

The New York State School Report Card

Accountability and Overview Report 2007 – 08 School IS 286 RENAISSANCE MILITARY & LEADERSHIP ACADEMY District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5 School ID 31-05-00-01-0286 Principal QUADIR BEN DIXON Telephone (212) 690-5972 Grades 6-8, UE, US

This School's Report Card

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

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

Use this report to:

Get School Profile information.

This section shows comprehensive data relevant to this school's learning environment.

2 Review School Accountability Status.

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

Review an Overview of School Performance.

This section has information about the school's performance on state assessments in English, mathematics, and science, and on high school graduation rate.

For more information:

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

School Profile

This section shows comprehensive data relevant to this school's learning environment, including information about enrollment, average class size, and teacher qualifications.

Enrollment

	2005-06	2006–07	2007-08
Pre-K	0	0	0
Kindergarten	0	0	0
Grade 1	0	0	0
Grade 2	0	0	0
Grade 3	0	0	0
Grade 4	0	0	0
Grade 5	0	0	0
Grade 6	26	22	25
Ungraded Elementary	2	0	1
Grade 7	126	87	66
Grade 8	132	122	80
Grade 9	0	0	0
Grade 10	0	0	0
Grade 11	0	0	0
Grade 12	0	0	0
Ungraded Secondary	30	28	21
Total K–12	316	259	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	40	30	30
Grade 8			
English	24		
Mathematics	29		
Science	30		
Social Studies	20		
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

	2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Eligible for Free Lunch	292	92%	0	0%	177	92%
Reduced-Price Lunch	16	5%	0	0%	9	5%
Student Stability*		90%		92%		81%
Limited English Proficient	24	8%	20	8%	12	6%
Racial/Ethnic Origin						
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Black or African American	211	67%	164	63%	116	60%
Hispanic or Latino	100	32%	94	36%	74	38%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
White	4	1%	1	0%	1	1%
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		6-07
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annual Attendance Rate		95%		92%		94%
Student Suspensions	32	10%	38	12%	38	15%

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	24	21	20
Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate	29%	5%	0%
Percent Teaching Out of Certification	38%	10%	25%
Percent with Fewer Than Three Years of Experience	29%	14%	10%
Percentage with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate	25%	29%	40%
Total Number of Core Classes	46	26	26
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	33%	15%	31%
Total Number of Classes	50	30	30
Percent Taught by Teachers Without Appropriate Certification	30%	17%	33%

Teacher Turnover Rate

	2004–05	2005-06	2006-07
Turnover Rate of Teachers with Fewer than Five Years of Experience	36%	70%	17%
Turnover Rate of All Teachers	32%	38%	19%

Staff Counts

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Total Other Professional Staff	3	3	0
Total Paraprofessionals*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant Principals	1	1	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 PL + (200 - the 2006-07 PL × 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**.

-	deral Title I Status plies 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 ident Restructuring, Restructuring, Requiring Academic Progress, or as a S		as a School in Need of Improvement, in Corrective Action, Planning for ol 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 IS 286 RENAISSANCE MILITARY & LEADERSHIP ACADEMY School ID 31-05-00-01-0286

Summary

Overall Accountability	A Planning for Restructuring							
Status (2008–09)	Element	tary/Middle Level	Secondary Leve	Secondary Level				
	ELA	Planning for Restructuring	ELA					
	Math	Planning for Restructuring	Math					
	Science	▲ Good Standing	Graduation Rate					
Title I Part A Funding	Yearst	he School Received Title	I Part A Funding					
	2006-0	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 Crowns	English			English			
Student Groups	Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	Language Arts	Mathematics	Graduation Rate	
All Students	SH	v	 				
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-					
Black or African American	V SH	~	••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Hispanic or Latino	~	V	••••		••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••••	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	•••••	•••••	•••••	••••••			
White	–	-	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Multiracial			•••••••••••		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities	✓ SH	_					
Limited English Proficient	–	–	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Economically Disadvantaged	✓SH	<	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Student groups making AYP in each subject	🗸 5 of 5	🖌 4 of 4	🖌 1 of 1				



