

The New York State School Report Card

Accountability and Overview Report 2007 – 08 School PS 63 WILLIAM MCKINLEY SCHOOL District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 1 School ID 31-01-00-01-0063 Principal DARLENE DESPEIGNES Telephone (212) 674-3180 Grades PK-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

	2005-06	2006–07	2007-08
Pre-K	11	10	9
Kindergarten	30	22	24
Grade 1	35	37	26
Grade 2	36	35	36
Grade 3	28	32	32
Grade 4	29	30	28
Grade 5	29	31	19
Grade 6	25	0	0
Ungraded Elementary	17	21	28
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	229	208	193

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

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Common Branch	14	17	17
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	5-06	200	2006–07		7–08
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Eligible for Free Lunch	112	49%	112	54%	95	49%
Reduced-Price Lunch	28	12%	28	13%	23	12%
Student Stability*		84%		91%		84%
Limited English Proficient	9	4%	13	6%	10	5%
Racial/Ethnic Origin						
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Black or African American	38	17%	39	19%	34	18%
Hispanic or Latino	148	65%	136	65%	128	66%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	32	14%	19	9%	17	9%
White	11	5%	13	6%	14	7%
Multiracial**	N/A	N/A	0	0%	0	0%

* Available only at the school level.

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

Attendance and Suspensions

	2004	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Annual Attendance Rate		90%		91%		90%	
Student Suspensions	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	

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

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Total Number of Teachers	23	22	23
Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate	9%	9%	0%
Percent Teaching Out of Certification	13%	9%	4%
Percent with Fewer Than Three Years of Experience	26%	5%	4%
Percentage with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate	22%	14%	26%
Total Number of Core Classes	80	17	17
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	23%	6%	6%
Total Number of Classes	44	39	20
Percent Taught by Teachers Without Appropriate Certification	23%	23%	5%

Teacher Turnover Rate

	2004-05	2005-06	2006–07
Turnover Rate of Teachers with Fewer than Five Years of Experience	0%	20%	25%
Turnover Rate of All Teachers	11%	22%	23%

Staff Counts

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Total Other Professional Staff	4	6	0
Total Paraprofessionals*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant Principals	0	0	0
Principals	1	1	0

* 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 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 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 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.

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) \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 2007–08 safe harbor targets were calculated using the following equation: 2006-07 RL + (200 – the 2006–07 RL + 0.10

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.

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**.

	I l Title I Status 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)
A sc	ool in Good Standing hool is considered to be in good standing if it has not been identi ructuring, Restructuring, Requiring Academic Progress, or as a So	is a School in Need of Improvement, in Corrective Action, Planning for Under Registration Review.
A sc mea is co	ool in Need of Improvement (Year 1) hool that has not made AYP on the same accountability isure for two consecutive years while receiving Title I funds onsidered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for the owing 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.
A Sc AYP is co	ool in Need of Improvement (Year 2) shool in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that does not make on the accountability measure for which it was identified onsidered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) for the owing 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.
A Sc AYP cons	ool in Corrective Action chool in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that does not make on the accountability measure for which it was identified is sidered a School in Corrective Action for the following year, 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.
A Sc accc a Sc	ool Planning for Restructuring shool in Corrective Action that does not make AYP on the puntability measure for which it was identified is considered hool Planning for Restructuring for the following year, if it tinues 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.
A Sc AYP cons	ool Restructuring (Year 1) thool Planning for Restructuring that does not make on the accountability measure for which it was identified is sidered a School Restructuring (Year 1) for the following year, 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.
A Sc AYP is co	ool Restructuring (Year 2 and above) thool Restructuring (Year 1 and above) that does not make on the accountability measure for which it was identified onsidered a School Restructuring (Year 2 and above) for the owing 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 PS 63 WILLIAM MCKINLEY SCHOOL School ID 31-01-00-01-0063

Summary

Overall Accountability	▲ Good Standing							
Status (2008–09)	Element	ary/Middle Level	Secondar	ry Level				
	ELA	▲ Good Standing	ELA					
	Math 🔥 Good Standing		Math					
	Science	▲ Good Standing	Graduatio	n Rate				
Title I Part A Funding	Years t	he School Receiv	ved Title I Part A Fun	ding				
	2006-0	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?

