The New York State School Report Card

Accountability and Overview Report 2010 – 11

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**
Principal **LESSIE HAMILTON-ROSE**
Telephone **(585) 254-2080**
Grades **K-6**

This School's Report Card

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

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

Use this report to:

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

2 **Review School Accountability Status.**
This section indicates whether a school made adequate yearly progress (AYP) and identifies the school's accountability status.

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

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

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

School Profile

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

Enrollment

	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11
Pre-K	0	0	0
Kindergarten	48	46	45
Grade 1	44	46	41
Grade 2	39	38	42
Grade 3	70	48	45
Grade 4	31	72	48
Grade 5	31	40	49
Grade 6	29	26	35
Ungraded Elementary	0	0	0
Grade 7	0	0	0
Grade 8	0	0	0
Grade 9	0	0	0
Grade 10	0	0	0
Grade 11	0	0	0
Grade 12	0	0	0
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0
Total K–12	292	316	305

Average Class Size

	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11
Common Branch	19	19	19
Grade 8			
English			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			
Grade 10			
English			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			

Enrollment Information

Enrollment counts are as of Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) day, which is typically the first Wednesday of October of the school year. Students who attend BOCES programs on a part-time basis are included in a school's enrollment. Students who attend BOCES on a full-time basis or who are placed full time by the district in an out-of-district placement are not included in a school's enrollment. Students classified by schools as "pre-first" are included in first grade counts.

Average Class Size Information

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

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Demographic Factors

	2008–09		2009–10		2010–11	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Eligible for Free Lunch	234	80%	263	83%	239	78%
Reduced-Price Lunch	17	6%	4	1%	12	4%
Student Stability*		93%		92%		94%
Limited English Proficient	5	2%	3	1%	2	1%
Racial/Ethnic Origin						
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0%	2	1%	3	1%
Black or African American	230	79%	246	78%	234	77%
Hispanic or Latino	36	12%	45	14%	44	14%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3	1%	1	0%	0	0%
White	18	6%	18	6%	20	7%
Multiracial	4	1%	4	1%	4	1%

* Available only at the school level.

Attendance and Suspensions

	2007–08		2008–09		2009–10	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annual Attendance Rate		93%		93%		94%
Student Suspensions	31	13%	0	0%	3	1%

Demographic Factors Information

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

Attendance and Suspensions Information

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

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Teacher Qualifications

	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11
Total Number of Teachers	22	23	24
Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate	5%	0%	0%
Percent Teaching Out of Certification	5%	0%	0%
Percent with Fewer Than Three Years of Experience	18%	9%	0%
Percentage with Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate	14%	17%	17%
Total Number of Core Classes	23	36	31
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in This School	4%	0%	0%
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in This District	7%	3%	4%
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified in High-Poverty Schools Statewide	8%	6%	5%
Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified in Low-Poverty Schools Statewide	1%	1%	0%
Total Number of Classes	45	49	44
Percent Taught by Teachers Without Appropriate Certification	2%	0%	0%

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. 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. A teacher who taught one class outside of the certification area(s) is counted as Highly Qualified provided that 1) the teacher had been determined by the school or district through the HOUSSE process or other state-accepted methods to have demonstrated acceptable subject knowledge and teaching skills and 2) the class in question was not the sole assignment reported. Credit for incidental teaching does not extend beyond a single assignment. Independent of Highly Qualified Teacher status, any assignment for which a teacher did not hold a valid certificate still registers as teaching out of certification. High-poverty and low-poverty schools are those schools in the upper and lower quartiles, respectively, for percentage of students eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch.

Teacher Turnover Rate

	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10
Turnover Rate of Teachers with Fewer than Five Years of Experience	60%	57%	20%
Turnover Rate of All Teachers	26%	41%	26%

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

	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11
Total Other Professional Staff	2	0	0
Total Paraprofessionals*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant Principals	0	1	1
Principals	1	1	1

* Not available at the school level.