District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5

Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

Accountability Status for This Subject (2008–09)	^	Planning for Restructuring
Accountability Measures	5 of 5	Student groups making AYP in English language arts
	~	Made AYP
Prospective Status		To be removed from improvement status in English language arts, this school must make AYP in this measure for two consecutive years. If this school fails to make AYP in 2008-09, the school will be Restructuring (Year 1) in 2009-10. If this school makes AYP in 2008-09, the school will be in good standing in 2009-10. [113]

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

	AYP	Participat	ion ²	Test Performance ³		Performance Objectives		
Student Group	M	Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	Effective	Safe Harbor Target	
(Total: Continuous Enrollment) ¹	Status	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	AMO	2007-08	2008-09
All Students (182:146)	✓ SH	V	99%	✓ SH	121	124	106	129
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (1:1)	_	_	-	-	-	-		_
Black or African American (105:79)	✔SH	~	100%	✓SH	120	122	105	128
Hispanic or Latino (75:65)	<	✓	97%	 	123	121	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0:0)								
White (1:1)	_	_	-	_	_	_		_
Multiracial (0:0)			••••		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities ⁴								
(43:32)	✓ SH	~	100%	✓ SH	81	116	70	93
Limited English Proficient ⁵	• •••••	•••••	••••	•••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••	••••	••••
(13:12)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Economically Disadvantaged (181:145)	SH	~	99%	SH	121	124	106	129
Final AYP Determination	🖌 5 of 5							

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.
- \ddagger 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

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5

Elementary/Middle-Level Mathematics

Accountability Status for This Subject (2008–09)	^	Planning for Restructuring
Accountability Measures	4 of 4	Student groups making AYP in mathematics
	~	Made AYP
Prospective Status		To be removed from improvement status in mathematics, this school must make AYP in this measure for two consecutive years. If this school fails to make AYP in 2008-09, the school will be Restructuring (Year 1) in 2009-10. If this school makes AYP in 2008-09, the school will be in good standing in 2009-10. [113]

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

	AYP	Participat	ion ²	Test Perfo	rmance ³	Performa	nce Objectiv	es
Student Group	Chathar	Met	Percentage	Met	Performance	Effective	Safe Harbo	
(Total: Continuous Enrollment) ¹	Status	Criterion	Tested	Criterion	Index	AMO	2007-08	2008-09
All Students (187:141)	V	V	98%	~	126	93		
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (1:1)	_	_	-	-	-	-		_
Black or African American (111:77)	~	~	98%	~	126	91	••••	••••
Hispanic or Latino ^(74:62)	✓	<	99%	~	126	90	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0:0)								
White (1:1)	_	_	-	–	-	-	••••	-
Multiracial (0:0)	•••••••••••••••••	•••••	••••		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities ⁴								
(43:29)	-	V	98%	-	-	-		-
Limited English Proficient ⁵	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•••••••	•••	•••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••	••••	••••
(11:10)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Economically Disadvantaged (182:140)	V	/	99%	~	125	93		
Final AYP Determination	🖌 4 of 4							

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.
- 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

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5

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 (Total: Continuous Enrollment) ¹	Status	Safe Harbor Qualification	Met Criterion	Percentage Tested	Met Criterion	Performance Index	State Standard	Progress 2007-08	5 Target 2008–09
All Students (98:70)	~	Qualified	~	98%	~	119	100		
Ethnicity									
American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0)									
Black or African American (59:39)		Qualified	~	98%	~	123	100		
Hispanic or Latino (38:30)		Qualified	_	-	~	110	100		
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0:0)									
White (1:1)		-	_	-	-	-	-		-
Multiracial (0:0)						••••			
Other Groups									
Students with Disabilities (22:11)		_	_	-	-	_	-		-
Limited English Proficient ⁴ (6:5)		-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Economically Disadvantaged (96:69)		Qualified	~	98%	~	117	100		
Final AYP Determination	🖌 1 c	of 1							
AYP Status Made AYP SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Targ		followed b students w ² Groups wit the partici shown is th	y the count of co ho were excuse h fewer than 40 pation criterion.	ontinuously enrolle d from testing for r students enrolled If the participation 07 and 2007–08 e	ed tested stude nedical reasons during the test n rate of a group	est administration p nts (used for Perfor s are not included ir administration peri p fell below 80 perc the percent tested	mance). For a n the enrollme od are not rec ent in 2007–0	ccountabilit ent count. quired to me v8, the enrol	y calculatio eet Iment

