

# The New York State School Report Card

Accountability and Overview Report 2006 – 07 School PS 42 ELTINGVILLE SCHOOL District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT #31 School ID 35-31-00-01-0042 Principal BRIAN SHARKEY Telephone (718) 984-3800 Grades K-5, UE

# **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	61	63	68
Kindergarten	164	140	130
Grade 1	137	155	139
Grade 2	132	127	156
Grade 3	127	125	131
Grade 4	161	123	130
Grade 5	145	159	123
Grade 6	0	0	0
Ungraded Elementary	75	83	66
Grade 7	0	0	0
Grade 8	0	0	0
Grade 9	0	0	0
Grade 10	0	0	0
Grade 11	0	0	0
Grade 12	0	0	0
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0
Total K–12	941	912	875

### 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	22	22	22
Grade 8			
English			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			
Grade 10			
English			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			

# Average Class Size Information

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

### **Demographic Factors**

	200	4-05	200	5-06	200	6-07
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Eligible for Free Lunch	176	19%	159	17%	177	20%
Reduced-Price Lunch	138	15%	131	14%	114	13%
Student Stability*		94%		96%		94%
Limited English Proficient	20	2%	28	3%	21	2%
Racial/Ethnic Origin						
American Indian or Alaska Native	6	1%	3	0%	5	1%
Black or African American	8	1%	14	2%	6	1%
Hispanic or Latino	68	7%	66	7%	64	7%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	37	4%	37	4%	42	5%
White	822	87%	792	87%	758	87%
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		200	4-05	2005-06	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annual Attendance Rate		94%		94%		94%
Student Suspensions	1	0%	8	1%	10	1%

### 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	67	66	69
Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate	0%	0%	1%
Percent Teaching Out of Certification	7%	5%	4%
Percent with Fewer Than Three Years of Experience	4%	8%	4%
Percentage with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate	64%	68%	72%
Total Number of Core Classes*	N/A	255	80
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	N/A	3%	6%
Total Number of Classes	113	111	122
Percent Taught by Teachers Without Appropriate Certification	17%	14%	12%

\* 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	0%	13%	0%
Turnover Rate of All Teachers	8%	9%	5%

### **Staff Counts**

	2004–05	2005–06	2006–07
Total Other Professional Staff	9	9	10
Total Paraprofessionals*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant Principals	2	2	2
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: 2005-06 PL + (200 – the 2005–06 PL + 0.10

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.

#### **School Accountability** 2

School PS 42 ELTINGVILLE SCHOOL School ID 35-31-00-01-0042

### Summary

<b>Overall Accountability</b>	Good St	tanding		
Status (2007–08)	Elementary/Mi	ddle Level	Secondary Level	
	ELA 📕 Go	ood Standing	ELA	
	Math 📕 Go	ood Standing	Math	
	Science 📕 Go	ood Standing	Graduation Rate	
Title I Part A Funding	Years the Scl	hool Received Title I	Part A Funding	
	2005-06	2006-0	7	2007–08
	NO	NO		NO

#### 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	Mathamatica			English		
	Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	Language Arts	Mathematics	Graduation Rate	
All Students	V	V	V				
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	_					
Black or African American	–	_	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••	•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Hispanic or Latino	–	_	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-			•••••		
White	<	<ul> <li></li> </ul>	••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	
Multiracial	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities	<ul> <li>Image: A start of the start of</li></ul>	<ul> <li></li> </ul>					
Limited English Proficient	–	–		••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	
Economically Disadvantaged	✓	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	
Student groups making AYP in each subject	🗸 4 of 4	🗸 4 of 4	🖌 1 of 1				



### Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

Accountability Status for This Subject (2007–08)	•	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	4 of 4	Student groups making AYP in English Language Arts
	~	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 English Language Arts accountability measures?