	Elementary/I	Middle Level		Secondary Level			
Student Groups	English	Mathematics	Colongo	English	Mathematics		
-	Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	Language Arts	Mathematics	Graduation Rate	
All Students	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
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	-	_					
Limited English Proficient	–	–	••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	
Economically Disadvantaged	✓	✓	••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	
Student groups making AYP in each subject	🗸 3 of 3	✔ 3 of 3	🖌 1 of 1				



Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

Accountability Status for This Subject (2008–09)	^	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	3 of 3	Student groups making AYP in English language arts
	✓	Made AYP
Prospective Status		This school will be in good standing in 2009-10. [101]

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

	AYP	Participation ²		Test Performance ³		Performance Objectives		
Student Group		Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	Effective	Safe Harbor Target	
(Total: Continuous Enrollment) ¹	Status	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	AMO	2007-08	2008-09
All Students (88:83)	v	 Image: A start of the start of	100%	v	152	122		
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0)								
Black or African American (20:20)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Hispanic or Latino (57:53)	~	✓	100%	~	142	120	•••••••••••••••	••••
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (7:6)	-	_	-	-	-	-		-
White (4:4)	_	_	_	-	-	-	••••	-
Multiracial (0:0)			•••••••••••••••••••••		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities ⁴								
(25:24)	-	_	-	-	-	-		-
Limited English Proficient ⁵	••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••	••••	••••
(4:4)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Economically Disadvantaged (88:83)	~	/	100%	/	152	122		····
Final AYP Determination	🖌 3 of 3							

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 Pls. 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.
- 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
- ✓^{SH} 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 (2008–09)	^	Good Standing
Accountability Measures	3 of 3	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?

	AYP	Participati	articipation ²		rmance ³	Performance Objectives		
Student Group		Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	Effective	Safe Harbo	
(Total: Continuous Enrollment) ¹	Status	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	AMO	2007-08	2008-09
All Students (87:77)	~	V	100%	V	174	91		
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0)								
Black or African American (18:17)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Hispanic or Latino (58:50)	✓	✓	100%	~	170	89	••••••••••••••••	••••
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (7:6)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
White (4:4)	_	_	_	–	-	-	••••	-
Multiracial (0:0)	•••••••		••••••••••••••••••		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities ⁴								
(26:22)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Limited English Proficient ⁵	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••	••••	••••
(4:4)	-	_	-	-	-	-		-
Economically Disadvantaged (87:77)		/	100%	~	174	91	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	···· ····
Final AYP Determination	🖌 3 of 3							

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 Pls. 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.
- 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
- ✓^{SH} 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 (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?

	AYP		Participat	ion ²	Test Perfo	rmance ³	Performance Objectives		
Student Group		Safe Harbor	Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	State	Progress	Target
(Total: Continuous Enrollment) ¹	Status	Qualification	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	Standard	2007-08	2008-09
All Students (31:53)	/	Qualified	_	-	V	174	100		
Ethnicity									
American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0)									
Black or African American (7:11)		-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Hispanic or Latino (20:35)		Oualified	_	_	~	171	100		
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (1:4)		-	-	-	-	-	-		-
White (3:3)		_	_	_	_	_	_		_
Multiracial (0:0)	•••••••	•••••	• •••••	•••		••••			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Other Groups									
Students with Disabilities (6:10)		_	_	_	-	_	-		_
Limited English Proficient ⁴ (0:0)									
Economically Disadvantaged (31:53)		Qualified	-	-	~	174	100		
Final AYP Determination	🖌 1 c	of 1							
AYP Status ✓ Made AYP ✓SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Targ X Did Not Make AYP — Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status	et	followed b students w Groups wit the partici shown is th participati Groups wit For school were comb	y the count of co ho were excuse h fewer than 40 pation criterion. he sum of 2006- on rates over tha h fewer than 30 s with fewer tha bined to determi	ontinuously enroll d from testing for r students enrolled If the participation o7 and 2007–08 e ose two years. continuously enro n 30 continuously ne counts and per s is equal to or gre	ed tested stude medical reason during the test n rate of a grou nrollments and illed tested stud enrolled tested formance indic	est administration p nts (used for Perfor s are not included in administration peri p fell below 80 perc the percent tested dents are not requir students in 2007–0 es. rmer LEP students i	mance). For a of the enrollme od are not rec ent in 2007–0 is the weighte ed to meet the p8, data for 20	ccountability ant count. quired to me 08, the enrol ed average o e performan 06–07 and 2	y calculation: et Iment f the ce criterion.

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 scored at or	Total Tested	
English Language Arts	0%	50%	100%
Grade 3	46%		35
Grade 4	67%		30
Grade 5	65%		23
Mathematics			
Grade 3	74%		34
Grade 4	77%		30
Grade 5	70%		23
Science			
Grade 4	74%		31

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 1

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: 68

All schools in this group are elementary level schools in New York City.