✓^{SH} Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target

X Did Not Make AYP

 Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status were combined to determine counts and performance indices.

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

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 a	f students that above Level 3	Total Tested
English Language Arts	0%	50%	100%
Grade 6	29%		24
Grade 7	44%		61
Grade 8	15%		95
Mathematics			
Grade 6	58%		26
Grade 7	41%		63
Grade 8	23%	l	95
Science			
Grade 8	30%		96

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5

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: 75

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

This School's Results in Grade 6 English Language Arts

		This Schoo	ol			Similar Sc	hools		
		Percentage s	coring at le	vel(s):		Percentage s	coring at level	(s):	
		2-4	3-4	2	1	2-4	3-4	4	
2008 Mean Score: 637	Range:	598-785	650-	-785	705-785				
2007 Mean Score: 628	100%	92% 100%				95%			
■ 2007-08■ 2006-07			29%	4%	0% 0%		28%	0%	
Number of Tested Students:	<u> </u>	22 23	7	1	0 0				
Results by		2007–08 S	chool Ye	ar			School Yea	r	
_		Total	Percenta	ge scoring a	t level(s):	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):
<u>Student Group</u>		Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
All Students		24	92 %	29 %	0%	23	100%	4%	0%
Female		12	92%	25%	0%	10	100%	10%	0%
Male		12	92%	33%	0%	13	100%	0%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Nati	ve								
Black or African American		17	94%	29%	0%	13	100%	0%	0%
Hispanic or Latino Asian or Native Hawaiian/Othei Pacific Islander	r	7	86%	29%	0%	10	100%	10%	0%
White Multiracial			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				••••	••••••	
Small Group Totals	•••••		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	••••	•••••	
General-Education Students		20	-	-	-	18	100%	6%	0%
Students with Disabilities		4				5	100%	0%	
English Proficient		21	_	_	_	21		-	-
English Froncicht		.				·····			
Limited English Proficient		3	_	_	_	2	_	-	_

Not Disadvantaged								
Migrant								
Not Migrant	24	92%	29%	0%	23	100%	4%	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.

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

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

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5

This School's Results in Grade 6 Mathematics

		This School			Similar S	ichools	
		Percentage scor	ing at level(s):	·	Percentage	scoring at level(s	:
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4
2008 Mean Score: 658	Range:	616-780	650-780	696-780			
2007 Mean Score: 641	100%	96% 87%	58%		86%	50%	
2007-082006-07			22%	12%			4%
Number of Tested Students:		25 20	15 5	3 0			
		2007-08 Sch	ool Year		2006-0	7 School Year	