Staff Counts Information

Other Professionals includes administrators, guidance counselors, school nurses, psychologists, and other professionals who devote more than half of their time to non-teaching duties. Teachers who are shared between buildings within a district are reported on the district report only.

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Understanding How Accountability Works in New York State

The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act requires that states develop and report on measures of student proficiency in 1) English language arts (ELA), in 2) mathematics, and on 3) a third indicator. In New York State in 2010–11, 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: **http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/accountability/.**

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 2010–11 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 2007 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, if it has 30 or more students, 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 group must meet both the participation criterion and the performance criterion in science.

Secondary-Level Graduation Rate: For a school to make AYP in graduation rate, the percent of students in the 2006 graduation-rate total cohort in the All Students group earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2010 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard (80%) or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target.

Qualifying for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math: To qualify, the percent of the 2006 graduation-rate total cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2010 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard (80%) or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target for that group.

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability

12th Graders
The count of 12th graders enrolled during the 2010–11 school year used to determine the Percentage Tested for the Participation part of the AYP determination for secondary-level ELA and mathematics. These are the first numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the secondary-level ELA and mathematics pages.

2007 Cohort
The count of students in the 2007 accountability cohort used to determine the Performance Index for the Test Performance part of the AYP determination for secondary-level ELA and mathematics. These are the second numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the secondary-level ELA and mathematics pages.

Accountability Cohort for English and Mathematics
The accountability cohort is used to determine if a school or district met the performance criterion in secondary-level ELA and mathematics. The 2007 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2007–08 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2007–08 school year, who were enrolled on October 6, 2010 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, 2011, are not included in the 2007 school accountability cohort. The 2007 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 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.)

Continuous Enrollment
The count of continuously enrolled tested students used to determine the Performance Index for the Test Performance part of the AYP determination for elementary/middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science. These are the second numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the elementary/middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science pages.

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 is the Performance Index (PI) value that each accountability group within a school or district is expected to achieve to make 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.p12.nysed.gov/irs**.

Graduation Rate
The Graduation Rate on the Graduation Rate page is the percentage of the 2006 cohort that earned a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2010.

Graduation-Rate Total Cohort
The Graduation-Rate Total Cohort, shown on the Graduation Rate page, is used to determine if a school or district made AYP in graduation rate. For the 2010–11 school year, this cohort is the 2006 graduation-rate total cohort. The 2006 total cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2006–07 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2006–07 school year, and who were enrolled in the school/district for five months or longer or who were enrolled in the school/district for less than five months but were previously enrolled in the same school/district for five months or longer between the date they first entered Grade 9 and the date they last ended enrollment. A more detailed definition of graduation-rate cohort can be found in the SIRS Manual at **http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/**.

For districts and schools with fewer than 30 graduation-rate total cohort members in the All Students group in 2010–11, data for 2009–10 and 2010–11 for accountability groups were combined to determine counts and graduation rates. Groups with fewer than 30 students in the graduation-rate total cohort are not required to meet the graduation-rate criterion.

Limited English Proficient
For all accountability measures, if the count of LEP students is equal to or greater than 30, former LEP students are also included in the performance calculations.

Non-Accountability Groups
Female, Male, and Migrant groups are not part of the AYP determination for any measure.

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability (continued)

Participation

Accountability groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period (for elementary/middle-level ELA, math, and science) or fewer than 40 12th graders (for secondary-level ELA and mathematics) are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the Percentage Tested for an accountability group fell below 95 percent for ELA and math or 80 percent for science in 2010–11, the participation enrollment ("Total" or "12th Graders") shown in the tables is the sum of 2009–10 and 2010–11 participation enrollments and the "Percentage Tested" shown is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

Performance Index (PI)

A Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group, indicating how that group performed on a required State test (or approved alternative) in English language arts, mathematics, or science. Student scores on the tests are converted to four performance levels, from Level 1 to Level 4. (See performance level definitions on the Overview summary page.) At the elementary/middle level, the PI is calculated using the following equation:

100 × [(Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) ÷ Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students]

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

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

A list of tests used to measure student performance for accountability is available at **www.p12.nysed.gov/irs.**

Progress Targets

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

Science: The current year's Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the previous year's Performance Index (PI). Example: The 2010–11 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2009–10 PI.