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		
2008 Mean Score: 647	Range:	616-780	650-780	720-780*					
2007 Mean Score: 653	100%	91% 91%			92%				
 2007-08 2006-07 			46% 56%			58%			
Number of Tested Students:		32 29	16 18	0% ^{6%} 0 2			6%		
		2007-08 Scho	ol Vear		2006-07	School Vear			

Results by	2007-08	School Yea	r		2006–07 School Year			
	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	35	91%	46%	0%	32	91%	56%	6%
Female	6	100%	67%	0%	16	100%	63%	13%
Male	29	90%	41%	0%	16	81%	50%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	7	-	-	-	8	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	24	88%	42%	0%	21	86%	43%	5%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
White	1	-		-	2	-		-
Multiracial	•••••		••••••		•••••••		•••••	
Small Group Totals	11	100%	55%	0%	11	100%	82%	9%
General-Education Students	20	95%	65%	0%	29	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	15	87%	20%	0%	3	-	-	-
English Proficient	32	-	-	-	32	91%	56%	6%
Limited English Proficient	3	-	-	–	•••••••••••••••••••			
Economically Disadvantaged	35	91%	46%	0%	32	91%	56%	6%
Not Disadvantaged	•••••							
Migrant								
Not Migrant	35	91%	46%	0%	32	91%	56%	6%

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	2007–08 S	chool Year			2006–07 School Year			
-	Total	Number sco	Number scoring at level(s):			Number sco	oring at leve	el(s):
Assessments	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	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.

This School's Results in Grade 3 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):					
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2008 Mean Score: 671	Range:	624-770	650-770	703-770				
2007 Mean Score: 675	100%	97% 97%	91% 74%		97%	88%		
2007-08								
2006-07				9% 15%			20%	
Number of Tested Students:	<u>.</u>	33 33	25 31	3 5				

Poculto by	2007-08	School Yea	r	2006–07 School Year				
Results by	Total Tested	-	e scoring at		Total Tested	-	e scoring at	
Student Group	Testeu	2-4	3-4	4	Testeu	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	34	97 %	74%	9 %	34	97%	91%	15%
Female	7	86%	57%	0%	16	100%	100%	19%
Male	27	100%	78%	11%	18	94%	83%	11%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	6	-	-	-	9	-	–	-
Hispanic or Latino	24	96%	67%	4%	22	95%	86%	9%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3	-	-	-	1	-	–	-
White	1			-	2			-
Multiracial							••••••	
Small Group Totals	10	100%	90%	20%	12	100%	100%	25%
General-Education Students	18	100%	89%	17%	30	-	_	-
Students with Disabilities	16	94%	56%	0%	4	-	-	-
English Proficient	31	-	-	-	34	97%	91%	15%
Limited English Proficient	3	-	-	-		••••••••••••••		•••••
Economically Disadvantaged	34	97%	74%	9%	34	97%	91%	15%
Not Disadvantaged								
Migrant								
Not Migrant	34	97%	74%	9%	34	97%	91%	15%

Other	2007–08 Sc	chool Year			2006–07 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 3 Equivalent	0				0				

This School's Results in Grade 4 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar S	Similar Schools			
		Percentage sco	ring at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):				
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
2008 Mean Score: 657	Range:	612-775	650-775	716-775					
2007 Mean Score: 652 2007-08 2006-07	100%	97% 88%	67% 54%	0% 0%	90%	59%	4%		
Number of Tested Students:		29 23	20 14	0 0	_				
Posults by		2007–08 Sch	ool Year		2006-07	School Year			

Results by	2007-08	School Yea	r	2006-07 School Year					
Results by	Total	Percentage	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	30	97%	67 %	0%	26	88%	54%	0%	
Female	15	100%	67%	0%	18	89%	56%	0%	
Male	15	93%	67%	0%	8	88%	50%	0%	
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Black or African American	7	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	
Hispanic or Latino	19	95%	58%	0%	17	88%	53%	0%	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other	1				3				
Pacific Islander	ـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	-	-	-	3	-	_	_	
White	3	-		-					
Multiracial									
Small Group Totals	11	100%	82%	0%	9	89%	56%	0%	
General-Education Students	25	100%	72%	0%	20	90%	65%	0%	
Students with Disabilities	5	80%	40%	0%	6	83%	17%	0%	
English Proficient	30	97%	67%	0%	26	88%	54%	0%	
Limited English Proficient	•••••	••••							
Economically Disadvantaged	30	97%	67%	0%	26	88%	54%	0%	
Not Disadvantaged	••••••••	••••	•••••••				•••••••		
Migrant									
Not Migrant	30	97%	67%	0%	26	88%	54%	0%	