2007-08	School Yea	r		2006-07	School Yea	r	
Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	level(s):
Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
26	96%	58%	12%	23	87%	22%	0%
15	93%	53%	13%	10	80%	20%	0%
11	100%	64%	9%	13	92%	23%	0%
20	95%	55%	10%	13	92%	31%	0%
6	100%	67%	17%	10	80%	10%	0%
••••••		•••••	•••••			••••••	
22	-	_	-	18	89%	22%	0%
4	-	-	-	5	80%	20%	0%
24	-	-	-	21	-	-	-
2	-		-	2	-	–	–
26	96%	58%	12%	23	87%	22%	0%
		•••••	••••••			•••••••	
26	96%	58%	12%	23	87%	22%	0%
	Total Tested 26 15 11 20 6 22 4 24 2 26	Total Tested Percentage 26 96% 15 93% 11 100% 20 95% 6 100% 22 - 4 - 24 - 26 96%	Total Tested Percentage scoring at 2-4 3-4 26 96% 58% 15 93% 53% 11 100% 64% 20 95% 55% 6 100% 67% 22 - - 4 - - 24 - - 26 96% 58%	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 3-4 4 26 96% 58% 12% 15 93% 53% 13% 11 100% 64% 9% 20 95% 55% 10% 6 100% 67% 17% 22 - - - 4 - - - 24 - - - 2 - - - 26 96% 58% 12%	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 Total 3-4 Total Tested 26 96% 58% 12% 23 15 93% 53% 13% 10 11 100% 64% 9% 13 20 95% 55% 10% 13 6 100% 67% 17% 10 22 - - - 18 4 - - - 5 24 - - 21 2 2 - - 2 2 2 - - 2 2 2 - - 2 2 2 - - 2 2 2 - - 2 2 2 - - 2 2 2 - - 2 2 2 - - - 2	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 Total 3-4 Total Tested Percentage 2-4 26 96% 58% 12% 23 87% 15 93% 53% 13% 10 80% 11 100% 64% 9% 13 92% 20 95% 55% 10% 13 92% 6 100% 67% 17% 10 80% 22 - - - 18 89% 4 - - - 5 80% 24 - - - 21 - 2 - - - 2 - 26 96% 58% 12% 23 87%	Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): Total Tested Percentage scoring at level(s): 26 96% 58% 12% 23 87% 22% 15 93% 53% 13% 10 80% 20% 11 100% 64% 9% 13 92% 23% 20 95% 55% 10% 13 92% 31% 6 100% 67% 17% 10 80% 10% 22 - - - 18 89% 22% 4 - - - 5 80% 20% 24 - - - 21 - - 2 - - 22 - - - 2 - - 21 - - - 2 - - 22 - - - 26 96% 58% 12% 23

Assessments Total Tested Number scoring at level(s): 2-4 Total 3-4 Number scoring at level(s): 2-4 Total Tested Number scoring at level(s): 2-4 New York State Alternate Assessment 0 0 0	Other	2007–08 S e	chool Year			2006-07 S	chool Year		
New York State Alternate Assessment		Total	Number sco	oring at leve	l(s):	Total	Number sco	oring at level	l(s):
0	Assessments	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
(NTSAR). Orace o Equivalent	New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent	0				0			

This School's Results in Grade 7 English Language Arts

		This School			Similar Scho	ols	
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):		Percentage scor	ing at level(s):	
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4
2008 Mean Score: 644	Range:	600-790	650-790	712-790			
2007 Mean Score: 623	100%	95% 85%			95%		
2007-08 2006-07			44%	0% 0%		37%	0%
Number of Tested Students:		58 68	27 12	0 0			

Doculto by	2007-08	School Yea	r		2006-07 \$	School Yea	r	
Results by Student Group	Total Tested	Percentage 2–4	e scoring at 3–4	level(s): 4	Total Tested	Percentag 2-4	e scoring at 3−4	level(s): 4
All Students	61	95%	44%	0%	80	85%	15%	0%
Female	29	97%	55%	0%	26	88%	23%	0%
Male	32	94%	34%	0%	54	83%	11%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	-	-	-				
Black or African American	30	-	-	-	43	86%	19%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	30	97%	43%	0%	36	-	-	-
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	•••••••••••••••••••••••		•••••		1	-		–
Multiracial	••••••		••••••		•••••••	••••••••••••••••	••••••	
Small Group Totals	31	94%	45%	0%	37	84%	11%	0%
General-Education Students	41	100%	54%	0%	66	92%	18%	0%
Students with Disabilities	20	85%	25%	0%	14	50%	0%	0%
English Proficient	57	-	-	-	71	85%	14%	0%
Limited English Proficient	4	-	-	–	9	89%	22%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	61	95%	44%	0%	80	85%	15%	0%
Not Disadvantaged								
Migrant								
Not Migrant	61	95%	44%	0%	80	85%	15%	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 S e	chool Year		
Assessments	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 7 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 7	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.

