The New York State School Report Card

Accountability and Overview Report 2007 – 08

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**
Principal **ANNE MCANDREW**
Telephone **(585) 458-4200**
Grades **K-6**

This School's Report Card

The New York State School Report Card is an important part of the Board of Regents effort to raise learning standards for all students. It provides information to the public on the school's status under the State and federal accountability systems, on student performance, and on other measures of school and district performance. Knowledge gained from the school report card on a school's strengths and weaknesses can be used to improve instruction and services to students.

State assessments are designed to help ensure that all students reach high learning standards. They show whether students are getting the knowledge and skills they need to succeed at the elementary, middle, and commencement levels and beyond. The State requires that students who are not making appropriate progress toward the standards receive academic intervention services.

Use this report to:

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

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

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

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

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

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

	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08
Pre-K	0	0	0
Kindergarten	84	86	76
Grade 1	103	101	82
Grade 2	79	74	101
Grade 3	79	83	68
Grade 4	79	77	83
Grade 5	91	77	70
Grade 6	94	87	69
Ungraded Elementary	0	0	0
Grade 7	0	0	0
Grade 8	0	0	0
Grade 9	0	0	0
Grade 10	0	0	0
Grade 11	0	0	0
Grade 12	0	0	0
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0
Total K–12	609	585	549

Average Class Size

	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08
Common Branch	20	19	19
Grade 8			
English			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			
Grade 10			
English			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			

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 Information

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

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Demographic Factors

	2005–06		2006–07		2007–08	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Eligible for Free Lunch	439	72%	392	67%	425	77%
Reduced-Price Lunch	61	10%	47	8%	45	8%
Student Stability*		95%		93%		91%
Limited English Proficient	33	5%	23	4%	22	4%
Racial/Ethnic Origin						
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	0%	2	0%	2	0%
Black or African American	317	52%	301	51%	304	55%
Hispanic or Latino	104	17%	104	18%	92	17%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	18	3%	16	3%	10	2%
White	168	28%	162	28%	136	25%
Multiracial**	N/A	N/A	0	0%	5	1%

* Available only at the school level.
** Multiracial enrollment data were not collected statewide in the 2005-06 school year.

Attendance and Suspensions

	2004–05		2005–06		2006–07	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annual Attendance Rate		92%		93%		92%
Student Suspensions	71	12%	85	14%	64	11%

Demographic Factors Information

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

Attendance and Suspensions Information

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

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Teacher Qualifications

	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08
Total Number of Teachers	43	44	44
Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate	2%	5%	5%
Percent Teaching Out of Certification	2%	5%	5%
Percent with Fewer Than Three Years of Experience	5%	14%	11%
Percentage with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate	12%	9%	9%
Total Number of Core Classes	179	67	64
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	8%	6%	13%
Total Number of Classes	94	86	82
Percent Taught by Teachers Without Appropriate Certification	1%	5%	11%

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

	2004–05	2005–06	2006–07
Turnover Rate of Teachers with Fewer than Five Years of Experience	25%	0%	11%
Turnover Rate of All Teachers	18%	17%	9%

Teacher Turnover Rate Information

Teacher Turnover Rate for a specified school year is the number of teachers in that school year who 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

	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08
Total Other Professional Staff	4	3	3
Total Paraprofessionals*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant Principals	1	1	1
Principals	1	1	1

* Not available at the school level.

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.

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Understanding How Accountability Works in New York State

The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act requires that states develop and report on measures of student proficiency in 1) English language arts (ELA), in 2) mathematics, and on 3) a third indicator. In New York State in 2007–08, 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 2007–08 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 2004 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 2003 graduation-rate total cohort in the All Students group earning a high school diploma by August 31, 2007 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 2003 graduation-rate total cohort earning a local diploma by August 31, 2007 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard (55%) or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target for that group.

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability

Accountability Cohort for English and Mathematics

The 2004 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2004–05 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2004–05 school year, who were enrolled on October 3, 2007 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, 2008, are not included in the 2004 school accountability cohort. The 2004 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 Total 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) ÷ Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students]

At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation:

100 × [(Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) ÷ Count of All Cohort Members]

A list of tests used to measure student performance for accountability is available at **www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts**.

Progress Target

For accountability groups below the State Standard in science or graduation rate, the Progress Target is an alternate method for making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or qualifying for Safe Harbor in English language arts and mathematics based on improvement over the previous year's performance.