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	2007–08 S e	chool Year			2006–07 School Year				
Assessments	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0				0				
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 4	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	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 So	chools	
		Percentage sco	oring at level(s):		Percentage	scoring at level(s):
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4
2008 Mean Score: 671	Range:	622-800	650-800	702-800			
2007 Mean Score: 661	100%	100% 87%	77% _{73%}		94%	79%	
 2007-08 2006-07 				17% 7%			20%
Number of Tested Students:		30 26	23 22	52			
Results by		2007–08 Sch	nool Year		2006-07	School Year	
		Total	Percentage scori	ng at level(s):	Total	Percentage s	scoring at level(s):
Student Group		Tested	2 4 2		Tested	2 1	2_1 1

	Totat	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	TOLAL	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
 All Students	30	100%	77%	17%	30	87%	73%	7%
Female	14	100%	79%	21%	19	89%	79%	0%
Male	16	100%	75%	13%	11	82%	64%	18%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	6	-	-	-	6	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	20	100%	70%	10%	20	85%	75%	0%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
White	3	-			1	-	-	
Multiracial			•••••	•••••		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••••	•••••
Small Group Totals	10	100%	90%	30%	10	90%	70%	20%
General-Education Students	25	100%	76%	16%	23	96%	83%	9%
Students with Disabilities	5	100%	80%	20%	7	57%	43%	0%
English Proficient	30	100%	77%	17%	29	-	-	-
Limited English Proficient	••••••••••••••••••		•••••	•••••	1	-	–	-
Economically Disadvantaged	30	100%	77%	17%	30	87%	73%	7%
Not Disadvantaged								
Migrant								
Not Migrant	30	100%	77%	17%	30	87%	73%	7%

Other Zoor-os school real Zoor-os school real Total Number scoring at level(s): Total Tested 2-4 3-4	⊳l(s)·
	ct(0).
	4
New York State Alternate Assessment 0 0 0 0 0	

This School's Results in Grade 4 Science

	This Schoo	ol		Similar S	chools	
	Percentage s	scoring at level(s):		Percentage	scoring at level(s	:
	2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4
2008 Mean Score: 73	Range: 45–100	65-100	85-100			
2007 Mean Score: 70 ■ 2007–08 ■ 2006–07	100%	^{74%} 63%	^{16%} 10%	95%	73%	29%
			10%			
Number of Tested Students:	31 28	23 19	5 3			

Poculto by	2007-08	School Yea	r	2006–07 School Year					
Results by	Total	Percentage	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	31	100%	74%	16%	30	93%	63%	10%	
Female	14	100%	79%	21%	19	95%	63%	5%	
Male	17	100%	71%	12%	11	91%	64%	18%	
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Black or African American	7	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	
Hispanic or Latino	20	100%	70%	15%	20	95%	70%	5%	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	
White	3	-	-		1	–	-	–	
Multiracial	••••••		•••••	•••••		•••••	•••••		
Small Group Totals	11	100%	82%	18%	10	90%	50%	20%	
General-Education Students	25	100%	76%	20%	22	95%	73%	14%	
Students with Disabilities	6	100%	67%	0%	8	88%	38%	0%	
English Proficient	31	100%	74%	16%	29	-	_	-	
Limited English Proficient	•••••••••••••••••••••••		•••••	••••••	1	–	-	–	
Economically Disadvantaged	31	100%	74%	16%	30	93%	63%	10%	
Not Disadvantaged	•••••••••••••••••••••••	••••		•••••			•••••		
Migrant									
Not Migrant	31	100%	74%	16%	30	93%	63%	10%	

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

This School's Results in Grade 5 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar S	chools				
		Percentage scor	Percentage scoring at level(s):			Percentage scoring at level(s):				
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4			
2008 Mean Score: 656	Range:	608-795	650-795	711-795						
2007 Mean Score: 654 ■ 2007–08 ■ 2006–07	100%	96% 94%	65% 53%		98%	69%				
Number of Tested Students:		22 30	15 17	4% 3% 1 1			2%			
		2007-08 Sch	ool Year		2006-07	School Year				