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5

This School's Results in Grade 7 Mathematics

		This School			Similar Schools			
		Percentage scori	ng at level(s):		Percentage scoring at level(s):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4	
2008 Mean Score: 640	Range:	611-800	650-800	693-800				
2007 Mean Score: 627	100%	84% 79%			90%			
■ 2007-08■ 2006-07			41% 20%	0% 1%		47%	4%	
Number of Tested Students:		53 63	26 16	0 1				

Pocults by	2007-08	School Yea	r		2006-07 Sc	chool Year			
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	
All Students	63	84%	41%	0%	80	79%	20%	1%	
Female	30	83%	37%	0%	26	85%	23%	4%	
Male	33	85%	45%	0%	54	76%	19%	0%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	-	-	-					
Black or African American	33	85%	39%	0%	43	81%	12%	0%	
Hispanic or Latino	29	-	-	-	36	-		-	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other			•••••••			••••••	••••••		
Pacific Islander									
White					1	-	-	-	
Multiracial									
Small Group Totals	30	83%	43%	0%	37	76%	30%	3%	
General-Education Students	44	93%	52%	0%	65	85%	20%	2%	
Students with Disabilities	19	63%	16%	0%	15	53%	20%	0%	
English Proficient	60	-	-	-	71	79%	21%	1%	
Limited English Proficient	3	-	–	-	9	78%	11%	0%	
Economically Disadvantaged	61	-	_	-	80	79%	20%	1%	
Not Disadvantaged	2	-				•••••	•••••		
Migrant									
Not Migrant	63	84%	41%	0%	80	79%	20%	1%	

Total Tested Number scoring at level(s): Total Tested <th< th=""><th>Other</th><th>2007–08 S</th><th>chool Year</th><th></th><th></th><th>2006-07 Se</th><th>chool Year</th><th colspan="4">umber scoring at level(s):</th></th<>	Other	2007–08 S	chool Year			2006-07 S e	chool Year	umber scoring at level(s):			
New York State Alternate Assessment		Total Number scoring at level(s):				Total Number scoring at level			.(s):		
0	Assessments	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4		
		0				0					

This School's Results in Grade 8 English Language Arts

		This Schoo	L		Similar Schools				
		Percentage sc	oring at level(s):		Percentage):			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
2008 Mean Score: 630	7 Mean Score: 618 100% 2007–08 2006–07	602-790	650-790	715-790					
2007 Mean Score: 618	100%								
		87% 81%			87%				
 2007-08 2006-07 			15% _{10%}	0% 0%		21%	0%		
Number of Tested Students:		83 110	14 13	0 0					
Posults by		2007–08 Sc	hool Year		2006–07 School Year				
Results by Student Group)	Total Tested	Percentage scori 2–4 3-	ng at level(s): -4 4	Total Tested	Percentage s 2–4	scoring at level(s): 3–4 4		

Student Group	resteu	2-4	3-4	4	Testeu	2-4	3-4	4
All Students	95	87%	15%	0%	136	81%	10%	0%
Female	27	89%	15%	0%	65	91%	12%	0%
Male	68	87%	15%	0%	71	72%	7%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	58	86%	14%	0%	93	82%	5%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	36	-	-	-	43	79%	19%	0%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other								
Pacific Islander								
White	1		-	-				
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	37	89%	16%	0%				
General-Education Students	76	93%	18%	0%	108	89%	12%	0%
Students with Disabilities	19	63%	0%	0%	28	50%	0%	0%
English Proficient	89	87%	16%	0%	124	81%	10%	0%
Limited English Proficient	6	100%	0%	0%	12	75%	8%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	94	-	-	-	136	81%	10%	0%
Not Disadvantaged	1	-	-	-			•••••	
Migrant								
Not Migrant	95	87%	15%	0%	136	81%	10%	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 S e	chool Yeaı	r				
-	Total	Total	Number scoring at level(s):								
Assessments	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4			
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent	0				0						
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 8	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 8 Mathematics