Safe Harbor

Safe Harbor provides an alternate means to demonstrate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for accountability groups that do not achieve their Effective Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in English or mathematics.

Safe Harbor Targets

The 2007–08 safe harbor targets were calculated using the following equation:

2006–07 PI + (200 – the 2006–07 PI) × 0.10

Science Progress Target

The elementary/middle-level 2007–08 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2006–07 PI. The 2008–09 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2007–08 PI. The 2007–08 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the State Science Standard in 2007–08.

Science Standard

The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory performance in science. In 2007–08, 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.

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Understanding Your School Accountability Status

The list below defines the school status categories applied to each accountability measure under New York State's accountability system, which is divided into a Federal Title I component and a State component. Accountability measures for schools at the elementary/middle level are English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science; at the secondary level, they are ELA, mathematics, and graduation rate. A school may be assigned a different status for different accountability measures. The overall status of a school is the status assigned to the school for the accountability measure with the most advanced designation in the hierarchy. If the school receives Title I funds, it is the most advanced designation in the Title I hierarchy, unless the school is in good standing under Title I but identified as SRAP under the State hierarchy. A school that does not receive Title I funding in a school year does not have a federal status in that year; however, all schools (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)	New York State Status (Applies to all New York State public schools except charter schools)
School in Good Standing A school is considered to be in good standing if it has not been identified as a School in Need of Improvement, in Corrective Action, Planning for Restructuring, Restructuring, Requiring Academic Progress, or as a School Under Registration Review.	
School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) A school that has not made AYP on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years while receiving Title I funds is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for the following year.	**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1)** A school that has not made AYP on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) for the following year.
School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) A School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.	**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2)** A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) for the following year.
School in Corrective Action A School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School in Corrective Action for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.	**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3)** A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) for the following year.
School Planning for Restructuring A School in Corrective Action that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Planning for Restructuring for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.	**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4)** A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4) for the following year.
School Restructuring (Year 1) A School Planning for Restructuring that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 1) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.	**School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 and above)** A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4 and above) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 and above) for the following year.
School Restructuring (Year 2 and above) A School Restructuring (Year 1 and above) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 2 and above) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.	

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 **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Summary

Overall Accountability Status (2008–09)

Good Standing

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

Title I Part A Funding

Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding

2006–07	2007–08	2008–09
YES	YES	YES

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

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

AYP Status

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

Accountability Status Levels

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

Pending – Requires Special Evaluation

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

Accountability Status for This Subject (2008–09)	^	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	6 of 6	Student groups making AYP in English language arts
	✔	Made AYP
Prospective Status		This school will be in good standing in 2009-10. [101]

How did students in each accountability group perform on elementary/middle-level English language arts accountability measures?

Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)[1]	AYP Status	Participation[2] Met Criterion	Participation[2] Percentage Tested	Test Performance[3] Met Criterion	Test Performance[3] Performance Index	Performance Objectives Effective AMO	Safe Harbor Target 2007–08	Safe Harbor Target 2008–09
All Students (286:278)	✔	✔	99%	✔	153	126		
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (2:1)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Black or African American (153:149)	✔	✔	99%	✔	150	124		
Hispanic or Latino (46:46)	✔	✔	100%	✔	154	119		
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (5:5)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
White (80:77)	✔	✔	100%	✔	155	122		
Multiracial (0:0)								
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities[4] (33:31)	✔SH	–	–	✔SH	100	116	88	110
Limited English Proficient[5] (7:7)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Economically Disadvantaged (238:234)	✔	✔	99%	✔	151	126		
Final AYP Determination	✔ 6 of 6							

AYP Status

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

NOTES

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

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the participation rate of a group fell below 95 percent in 2007–08, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2006–07 and 2007–08 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in the All Students group in 2007–08, data for 2006–07 and 2007–08 were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students in the All Students group in 2007–08, student groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion.

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

5 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.