AYP	Participat	ion <sup>2</sup>	Test Perfo	rmance <sup>3</sup>	Performa	es	
	Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	Effective	Safe Harbor Target	
Status	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	AMO	2006-07	2007-08
~	V	100%	<b>V</b>	177	117		
_	_	-	-	-	-		_
-	-	-	-	-	-		-
_	_	_	–	-	-	•••••••••••••••	-
-	-	-	-	-	-		-
<b>~</b>	<	100%	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	179	116	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••
		••••		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	100%	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	122	111		
• •••••	••••••	••••		••••	•••••	••••	••••
-	-	-	-	-	-		-
~	~	100%	<b>/</b>	159	113		••••
🗸 4 of 4							
	Status	Status     Met Criterion       -     -	Met Criterion       Percentage Tested         ✓       100%         –       –	Met Criterion     Percentage Tested     Met Criterion       Met     Met Criterion       Met     Met Criterion       Met     Met Criterion       Met N     Met N       Met N     Met N       Met N     Met N       Met N     Met N       Met N     Met N       Met N     Met N       Met N     N        N       <	Met Status       Percentage Tested       Met Criterion       Performance Index         Image: Criterion       Met Index       Performance Index         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion         Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Image: Criterion       Ima	Met Status         Percentage Criterion         Met Tested         Performance Criterion         Effective AMO           V         100%         V         177         117           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -           -	Met Criterion         Percentage Tested         Met Criterion         Performance Index         Effective AMO         Safe Harbo 2006-07           V         100%         177         117           -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -           -

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

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

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

Accountability Status for This Subject (2007–08)	•	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	4 of 4	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>		Test Perfo	rmance <sup>3</sup>	Performance Objectives		
	Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	Effective		
Status	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	AMO	2006-07	2007-08
<b>v</b>	<b>V</b>	100%	V	189	81		
_	_	-	-	-	-		_
-	_	-	-	-	-		_
			_	-	-	•••••••••••••••	-
-	-	-	-	-	-		-
<b>~</b>	<b>~</b>	100%	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	189	80	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••
• ••••••	••••••••	••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
V	V	100%	<b>v</b>	159	75		
• •••••	•••••	••••	•••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••	••••	••••
-	-	-	-	-	-		-
~	~	100%	<b>/</b>	179	77	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
🖌 4 of 4							
	Status	Status     Met Criterion       ✓     ✓       –     –       –     –       –     –       –     –       –     –       –     –       –     –       –     –       –     –       –     –       ✓     ✓       ✓     ✓	Met Criterion       Percentage Tested         ✓       100%         –       –	Met Criterion       Percentage Tested       Met Criterion         V       100%       V         -       -       -         -       -       -         -       -       -         -       -       -         -       -       -         -       -       -         -       -       -         -       -       -         -       -       -       -         -       -       -       -         -       -       -       -         V       100%       V         -       -       -         V       100%       V	Met Status         Percentage Tested         Met Criterion         Performance Index           ✓         100%         ✓         189           ✓         100%         ✓         189           ✓         –         –         –           –         –         –         –           –         –         –         –         –           –         –         –         –         –         –           –         –         –         –         –         –         –           –         –         –         –         –         –         –         –         –           – </td <td>Met Status         Percentage Criterion         Met Tested         Performance Criterion         Effective AMO           V         100%         V         189         81           -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -           V         100%         V         159         75         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -           V         100%         V         179         <td< td=""><td>Met Criterion         Percentage Tested         Met Criterion         Performance Index         Effective AMO         Safe Harbo 2006-07           V         100%         189         81        </td></td<></td>	Met Status         Percentage Criterion         Met Tested         Performance Criterion         Effective AMO           V         100%         V         189         81           -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -           V         100%         V         159         75         -         -           -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -           V         100%         V         179 <td< td=""><td>Met Criterion         Percentage Tested         Met Criterion         Performance Index         Effective AMO         Safe Harbo 2006-07           V         100%         189         81        </td></td<>	Met Criterion         Percentage Tested         Met Criterion         Performance Index         Effective AMO         Safe Harbo 2006-07           V         100%         189         81

#### 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.
- ‡ 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

### **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>	Performa	nce Obje	ctives
<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	
All Students (151:147)	~	Qualified	~	99%	<b>~</b>	191	100		
Ethnicity									
American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0)									
Black or African American (1:1)		-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Hispanic or Latino (11:10)		_	_	-	-	-	-		-
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (5:5)		-	-	-	-	-	-		-
White (134:131)		Qualified	~	99%	~	192	100		•••••
Multiracial (0:0)	••••••		••••••	••••				••••••	
Other Groups									
Students with Disabilities (41:39)		Qualified	~	100%	~	177	100		
Limited English Proficient <sup>4</sup> (2:2)		_	-	-	-	-	-		-
Economically Disadvantaged (59:56)		Qualified	~	100%	~	188	100		
Final AYP Determination	🖌 1 o	f 1							
AYP Status		followed b students w <sup>2</sup> Groups wit	y the count of co ho were excuse h fewer than 40	ontinuously enrolle d from testing for r students enrolled	ed tested stude medical reasons during the test	est administration p nts (used for Perforn s are not included ir administration peri o fell below 80 perc	mance). For a the enrollme od are not rec	ccountabilit ent count. juired to me	y calculatio

participation rates over those two years.

were combined to determine counts and performance indices.