Graduation Rate: The Graduation-rate Progress Target is calculated by determining a 20% gap reduction between the rate of the previous year's graduation-rate cohort and the state standard. Example: The 2010–11 Graduation-Rate Progress Target = [(80 – percentage of the 2005 cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2009) × 0.20] + percentage of the 2005 cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2009.

Progress Targets are provided for groups whose PI (for science) or graduation rate (for graduation rate) is below the State Standard.

Safe Harbor Targets

Safe Harbor provides an alternate means to demonstrate AYP for accountability groups that do not achieve their EAMOs in English or mathematics. The 2010–11 safe harbor targets are calculated using the following equation:
2009–10 PI + (200 – the 2009–10 PI) × 0.10

Safe Harbor Targets are provided for groups whose PI is less than the EAMO.

Safe Harbor Qualification (‡)

On the science page, if the group met both the participation and the performance criteria for science, the Safe Harbor Qualification column will show "Qualified." If the group did not meet one or more criteria, the column will show "Did not qualify." A "‡" symbol after the 2010–11 Safe Harbor Target on the elementary/middle- or secondary-level ELA or mathematics page indicates that the student group did not make AYP in science (elementary/middle level) or graduation rate (secondary level) and; therefore, the group did not qualify for Safe Harbor in ELA or mathematics.

State Standard

The criterion value that represents minimally satisfactory performance (for science) or a minimally satisfactory percentage of cohort members earning a local or Regents diploma (for graduation rate). In 2010–11, the State Science Standard is a Performance Index of 100; the State Graduation-Rate Standard is 80%. The Commissioner may raise the State Standard at his discretion in future years.

Students with Disabilities

For all measures, if the count of students with disabilities is equal to or greater than 30, former students with disabilities are also included in the performance calculations.

Test Performance

For districts and schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students (for elementary/middle-level ELA, math, and science) or fewer than 30 students in the 2007 cohort (for secondary-level ELA and mathematics) in the All Students group in 2010–11, data for 2009–10 and 2010–11 for accountability groups were combined to determine counts and Performance Indices. For districts and schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students/2007 cohort members in the All Students group in 2010–11, student groups with fewer than 30 members are not required to meet the performance criterion. This is indicated by a "—" in the Test Performance column in the table.

Total

The count of students enrolled during the test administration period used to determine the Percentage Tested for the Participation part of the AYP determination for elementary/middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science. These are the first numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the elementary/middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science pages. For accountability calculations, students who were excused from testing for medical reasons in accordance with federal NCLB guidance are not included in the count.

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Understanding Your School Accountability Status

New York State participates in the Differentiated Accountability pilot program, as approved by the United States Department of Education in January 2009. Under this program, each public school in the State is assigned an accountability "phase" (Good Standing, Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring) and, for schools not in Good Standing, a "category" (Basic, Focused, or Comprehensive) for each measure for which the school is accountable. 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. Generally, the school's overall accountability status is its most advanced accountability phase and its highest category within that phase. A school in any year of the phase (that is not Good Standing) that makes AYP for the measure remains in the same phase/category the following year. An identified school that makes AYP in the identified measure for two consecutive years returns to Good Standing. Once a school is identified with a category within a phase, it cannot move to a less intensive category in the following school year within that phase.