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Elementary/Middle-Level Mathematics

Accountability Status for This Subject (2008–09)	^	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	6 of 6	Student groups making AYP in mathematics
	✔	Made AYP
Prospective Status		This school will be in good standing in 2009-10. [101]

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

Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)[1]	AYP Status	Participation[2] Met Criterion	Participation[2] Percentage Tested	Test Performance[3] Met Criterion	Test Performance[3] Performance Index	Performance Objectives Effective AMO	Safe Harbor Target 2007–08	Safe Harbor Target 2008–09
All Students (283:276)	✔	✔	100%	✔	173	95		
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (2:1)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Black or African American (150:148)	✔	✔	100%	✔	168	93		
Hispanic or Latino (46:46)	✔	✔	100%	✔	180	88		
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (5:5)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
White (80:76)	✔	✔	99%	✔	175	91		
Multiracial (0:0)								
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities[4] (33:31)	✔	–	–	✔	132	85		
Limited English Proficient[5] (7:7)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Economically Disadvantaged (237:235)	✔	✔	100%	✔	172	95		
Final AYP Determination	✔ 6 of 6							

AYP Status

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

NOTES

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

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the participation rate of a group fell below 95 percent in 2007–08, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2006–07 and 2007–08 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in the All Students group in 2007–08, data for 2006–07 and 2007–08 were combined to determine counts and PIs. For schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students in the All Students group in 2007–08, student groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion.

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

5 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.

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Elementary/Middle-Level Science

Accountability Status for This Subject (2008–09)	^	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 2009-10. [101]

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

Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)[1]	AYP Status	AYP Safe Harbor Qualification	Participation[2] Met Criterion	Participation[2] Percentage Tested	Test Performance[3] Met Criterion	Test Performance[3] Performance Index	Performance Objectives State Standard	Progress Target 2007–08	Progress Target 2008–09
All Students (81:79)	✔	Qualified	✔	99%	✔	189	100		
Ethnicity									
American Indian or Alaska Native (1:1)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Black or African American (42:41)		Qualified	✔	98%	✔	183	100		
Hispanic or Latino (10:10)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0:0)									
White (28:27)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Multiracial (0:0)									
Other Groups									
Students with Disabilities (9:9)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Limited English Proficient[4] (2:2)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Economically Disadvantaged (69:67)		Qualified	✔	99%	✔	187	100		
Final AYP Determination	✔ 1 of 1								

AYP Status

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

NOTES

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

2 Groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the participation rate of a group fell below 80 percent in 2007–08, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2006–07 and 2007–08 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

3 Groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students are not required to meet the performance criterion. For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2007–08, data for 2006–07 and 2007–08 were combined to determine counts and performance indices.

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

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Summary of 2007–08 School Performance

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

	Percentage of students that scored at or above Level 3	Total Tested
English Language Arts		
Grade 3	37%	65
Grade 4	45%	83
Grade 5	71%	69
Grade 6	81%	67
Mathematics		
Grade 3	81%	64
Grade 4	76%	82
Grade 5	68%	68
Grade 6	79%	68
Science		
Grade 4	90%	80

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: 5

All schools in this group are elementary level schools in large cities other than New York City.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 3 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 646	Range:	616–780	650–780	720–780*			
2007 Mean Score: 643	100%	88% 82%	37% 40%	0% 1%	88% 80%	45% 41%	3% 2%
Number of Tested Students:		57 67	24 33	0 1			

■ 2007–08
■ 2006–07

Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**65**	**88%**	**37%**	**0%**	**82**	**82%**	**40%**	**1%**
Female	34	94%	32%	0%	37	86%	43%	0%
Male	31	81%	42%	0%	45	78%	38%	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	40	90%	28%	0%	39	85%	46%	3%
Hispanic or Latino	9	–	–	–	15	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	–	–	–				
White	15	87%	53%	0%	27	85%	44%	0%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	10	80%	50%	0%	16	69%	19%	0%
General-Education Students	52	98%	40%	0%	69	88%	48%	1%
Students with Disabilities	13	46%	23%	0%	13	46%	0%	0%
English Proficient	64	–	–	–	78	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–	4	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	55	87%	33%	0%	67	82%	37%	0%
Not Disadvantaged	10	90%	60%	0%	15	80%	53%	7%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	65	88%	37%	0%	82	82%	40%	1%

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.

* Level 4 range is for 2007–08 only. The 2006–07 range is 730–780.