2007-08	School Yea	r	2006–07 School Year				
Total	Percentage	e scoring at l	evel(s):	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):
Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
23	96%	65%	4%	32	94%	53%	3%
14	93%	71%	7%	10	100%	30%	0%
9	100%	56%	0%	22	91%	64%	5%
6	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
14	93%	57%	7%	20	95%	55%	0%
с. Э				E	900/	600/	0%
3			_	C	80%	60%	0%
				2	-	-	-
9	100%	78%	0%	7	100%	43%	14%
18	100%	83%	6%	21	100%	62%	5%
5	80%	0%	0%	11	82%	36%	0%
22	-	-	-	31	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	1	-	–	–
23	96%	65%	4%	32	94%	53%	3%
•••••	••••	•••••	•••••		••••		
23	96%	65%	4%	32	94%	53%	3%
	Total Tested 23 14 9 6 14 3 9 18 5 22 1 23	Total Tested Percentage 2-4 23 96% 14 93% 9 100% 6 - 14 93% 3 - 9 100% 3 - 9 100% 18 100% 5 80% 22 - 1 - 23 96%	Tested 2-4 3-4 23 96% 65% 14 93% 71% 9 100% 56% 6 - - 14 93% 57% 3 - - 9 100% 78% 18 100% 83% 5 80% 0% 22 - - 1 - - 23 96% 65%	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 $3-4$ 4 23 96% 65% 4% 14 93% 71% 7% 9 100% 56% 0% 6 - - - 14 93% 57% 7% 3 - - - 9 100% 78% 0% 3 - - - 9 100% 78% 0% 18 100% 83% 6% 5 80% 0% 0% 22 - - - 1 - - - 23 96% 65% 4%	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 Total 3-4 Total Tested 23 96% 65% 4% 32 14 93% 71% 7% 10 9 100% 56% 0% 22 6 - - - 5 14 93% 57% 7% 20 3 - - - 5 14 93% 57% 7% 20 3 - - - 5 9 100% 78% 0% 7 18 100% 83% 6% 21 5 80% 0% 0% 11 22 - - - 31 1 - - - 31 1 - - - 31 23 96% 65% 4% 32	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 Total 3-4 Percentage Tested Percentage 2-4 23 96% 65% 4% 32 94% 14 93% 71% 7% 10 100% 9 100% 56% 0% 22 91% 6 - - - 5 - 14 93% 57% 7% 20 95% 3 - - - 5 80% 9 100% 78% 0% 7 100% 9 100% 78% 0% 11 82% 22 - - - 31 - 9 100% 78% 0% 11 82% 22 - - - 31 - 1 - - - 1 - 23 96% 65% 4% 32 94%	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): Total Tested Percentage scoring at 2-4 Total 3-4 Percentage scoring at 2-4 Percentage scoring at 2-4

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	2007–08 S e	chool Year			2006–07 School Year				
Assessments	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	Total Tested	Number sco 2–4	oring at leve 3–4	el(s): 4	
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 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.

This School's Results in Grade 5 Mathematics

		This Schoo	ol			Similar Sch	nools			
		Percentage s	Percentage scoring at level(s):				coring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4		
2008 Mean Score: 657	Range:	619-780	650-7	780 6	599-780					
2007 Mean Score: 670	100%	96% 97%	70% 7	4%		95%	79%			
2006-07				4	21% 4%			20	%	
Number of Tested Students:		22 33	16	25	1 7					
Deculte by		2007–08 S	chool Yea	r		2006-07 \$	School Yea	r		
Results by		Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	t level(s):	
Student Group		Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	
=		23	96%	70%	4%	34	97%	74%	21%	
Female		14	100%	64%	0%	11	100%	64%	18%	
Male	••••••	9	89%	78%	11%	23	96%	78%	22%	
American Indian or Alaska Nativ	/e									
Black or African American	••••••	6	-	-	-	5	-	–	–	
Hispanis or Latino		14	100%	71%	0%	21	100%	67%	19%	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		3	-	-	–	5	80%	80%	40%	

Pacific Islander	3	-	-	-	5	80%	80%	40%
White			••••••		3	–	-	-
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	9	89%	67%	11%	8	100%	88%	13%
General-Education Students	18	100%	83%	6%	23	100%	91%	26%
Students with Disabilities	5	80%	20%	0%	11	91%	36%	9%
English Proficient	22	-	_	-	33	-	-	-
Limited English Proficient	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	23	96%	70%	4%	34	97%	74%	21%
Not Disadvantaged								
Migrant								
Not Migrant	23	96%	70%	4%	34	97%	74%	21%

Other Assessments	2007–08 School Year				2006–07 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				0				