Each school district with one or more Title I schools and each Title I charter school designated as Improvement (year 1 and year 2), Corrective Action, or Restructuring must make Supplemental Educational Services available for eligible students in the identified Title I school(s). A school district with one or more schools designated as Improvement (year 2), Corrective Action, or Restructuring must also provide Public School Choice to eligible students in identified Title I school(s). For more information on the Differentiated Accountability program and a list of interventions for schools not in Good Standing,
see **http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/APA/Differentiated_Accountability/DA_home.html.**

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Understanding Your School Accountability Status (continued)

Phase	Phase/Category
Good Standing A school that has not been designated as Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring.	
Improvement (year 1) A school that failed to make AYP for two consecutive years on the same accountability measure; or a school that was designated as Improvement (year 1) in the current school year that made AYP for the identified measure and is in Good Standing. **Improvement (year 2)** A school that was designated as a school in Improvement (year 1) in the current school year and failed to make AYP on the same accountability measure for which it was identified; or a school that was designated as Improvement (year 2) in the current school year that made AYP for the identified measure.	**Improvement/Basic:** A school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math for one accountability group, but made AYP for the All Students group; or a school that failed to make AYP in only science or graduation rate. **Improvement/Focused:** A school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math for more than one accountability group, but made AYP for the All Students group; or a school whose worst status is Improvement/Basic for at least two measures. **Improvement/Comprehensive:** A school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math for the All Students group; or a school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math for every accountability group for which there are at least two, but made AYP for the All Students group; or a school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math AND in science or graduation rate.
Corrective Action (year 1) A school that was designated as a school in Improvement (year 2) in the current school year and failed to make AYP on the same accountability measure for which it was identified; or a school that was designated as Corrective Action (year 1) in the current school year that made AYP for the identified measure. **Corrective Action (year 2)** A school that was designated as a school in Corrective Action (year 1) in the current school year that failed to make AYP on the same accountability measure for which it was identified; or a school that was designated as Corrective Action (year 2) in the current school year that made AYP for the identified measure.	**Corrective Action or Restructuring/Focused:** A school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math for one or more accountability groups, but made AYP for the All Students group; or a school that failed to make AYP in science or graduation rate but made AYP in ELA and math. **Corrective Action or Restructuring/Comprehensive:** A school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math for the All Students group; or a school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math for every accountability group except the All Students group for which there are at least two, but made AYP for the All Students group; or a school that failed to make AYP in ELA and/or math AND in science or graduation rate.
Restructuring (year 1) A school that was designated as a school in Corrective Action (year 2) in the current school year and failed to make AYP on the same accountability measure for which it was identified; or a school that was designated as Restructuring (year 1) in the current school year that made AYP for the identified measure. **Restructuring (year 2)** A school that was designated as a school in Restructuring (year 1) in the current school year that failed to make AYP on the same accountability measure for which it was identified; or a school that was designated as Restructuring (year 2) in the current school year that made AYP for the identified measure. **Restructuring (Advanced)** A school that was designated as a school in Restructuring (year 2) in the current school year that failed to make AYP on the same accountability measure for which it was identified; or a school that was designated as Restructuring (Advanced) in the current school year that made AYP for the identified measure.	**SURR:** A school that is identified for registration review (SURR) during a school year in which it is designated as a school in Improvement or Corrective Action shall, in the next school year, be designated as **Restructuring (year 1)/Comprehensive.**

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Summary

Overall Accountability Status (2011–12)

In Good Standing

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

Title I Part A Funding

Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding

2009–10	2010–11	2011–12
YES	YES	YES

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

	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
Student Groups	English Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	English Language Arts	Mathematics	Graduation Rate
All Students	✘	✘	✔			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	–	–				
Black or African American	✘	✘				
Hispanic or Latino	–	–				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander						
White	–	–				
Multiracial	–	–				
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	–	–				
Limited English Proficient	–	–				
Economically Disadvantaged	✘	✘				
Student groups making AYP in each subject	✘ 0 of 3	✘ 0 of 3	✔ 1 of 1			

AYP Status

✔ Made AYP
✔SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
✘ Did not make AYP
— Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

Accountability Status for This Subject (2011–12)	In Good Standing	
Accountability Measures	0 of 3	Student groups making AYP in English language arts
	✘	Did not make AYP

