572	95%	51%	5%
Students with Disabilities	43	77%	21%	0%	47	62%	17%	0%
English Proficient	549	97%	55%	4%	572	94%	51%	5%
Limited English Proficient	85	60%	8%	0%	47	72%	11%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	543	92%	45%	3%	570	95%	51%	5%
Not Disadvantaged	91	98%	74%	7%	49	61%	18%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	634	92%	49%	3%	619	93%	48%	4%

**NOTES** The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students have 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	2006–07 <b>Sc</b>	2006–07 School Year				2005–06 School Year			
Assessments	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 7 Equivalent	1	-	-	_	New NYSAA 2006 and 2			2007, so be compared	
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 7	15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

\* These counts represent recently arrived LEP students who used the NYSESLAT to fulfill the English language arts participation requirement.

### This School's Results in Grade 7 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Sch	ools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2007 Mean Score: 670	Range:	611-800	650-800	693-800				
2006 Mean Score: 653 ■ 2006-07 ■ 2005-06	100%	95% 91%	72% 52%	22%	91% 83%	58%	13% 7%	
Number of Tested Students:		620 616	469 355	141 67				

Poculto by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	650	95%	72%	22%	678	91%	52%	10%
Female	293	94%	71%	22%	334	93%	52%	13%
Male	357	96%	73%	22%	344	89%	52%	7%
American Indian or Alaska Native					2	-	-	-
Black or African American	12	75%	50%	17%	4	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	388	96%	67%	12%	392	87%	39%	3%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	154	95%	88%	44%	176	97%	78%	23%
White	96	97%	71%	28%	104	93%	61%	13%
Multiracial	•••••••••••••••••			••••••			•••••	
Small Group Totals	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				6	100%	50%	0%
General-Education Students	610	96%	75%	23%	631	93%	55%	10%
Students with Disabilities	40	83%	30%	0%	47	64%	17%	4%
English Proficient	549	97%	77%	24%	572	93%	57%	12%
Limited English Proficient	101	87%	45%	7%	106	80%	28%	1%
Economically Disadvantaged	556	95%	72%	20%	629	93%	55%	10%
Not Disadvantaged	94	98%	74%	33%	49	65%	16%	4%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	650	95%	72%	22%	678	91%	52%	10%

Other Assessments	2006–07 <b>S</b> o	hool Year			2005–06 School Year			
	Total	Number scoring at level(s):			Total	Number scoring at level(s):		
	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 7 Equivalent	1	-	-	-	New NYSAA 2006 and 2	were deve 007 results	eloped in 2 s cannot be	007, so e compared.

### This School's Results in Grade 8 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar Scho	ols			
		Percentage scori	Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
2007 Mean Score: 643	Range:	602-790	650-790	715-790					
2006 Mean Score: 643	100%	91% 89%			92% 87%				
<ul><li>2006-07</li><li>2005-06</li></ul>			41% 41%	1% 2%		41% 35%	<u>2%</u> 2%		
Number of Tested Students:		592 548	267 251	9 11					

Poculto by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	647	91%	41%	1%	613	89%	41%	2%
Female	322	94%	50%	2%	275	92%	48%	2%
Male	325	89%	32%	1%	338	87%	35%	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	-	-	-				
Black or African American	3	-	-	-	9	78%	44%	11%
Hispanic or Latino	373	90%	31%	1%	358	85%	30%	1%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	170	91%	55%	3%	140	97%	61%	4%
White	99	98%	59%	2%	106	94%	52%	3%
Multiracial	••••••		•••••••			•••••	••••••	•••••
Small Group Totals	5	100%	40%	0%			••••••	•••••
General-Education Students	598	93%	44%	1%	570	91%	44%	2%
Students with Disabilities	49	78%	10%	2%	43	65%	5%	0%
English Proficient	566	97%	47%	2%	571	94%	44%	2%
Limited English Proficient	81	56%	2%	0%	42	31%	0%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	542	91%	39%	2%	566	91%	44%	2%
Not Disadvantaged	105	94%	51%	0%	47	68%	6%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	647	91%	41%	1%	613	89%	41%	2%

**NOTES** The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students have 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	2006–07 <b>Sc</b>	2006–07 School Year				2005–06 School Year			
Assessments	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent	4	-	-	-	New NYSAA 2006 and 2				
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 8	34	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

\* These counts represent recently arrived LEP students who used the NYSESLAT to fulfill the English language arts participation requirement.