Made AYP

SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target

X Did Not Make AYP

Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

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 a	Total Tested	
English Language Arts	0%	50%	100%
Grade 3	79%		143
Grade 4	79%		151
Grade 5	84%		<b>1</b> 24
Mathematics			
Grade 3	94%		141
Grade 4	89%		152
Grade 5	86%		124
Science			
Grade 4	91%		150

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT #31

#### 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: 1

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

### This School's Results in Grade 3 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: 677	Range:	616-780	650-780	730-780					
2006 Mean Score: 685 ■ 2006-07 ■ 2005-06	100%	92% 93%	79% 82%	12% 15%	94% 95%	75% <sup>79%</sup>	14% 10%		
Number of Tested Students:		132 138	113 121	17 22					

Poculto by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by	Total Tested	_	e scoring at		Total Tested	5	e scoring at	
Student Group	Testeu	2-4	3-4	4	Testeu	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	143	<b>92</b> %	<b>79%</b>	12%	148	93%	<b>82</b> %	15%
Female	71	94%	82%	15%	67	94%	84%	15%
Male	72	90%	76%	8%	81	93%	80%	15%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	-	-	-				
Black or African American	2	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	11	82%	82%	9%	12	83%	67%	0%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	8	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
White	121	94%	80%	12%	128	96%	84%	17%
Multiracial				•••••				
Small Group Totals	11	82%	64%	9%	8	63%	63%	0%
General-Education Students	115	98%	90%	15%	108	99%	95%	20%
Students with Disabilities	28	68%	36%	0%	40	78%	45%	0%
English Proficient	141	-	-	-	148	93%	82%	15%
Limited English Proficient	2	-	-	-				
Economically Disadvantaged	51	84%	67%	8%	31	100%	97%	13%
Not Disadvantaged	92	97%	86%	14%	117	91%	78%	15%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	143	92%	79%	12%	148	93%	82%	15%

**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 School 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	0				New NYSAA 2006 and 2	were deve	eloped in 2	2007, so
(NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent	ŭ				2000 anu 2			
New York State English as a Second								
Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†:	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 3								

+ 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 3 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		Percentage scor	ing at level(s):					
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2007 Mean Score: 695	Range:	624-770	650-770	703-770				
2006 Mean Score: 692	100%	96% 95%	94% 87%		98% 96%	92% <sub>88%</sub>		
2006-07 2005-06				40% 43%			43% 40%	
Number of Tested Students:	<u> </u>	136 141	132 129	57 64				

Doculto by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by Student Group	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 3-4 4			Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 3-4 4		
 All Students	141	96%	94%	40%	149	95%	87%	43%
Female	70	94%	93%	41%	70	94%	84%	41%
Male	71	99%	94%	39%	79	95%	89%	44%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	-	-	-				
Black or African American	1	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	10	90%	80%	10%	13	85%	62%	31%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	8	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
White	121	97%	95%	41%	128	97%	91%	45%
Multiracial	••••••		••••••	•••••				
Small Group Totals	10	100%	90%	60%	8	75%	63%	38%
General-Education Students	113	100%	100%	48%	107	99%	97%	57%
Students with Disabilities	28	82%	68%	11%	42	83%	60%	7%
English Proficient	139	-	-	-	147	-	-	-
Limited English Proficient	2	-	-	-	2	-	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	49	94%	88%	31%	30	100%	93%	50%
Not Disadvantaged	92	98%	97%	46%	119	93%	85%	41%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	141	96%	94%	40%	149	95%	87%	43%