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

Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)	AYP Status	Participation: Met Criterion	Participation: Percentage Tested	Test Performance: Met Criterion	Test Performance: Performance Index	Performance Objectives: Effective AMO	Safe Harbor Target 2010–11	Safe Harbor Target 2011–12
Accountability Groups								
All Students (165:156)	✘	✔	99%	✘	110	114	114	119
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (2:2)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Black or African American (124:118)	✘	✔	99%	✘	108	112	112	117
Hispanic or Latino (28:27)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0:0)								
White (10:8)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Multiracial (1:1)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities (26:23)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Limited English Proficient (2:2)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Economically Disadvantaged (154:146)	✘	✔	100%	✘	110	113	113	119
Final AYP Determination	✘ 0 of 3							
Non-Accountability Groups								
Female (84:81)			100%		117	111		
Male (81:75)			99%		101	111		
Migrant (0:0)								

Symbols

- ✔ Made AYP
- ✔SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
- ✘ Did not make AYP
- — Fewer Than 40 Total/Fewer Than 30 Continuous Enrollment
- ‡ Did not qualify for Safe Harbor

NOTE: See *Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability* for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Elementary/Middle-Level Mathematics

Accountability Status for This Subject (2011–12)	In Good Standing	
Accountability Measures	0 of 3	Student groups making AYP in mathematics
	✘	Did not make AYP

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

Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)	AYP Status	Participation: Met Criterion	Participation: Percentage Tested	Test Performance: Met Criterion	Test Performance: Performance Index	Performance Objectives: Effective AMO	Safe Harbor Target 2010–11	Safe Harbor Target 2011–12
Accountability Groups								
All Students (165:156)	✘	✔	99%	✘	117	129	127	125
Ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native (2:2)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Black or African American (124:118)	✘	✔	99%	✘	118	127	125	126
Hispanic or Latino (28:27)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0:0)								
White (10:8)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Multiracial (1:1)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Other Groups								
Students with Disabilities (26:23)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Limited English Proficient (2:2)	–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Economically Disadvantaged (154:146)	✘	✔	100%	✘	116	128	126	124
Final AYP Determination	✘ 0 of 3							
Non-Accountability Groups								
Female (84:81)			100%		122	126		
Male (81:75)			99%		112	126		
Migrant (0:0)								

Symbols

- ✔ Made AYP
- ✔SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
- ✘ Did not make AYP
- — Fewer Than 40 Total/Fewer Than 30 Continuous Enrollment
- ‡ Did not qualify for Safe Harbor

NOTE: See *Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability* for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.

2 School Accountability

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Elementary/Middle-Level Science

Accountability Status for This Subject (2011–12)	In Good Standing	
Accountability Measures	1 of 1	Student groups making AYP in science
	✔	Made AYP

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

Student Group (Total: Continuous Enrollment)	AYP Status	AYP Safe Harbor Qualification	Participation Met Criterion	Participation Percentage Tested	Test Performance Met Criterion	Test Performance Performance Index	Performance Objectives State Standard	Progress Target 2010–11	Progress Target 2011–12
Accountability Groups									
All Students (46:41)	✔	Qualified	✔	98%	✔	163	100		
Ethnicity									
American Indian or Alaska Native (1:1)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Black or African American (35:33)		Qualified	–	–	✔	164	100		
Hispanic or Latino (6:5)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0:0)									
White (3:1)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Multiracial (1:1)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Other Groups									
Students with Disabilities (11:8)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Limited English Proficient (1:1)		–	–	–	–	–	–		–
Economically Disadvantaged (46:41)		Qualified	✔	98%	✔	163	100		
Final AYP Determination	✔	1 of 1							
Non-Accountability Groups									
Female (23:22)				–		–	–		
Male (23:19)				–		–	–		
Migrant (0:0)									

Symbols

✔ Made AYP
✘ Did not make AYP
— Fewer Than 40 Total/Fewer Than 30 Continuous Enrollment

NOTE: See *Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability* for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Summary of 2010–11 School Performance

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

	Percentage of students that scored at or above Level 3	Total Tested
English Language Arts	0% 50% 100%	
Grade 3	15%	40
Grade 4	24%	46
Grade 5	34%	44
Grade 6	44%	34
Mathematics		
Grade 3	20%	40
Grade 4	24%	46
Grade 5	41%	44
Grade 6	24%	34
Science		
Grade 4	69%	45