### This School's Results in Grade 8 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Scho	ools	
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):		Percentage sco	ring at level(s):	
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4
2007 Mean Score: 663	Range:	616-775	650-775	701-775			
2006 Mean Score: 652 ■ 2006-07 ■ 2005-06	100%	93% 86%	63%	18% 12%	84% 77%	48% 40%	<u>9%</u> 7%
Number of Tested Students:	<u> </u>	634 601	432 339	121 83			

Poculte by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	684	93%	63%	<b>18</b> %	699	86%	<b>48</b> %	12%
Female	340	91%	66%	20%	320	87%	48%	13%
Male	344	94%	60%	16%	379	85%	49%	11%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	-	-	-				
Black or African American	3	-	-	-	9	78%	44%	11%
Hispanic or Latino	394	92%	52%	7%	402	82%	37%	5%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	183	97%	84%	40%	173	94%	73%	29%
White	102	89%	68%	19%	115	87%	51%	10%
Multiracial	•••••			•••••			•••••	
Small Group Totals	5	100%	80%	0%				
General-Education Students	634	94%	67%	19%	655	87%	51%	13%
Students with Disabilities	50	76%	18%	2%	44	75%	18%	2%
English Proficient	568	94%	66%	20%	573	90%	54%	14%
Limited English Proficient	116	86%	49%	5%	126	66%	22%	1%
Economically Disadvantaged	578	93%	63%	17%	651	87%	51%	13%
Not Disadvantaged	106	93%	65%	24%	48	73%	21%	2%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	684	93%	63%	18%	699	86%	48%	12%

Other	2006–07 <b>Sc</b>	hool Year:			2005–06 School Year			
	Total	Number scoring at level(s):			Total	Number scoring at level(s):		
Assessments	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent	4	-	-	-	New NYSAA 2006 and 2	were deve 007 result	eloped in 2 s cannot be	007, so e compared.

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT #24

### **This School's Results in Grade 8 Science**

	This School	L		Similar Schools Percentage scoring at level(s):				
	Percentage sc	oring at level(s):						
	2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
1009	6							
	90% 88%			85%				
<ul><li>■ 2006-07</li><li>■ 2005-06</li></ul>		50% 50%	9% 7%		45%	9%		
Number of Tested Students:	607 602	334 343	63 51	_				
Doculto hy	2006–07 <b>Sc</b>	hool Year		2005-0	6 School Yea	r		
Results by Student Group	Total Tested	Percentage scor 2–4 3	ing at level(s): −4         4	Total Tested	Percentage 2–4	e scoring at level(s): 3–4 4		

Student oroup			-			-		
All Students	674	90%	50%	<b>9</b> %	684	88%	50%	7%
Female	332	90%	50%	10%	312	89%	45%	6%
Male	342	90%	49%	8%	372	87%	55%	9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	-	-	-				
Black or African American	3	-	-	-	9	89%	44%	11%
Hispanic or Latino	384	87%	36%	4%	390	85%	37%	3%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	185	94%	66%	22%	173	90%	69%	17%
White	100	94%	68%	7%	112	96%	65%	8%
Multiracial			•••••	•••••				•••••
Small Group Totals	5	100%	60%	0%				••••••
General-Education Students	631	92%	52%	10%	640	90%	52%	8%
Students with Disabilities	43	63%	12%	2%	44	66%	18%	0%
English Proficient	561	92%	58%	11%	563	94%	58%	9%
Limited English Proficient	113	79%	10%	0%	121	60%	12%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	567	90%	47%	8%	636	89%	52%	8%
Not Disadvantaged	107	92%	64%	14%	48	69%	23%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	674	90%	50%	9%	684	88%	50%	7%

Other Assessments	2006–07 School Year				2005–06 School Year				
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s):			Total	Number scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent	4	-	-	-	New NYSAA were developed in 2007, so 2006 and 2007 results cannot be compared.				
Regents Science	0				0				