Other	2006-07 <b>S</b> e	chool 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 3 Equivalent	0				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 4 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: 676	Range:	612-775	650-775	716-775					
2006 Mean Score: 674	100%	97% 97%	79% 75%		95% 94%	75% 77%			
2006-07 2005-06				12% 12%			12% 13%		
Number of Tested Students:		147 120	120 93	18 15					

Poculto by	2006-07	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	Percentag 2-4	e scoring at 3–4	: level(s): 4
All Students	151	97%	79%	12%	124	97%	75%	12%
Female	69	100%	81%	16%	62	97%	77%	15%
Male	82	95%	78%	9%	62	97%	73%	10%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	1	-	-	-				
Hispanic or Latino	10	90%	50%	10%	8	88%	50%	0%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	6	-	-	-	5	100%	100%	20%
White	134	98%	81%	12%	111	97%	76%	13%
Multiracial	•••••		•••••		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		•••••	•••••
Small Group Totals	7	100%	86%	14%	•••••••	•••••••••••••••••		•••••
General-Education Students	112	100%	95%	16%	102	100%	84%	15%
Students with Disabilities	39	90%	36%	0%	22	82%	32%	0%
English Proficient	149	-	_	_	124	97%	75%	12%
Limited English Proficient	2	-	-	-	•••••••••••••••••••••••			••••••
Economically Disadvantaged	58	95%	66%	10%	28	100%	68%	7%
Not Disadvantaged	93	99%	88%	13%	96	96%	77%	14%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	151	97%	79%	12%	124	97%	75%	12%

**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>S</b>	chool Year			2005–06 School Year			
-	Total	Number sco	Number scoring at level(s):			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 4 Equivalent	0				New NYSAA 2006 and 2	were deve 007 results	eloped in a s cannot b	2007, so be compared
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 4	0	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 4 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Scho	ols		
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2007 Mean Score: 694	Range:	622-800	650-800	702-800				
2006 Mean Score: 690	100%	97% 99%	89% 91%		96% 95%	86% 85%		
2006-07 2005-06				44% 42%			38% 38%	
Number of Tested Students:	<u> </u>	148 124	135 114	67 52				

Poculto by	2006-07 \$	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by Student Group	Total Tested	Percentag 2-4	e scoring at 3–4	level(s): 4	Total Tested	Percentag 2-4	e scoring a 3–4	t level(s): 4
All Students	152	97%	89%	44%	125	99%	<b>91</b> %	42%
Female	70	96%	83%	43%	62	100%	95%	42%
Male	82	99%	94%	45%	63	98%	87%	41%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	1	-	-	-				
Hispanic or Latino	11	82%	55%	27%	8	88%	75%	13%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	6	-	-	-	5	100%	100%	100%
White	134	99%	91%	44%	112	100%	92%	41%
Multiracial			••••••	•••••			••••••	
Small Group Totals	7	100%	100%	71%		•••••••••••••••	••••••	
General-Education Students	111	100%	98%	59%	102	100%	97%	51%
Students with Disabilities	41	90%	63%	5%	23	96%	65%	0%
English Proficient	150	-	-	-	123	-	-	-
Limited English Proficient	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	60	95%	83%	33%	29	100%	93%	31%
Not Disadvantaged	92	99%	92%	51%	96	99%	91%	45%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	152	97%	89%	44%	125	99%	91%	42%

Other Assessments	2006-07 <b>S</b>	chool 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 4 Equivalent	0				New NYSAA were developed in 2007 2006 and 2007 results cannot be co				

### This School's Results in Grade 4 Science

		This School			Similar Sch	ools		
		Percentage sco	oring at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2007 Mean Score: 83	Range:	45-100	65-100	85-100				
2006 Mean Score: 81	100%	99% 100%	91% 90%	55% 45%	97% 98%	85% 87%	46% 48%	
Number of Tested Students:		148 126	137 114	83 57				
Posults by		2006–07 Sch	nool Year	2006–07 School Year				