		This School		Similar Schools					
		Percentage scoring at level(s): 2-4 3-4 616-775 650-775 75% 62% 23% 10%			Percentage	:			
		2-4	3-4	4	2-4	3-4	4		
2008 Mean Score: 630	Range:	616-775	650-775	701-775					
2007 Mean Score: 620	100%		23%		83%	41%			
2006-07				0% 0%			3%		
Number of Tested Students:		71 86	22 14	0 0					
Deculte hy		2007–08 Sch	ool Year		2006-07	7 School Year			

Results by	2007-08	School Yea	r		2006-07	School Yea	r	oring at level(s): 3–4 4					
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at	level(s):	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	level(s):					
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4					
All Students	95	75%	23%	0%	138	62%	10%	0%					
Female	28	82%	54%	0%	67	58%	13%	0%					
Male	67	72%	10%	0%	71	66%	7%	0%					
American Indian or Alaska Native													
Black or African American	56	73%	23%	0%	95	55%	4%	0%					
Hispanic or Latino	38	-	-	-	43	79%	23%	0%					
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •												
Pacific Islander													
White	1			-									
Multiracial													
Small Group Totals	39	77%	23%	0%									
General-Education Students	76	79%	26%	0%	111	68%	13%	0%					
Students with Disabilities	19	58%	11%	0%	27	41%	0%	0%					
English Proficient	89	74%	25%	0%	126	62%	10%	0%					
Limited English Proficient	6	83%	0%	0%	12	67%	8%	0%					
Economically Disadvantaged	93	-	-	-	138	62%	10%	0%					
Not Disadvantaged	2	-	–	–			••••••						
Migrant													
Not Migrant	95	75%	23%	0%	138	62%	10%	0%					

Total Tested Number scoring at level(s): 2-4 Total 3-4 Number scoring at level(s): Tested Total 2-4 Number scoring at level(s): 2-4 New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent 0 0 0	Other	2007–08 S e	chool Year			2006–07 S e	2006–07 School Year				
New York State Alternate Assessment		italiser scoring at teret(s).			Total Number scoring at level(s			(s):			
0	Assessments	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4		
		0				0					

District NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 5

This School's Results in Grade 8 Science

	This Schoo	ol			Similar Sch	nools		
	Percentage s	coring at lev	el(s):		Percentage so	coring at level	l(s):	
	2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4	
100%	5							
					83%			
	76% 69%				85%			
2007-08								
2006-07		30%				29%		
2000 01		1	.1%	6 0%			2%	i.
Number of Tested Students:	73 96	29	16 1	0				-
Pocults by	2007-08 S	chool Yea	r		2006-07 \$	School Yea	r	
Results by	Total	Percentage	e scoring at l	evel(s):	Total	Percentag	e scoring at	level(s):
Student Group	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4
 All Students	96	76%	30%	1%	140	69 %	11%	0%
Female	29	90%	66%	0%	67	67%	12%	0%
Male	67	70%	15%	1%	73	70%	11%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native								
Black or African American	58	69%	34%	2%	96	61%	7%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	37	-	-	-	44	84%	20%	0%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other								
Pacific Islander								
White	1	_						
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	38	87%	24%	0%				
General-Education Students	74	80%	35%	1%	111	72%	14%	0%
Students with Disabilities	22	64%	14%	0%	29	55%	0%	0%
English Proficient	90	74%	32%	1%	128	68%	12%	0%
Limited English Proficient	6	100%	0%	0%	12	75%	8%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	94	_			140	69%	11%	0%
Not Disadvantaged	2		_	-				
Migrant								
Not Migrant	96	76%	30%	1%	140	69%	11%	0%

Other	2007–08 S	chool Year			2006-07 S	-07 School Year				
Assessments	Total	Number sco	Number scoring at level(s):			Number scoring at level(s):				
	Tested	2-4	3-4	4	Tested	2-4	3-4	4		
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent	0				0					
Regents Science	0				0					