Other Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	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.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 3 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 662	Range:	624–770	650–770	703–770			
2007 Mean Score: 660							
Number of Tested Students:		60 74	52 51	3 6			



Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**64**	**94%**	**81%**	**5%**	**81**	**91%**	**63%**	**7%**
Female	34	97%	82%	6%	37	95%	65%	3%
Male	30	90%	80%	3%	44	89%	61%	11%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	39	92%	79%	3%	38	87%	55%	11%
Hispanic or Latino	9	–	–	–	14	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	–	–	–				
White	15	93%	80%	7%	28	96%	71%	4%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	10	100%	90%	10%	15	93%	67%	7%
General-Education Students	51	100%	86%	4%	68	93%	69%	9%
Students with Disabilities	13	69%	62%	8%	13	85%	31%	0%
English Proficient	63	–	–	–	77	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–	4	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	55	95%	80%	4%	66	92%	64%	8%
Not Disadvantaged	9	89%	89%	11%	15	87%	60%	7%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	64	94%	81%	5%	81	91%	63%	7%

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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 4 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 650	Range:	612–775	650–775	716–775			
2007 Mean Score: 654	100%	93% 94%	45% 49%	2% 3%	83% 83%	47% 45%	2% 2%
Number of Tested Students:		77 74	37 39	2 2			

■ 2007–08
■ 2006–07

Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**83**	**93%**	**45%**	**2%**	**79**	**94%**	**49%**	**3%**
Female	42	93%	45%	5%	50	94%	46%	4%
Male	41	93%	44%	0%	29	93%	55%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	42	95%	43%	5%	40	93%	50%	3%
Hispanic or Latino	10	–	–	–	20	90%	55%	5%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					3	–	–	–
White	30	87%	43%	0%	16	–	–	–
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	11	100%	55%	0%	19	100%	42%	0%
General-Education Students	73	93%	49%	3%	71	96%	54%	3%
Students with Disabilities	10	90%	10%	0%	8	75%	13%	0%
English Proficient	81	–	–	–	77	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	2	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	70	96%	41%	3%	62	94%	50%	3%
Not Disadvantaged	13	77%	62%	0%	17	94%	47%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	83	93%	45%	2%	79	94%	49%	3%

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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 4	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	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.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 4 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 668	Range:	622–800	650–800	702–800			
2007 Mean Score: 659							
2007–08		96%	76%	9%	85%	58%	8%
2006–07		91%	57%	13%	81%	52%	7%
Number of Tested Students:		79 70	62 44	7 10			





Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**82**	**96%**	**76%**	**9%**	**77**	**91%**	**57%**	**13%**
Female	41	95%	73%	7%	47	87%	53%	9%
Male	41	98%	78%	10%	30	97%	63%	20%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	42	93%	67%	7%	40	85%	50%	15%
Hispanic or Latino	10	–	–	–	19	100%	63%	11%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					3	–	–	–
White	29	100%	86%	14%	15	–	–	–
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	11	100%	82%	0%	18	94%	67%	11%
General-Education Students	72	97%	82%	10%	70	90%	60%	14%
Students with Disabilities	10	90%	30%	0%	7	100%	29%	0%
English Proficient	80	–	–	–	75	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	2	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	70	96%	74%	7%	61	92%	57%	15%
Not Disadvantaged	12	100%	83%	17%	16	88%	56%	6%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	82	96%	76%	9%	77	91%	57%	13%

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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 4 Science

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 80	Range:	45–100	65–100	85–100			
2007 Mean Score: 77							
2007–08		99%	90%	41%	92%	69%	25%
2006–07		99%	82%	38%	94%	71%	24%
Number of Tested Students:		79	72	33			
		77	64	30			

Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**80**	**99%**	**90%**	**41%**	**78**	**99%**	**82%**	**38%**
Female	39	100%	87%	38%	47	98%	85%	32%
Male	41	98%	93%	44%	31	100%	77%	48%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	41	98%	85%	37%	43	98%	74%	23%
Hispanic or Latino	10	–	–	–	18	100%	94%	67%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					3	–	–	–
White	28	100%	96%	50%	14	–	–	–
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	11	100%	91%	36%	17	100%	88%	47%
General-Education Students	71	99%	92%	45%	71	99%	83%	38%
Students with Disabilities	9	100%	78%	11%	7	100%	71%	43%
English Proficient	78	–	–	–	76	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	2	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	68	99%	88%	37%	60	98%	83%	38%
Not Disadvantaged	12	100%	100%	67%	18	100%	78%	39%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	80	99%	90%	41%	78	99%	82%	38%

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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 5 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 661	Range:	608–795	650–795	711–795			
2007 Mean Score: 662							
Number of Tested Students:		69 69	49 43	1 3			



Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**69**	**100%**	**71%**	**1%**	**70**	**99%**	**61%**	**4%**
Female	40	100%	70%	3%	36	100%	64%	3%
Male	29	100%	72%	0%	34	97%	59%	6%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	36	100%	69%	3%	35	97%	57%	6%
Hispanic or Latino	17	100%	65%	0%	13	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
White	13	–	–	–	21	100%	76%	5%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	16	100%	81%	0%	14	100%	50%	0%
General-Education Students	62	100%	77%	2%	68	–	–	–
Students with Disabilities	7	100%	14%	0%	2	–	–	–
English Proficient	66	–	–	–	69	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	3	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	58	100%	76%	2%	52	98%	56%	4%
Not Disadvantaged	11	100%	45%	0%	18	100%	78%	6%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	69	100%	71%	1%	70	99%	61%	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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	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.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 5 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 661	Range:	619–780	650–780	699–780			
2007 Mean Score: 644							
2007–08		97%	68%	12%	87%	55%	6%
2006–07		86%	46%	1%	81%	44%	4%
Number of Tested Students:		66 60	46 32	8 1			





Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**68**	**97%**	**68%**	**12%**	**70**	**86%**	**46%**	**1%**
Female	40	100%	60%	5%	36	86%	39%	0%
Male	28	93%	79%	21%	34	85%	53%	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	35	94%	60%	9%	35	83%	34%	3%
Hispanic or Latino	17	100%	82%	18%	13	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
White	13	–	–	–	21	90%	52%	0%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	16	100%	69%	13%	14	86%	64%	0%
General-Education Students	61	98%	72%	13%	68	–	–	–
Students with Disabilities	7	86%	29%	0%	2	–	–	–
English Proficient	65	–	–	–	69	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	3	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	58	98%	71%	12%	53	85%	47%	0%
Not Disadvantaged	10	90%	50%	10%	17	88%	41%	6%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	68	97%	68%	12%	70	86%	46%	1%

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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 6 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 664	Range:	598–785	650–785	705–785			
2007 Mean Score: 657							
2007–08		100%	81%	1%	96%	48%	1%
2006–07		96%	67%	2%	95%	39%	2%
Number of Tested Students:		67 81	54 56	1 2			

Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**67**	**100%**	**81%**	**1%**	**84**	**96%**	**67%**	**2%**
Female	34	100%	79%	0%	47	100%	72%	4%
Male	33	100%	82%	3%	37	92%	59%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	33	100%	79%	0%	43	100%	60%	2%
Hispanic or Latino	10	–	–	–	12	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
White	22	100%	86%	5%	26	92%	73%	0%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	12	100%	75%	0%	15	93%	73%	7%
General-Education Students	64	–	–	–	72	100%	74%	3%
Students with Disabilities	3	–	–	–	12	75%	25%	0%
English Proficient	66	–	–	–	83	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	53	100%	77%	2%	62	97%	65%	3%
Not Disadvantaged	14	100%	93%	0%	22	95%	73%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	67	100%	81%	1%	84	96%	67%	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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	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.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 43-THEODORE ROOSEVELT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0043**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 6 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools		
		Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):		
		2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2008 Mean Score: 667	Range:	616–780	650–780	696–780			
2007 Mean Score: 649							
2007–08		99%	79%	13%	83%	52%	6%
2006–07		88%	57%	1%	79%	40%	3%
Number of Tested Students:		67 71	54 46	9 1			



Results by Student Group

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**68**	**99%**	**79%**	**13%**	**81**	**88%**	**57%**	**1%**
Female	35	97%	74%	11%	44	89%	52%	0%
Male	33	100%	85%	15%	37	86%	62%	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	34	100%	82%	9%	43	81%	53%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	10	–	–	–	10	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
White	22	100%	73%	14%	25	96%	56%	4%
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	12	92%	83%	25%	13	92%	69%	0%
General-Education Students	65	–	–	–	69	94%	64%	1%
Students with Disabilities	3	–	–	–	12	50%	17%	0%
English Proficient	67	–	–	–	80	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	54	98%	80%	13%	59	86%	58%	0%
Not Disadvantaged	14	100%	79%	14%	22	91%	55%	5%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	68	99%	79%	13%	81	88%	57%	1%

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 Assessments

	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent	0				0			