Results by	2006-07	School Yea	r		2005-06 School Year				
	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentage scoring at level(s):			
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	
All Students	150	99%	91%	55%	126	100%	90%	45%	
Female	68	97%	87%	50%	62	100%	95%	47%	
Male	82	100%	95%	60%	64	100%	86%	44%	
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Black or African American	1	-	-	-					
Hispanic or Latino	11	91%	64%	45%	8	100%	75%	13%	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other	5	_	_	_	5	100%	100%	100%	
Pacific Islander									
White	133	99%	93%	56%	113	100%	91%	45%	
Multiracial									
Small Group Totals	6	100%	100%	50%					
General-Education Students	109	99%	97%	68%	103	100%	96%	53%	
Students with Disabilities	41	98%	76%	22%	23	100%	65%	9%	
English Proficient	148	-	-	-	124	-	-	-	
imited English Proficient	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	
Economically Disadvantaged	59	97%	88%	46%	29	100%	93%	28%	
Not Disadvantaged	91	100%	93%	62%	97	100%	90%	51%	
Migrant									
Not Migrant	150	99%	91%	55%	126	100%	90%	45%	

Other	2006–07 <b>S</b> e	chool Year			2005–06 School Year			
Assessments	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s):			Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s):		
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0	2-4	3-4	4	New NYSAA 2006 and 2	2-4 were deve 007 results	3-4 eloped in 2 s cannot be	4 2007, so e compared.

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

		This School			Similar Sch	ools		
		Percentage scor	ing at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2007 Mean Score: 678	Range:	608-795	650-795	711-795				
2006 Mean Score: 669	100%	99% 97%	84% 74%		97% 96%	74% 76%		
<ul> <li>2006-07</li> <li>2005-06</li> </ul>				12% 14%			10%	
Number of Tested Students:		123 173	104 131	15 25				

Poculto by	2006-07	School Yea	r	2005–06 School Year				
Results by	Total	Percentag	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
	124	99%	84%	12%	178	97%	74%	14%
Female	62	100%	85%	13%	85	99%	76%	15%
Male	62	98%	82%	11%	93	96%	71%	13%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American					5	80%	20%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	6	100%	100%	0%	11	100%	64%	9%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	5	100%	100%	40%	9	89%	89%	11%
White	113	99%	82%	12%	153	98%	75%	15%
Multiracial	••••••		••••••	•••••		•••••	•••••	••••••
Small Group Totals	••••••	••••	••••••	•••••			•••••	••••••
General-Education Students	102	100%	94%	15%	139	100%	84%	17%
Students with Disabilities	22	95%	36%	0%	39	87%	36%	3%
English Proficient	123	-	_	_	178	97%	74%	14%
Limited English Proficient	1	-	-	-			•••••	••••••
Economically Disadvantaged	37	97%	70%	3%	27	100%	78%	4%
Not Disadvantaged	87	100%	90%	16%	151	97%	73%	16%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	124	99%	84%	12%	178	97%	74%	14%

**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>S</b> e	chool Year			2005–06 School Year			
Assessments	Total Tested	TotalNumber scoring at level(s):Tested2-43-44			Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3-4	el(s): 4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent	0				New NYSAA 2006 and 2	were deve	eloped in a	
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 5	0	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 5 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Sch	ools		
		Percentage scor	ring at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2007 Mean Score: 682	Range:	619-780	650-780	699-780				
2006 Mean Score: 675	100%	100% <sub>95%</sub>	86% 76%	27% 27%	96% 94%	83% 79%	34% 32%	
2005-06				21% 21%				
Number of Tested Students:		124 171	107 136	33 48				
-		2006-07 Sch	ool Year		2005-06 S	chool Year		

Results by Student Group	2006–07 School Year				2005–06 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s):			Total	Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
 All Students	124	100%	86%	27%	180	95%	76%	27%
Female	62	100%	89%	26%	86	94%	77%	24%
Male	62	100%	84%	27%	94	96%	74%	29%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American					5	100%	40%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	6	100%	100%	17%	11	91%	64%	9%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other	5	100%	100%	80%	9	89%	89%	44%
Pacific Islander	•					0.970		
White	113	100%	85%	25%	155	95%	77%	28%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals								
General-Education Students	102	100%	91%	32%	141	98%	86%	33%
Students with Disabilities	22	100%	64%	0%	39	85%	38%	3%
English Proficient	123	-	-	-	179	-	-	-
Limited English Proficient	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	37	100%	70%	8%	28	100%	71%	21%
Not Disadvantaged	87	100%	93%	34%	152	94%	76%	28%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	124	100%	86%	27%	180	95%	76%	27%

Other Assessments	2006–07 School 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 5 Equivalent	0				New NYSAA were developed in 2007, so 2006 and 2007 results cannot be compared.					