About the Performance Level Descriptors

English Language Arts

Level 1: Below Standard
Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the English language arts knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

Level 2: Meets Basic Standard
Student performance demonstrates a partial understanding of the English language arts knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

Level 3: Meets Proficiency Standard
Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the English language arts knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

Level 4: Exceeds Proficiency Standard
Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the English language arts knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

Mathematics

Level 1: Below Standard
Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

Level 2: Meets Basic Standard
Student performance demonstrates a partial understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

Level 3: Meets Proficiency Standard
Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

Level 4: Exceeds Proficiency Standard
Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the mathematics content expected at this 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.p12.nysed.gov/irs**.

In this section, this school's performance is compared with that of the school district and public schools Statewide.

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 3 English Language Arts



Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**40**	**65%**	**15%**	**0%**	**48**	**63%**	**31%**	**0%**
Female	18	72%	22%	0%	25	64%	24%	0%
Male	22	59%	9%	0%	23	61%	39%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	29	66%	17%	0%	39	62%	28%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	9	–	–	–	7	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	2	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	11	64%	9%	0%	9	67%	44%	0%
General-Education Students	38	–	–	–	36	58%	33%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2	–	–	–	12	75%	25%	0%
English Proficient	40	65%	15%	0%	47	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient					1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	37	–	–	–	45	–	–	–
Not Disadvantaged	3	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
Migrant								
Not Migrant	40	65%	15%	0%	48	63%	31%	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.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total				Total			
Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 3 Mathematics

	This School			School District			NY State Public		
Percentage scoring at level(s):	2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2011 Mean Score: 669 *Range:	662–770	684–770	707–770						
2010 Mean Score: 671									
2010–11	70%	20%	0%	75%	29%	3%	91%	60%	13%
2009–10	63%	17%	4%	74%	28%	6%	91%	59%	24%
Number of Tested Students:	28 30	8 8	0 2	1796 1862	690 696	74 155			

Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**40**	**70%**	**20%**	**0%**	**48**	**63%**	**17%**	**4%**
Female	18	67%	22%	0%	25	76%	20%	4%
Male	22	73%	18%	0%	23	48%	13%	4%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	29	76%	24%	0%	39	64%	18%	5%
Hispanic or Latino	9	–	–	–	7	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	2	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	11	55%	9%	0%	9	56%	11%	0%
General-Education Students	38	–	–	–	36	69%	22%	6%
Students with Disabilities	2	–	–	–	12	42%	0%	0%
English Proficient	40	70%	20%	0%	47	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient					1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	37	–	–	–	45	–	–	–
Not Disadvantaged	3	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
Migrant								
Not Migrant	40	70%	20%	0%	48	63%	17%	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.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 4 English Language Arts



Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**46**	**83%**	**24%**	**0%**	**70**	**100%**	**40%**	**0%**
Female	23	87%	26%	0%	36	100%	44%	0%
Male	23	78%	22%	0%	34	100%	35%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	35	89%	20%	0%	55	100%	29%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	6	83%	33%	0%	11	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	3	–	–	–	4	–	–	–
Multiracial	1	–	–	–				
Small Group Totals	5	40%	40%	0%	15	100%	80%	0%
General-Education Students	35	89%	23%	0%	65	100%	43%	0%
Students with Disabilities	11	64%	27%	0%	5	100%	0%	0%
English Proficient	45	–	–	–	70	100%	40%	0%
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–				
Economically Disadvantaged	46	83%	24%	0%	61	100%	38%	0%
Not Disadvantaged					9	100%	56%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	46	83%	24%	0%	70	100%	40%	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.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 4	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total				Total			
Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 4	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 4 Mathematics



Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**46**	**89%**	**24%**	**2%**	**70**	**100%**	**31%**	**4%**
Female	23	91%	26%	0%	36	100%	33%	3%
Male	23	87%	22%	4%	34	100%	29%	6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	35	94%	23%	3%	55	100%	25%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	6	83%	17%	0%	11	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	3	–	–	–	4	–	–	–
Multiracial	1	–	–	–				
Small Group Totals	5	60%	40%	0%	15	100%	53%	20%
General-Education Students	35	94%	26%	3%	65	100%	34%	5%
Students with Disabilities	11	73%	18%	0%	5	100%	0%	0%
English Proficient	45	–	–	–	70	100%	31%	4%
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–				
Economically Disadvantaged	46	89%	24%	2%	61	100%	33%	5%
Not Disadvantaged					9	100%	22%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	46	89%	24%	2%	70	100%	31%	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.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 4 Science



Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**45**	**91%**	**69%**	**11%**	**70**	**97%**	**83%**	**20%**
Female	23	87%	74%	9%	36	100%	86%	17%
Male	22	95%	64%	14%	34	94%	79%	24%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	35	91%	66%	11%	55	96%	80%	13%
Hispanic or Latino	6	–	–	–	11	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	2	–	–	–	4	–	–	–
Multiracial	1	–	–	–				
Small Group Totals	10	90%	80%	10%	15	100%	93%	47%
General-Education Students	35	91%	71%	9%	65	97%	85%	22%
Students with Disabilities	10	90%	60%	20%	5	100%	60%	0%
English Proficient	44	–	–	–	70	97%	83%	20%
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–				
Economically Disadvantaged	45	91%	69%	11%	61	97%	80%	21%
Not Disadvantaged					9	100%	100%	11%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	45	91%	69%	11%	70	97%	83%	20%

NOTES

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 5 English Language Arts



Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**44**	**89%**	**34%**	**0%**	**39**	**87%**	**28%**	**0%**
Female	26	88%	23%	0%	21	86%	29%	0%
Male	18	89%	50%	0%	18	89%	28%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	34	88%	24%	0%	30	87%	23%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	8	–	–	–	5	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	2	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	10	90%	70%	0%	9	89%	44%	0%
General-Education Students	41	–	–	–	26	88%	42%	0%
Students with Disabilities	3	–	–	–	13	85%	0%	0%
English Proficient	44	89%	34%	0%	38	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient					1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	41	–	–	–	33	91%	30%	0%
Not Disadvantaged	3	–	–	–	6	67%	17%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	44	89%	34%	0%	39	87%	28%	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.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total				Total			
Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 5 Mathematics



Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**44**	**98%**	**41%**	**5%**	**39**	**100%**	**36%**	**3%**
Female	26	100%	38%	0%	21	100%	33%	0%
Male	18	94%	44%	11%	18	100%	39%	6%
American Indian or Alaska Native					1	–	–	–
Black or African American	34	97%	32%	3%	30	100%	33%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	8	–	–	–	5	–	–	–
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	2	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	10	100%	70%	10%	9	100%	44%	11%
General-Education Students	41	–	–	–	26	100%	42%	4%
Students with Disabilities	3	–	–	–	13	100%	23%	0%
English Proficient	44	98%	41%	5%	38	–	–	–
Limited English Proficient					1	–	–	–
Economically Disadvantaged	41	–	–	–	33	100%	36%	3%
Not Disadvantaged	3	–	–	–	6	100%	33%	0%
Migrant								
Not Migrant	44	98%	41%	5%	39	100%	36%	3%

NOTES

The – symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent	0				0			

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 6 English Language Arts

	This School			School District			NY State Public		
Percentage scoring at level(s):	2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4	2–4	3–4	4
2011 Mean Score: 657 *Range:	644–785	662–785	694–785						
2010 Mean Score: 658									
2010–11	76%	44%	0%	78%	29%	0%	88%	56%	4%
2009–10	92%	35%	0%	79%	32%	1%	89%	54%	7%
Number of Tested Students:	26 24	15 9	0 0	1710 1728	646 698	10 29			

Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**34**	**76%**	**44%**	**0%**	**26**	**92%**	**35%**	**0%**
Female	17	88%	59%	0%	15	87%	33%	0%
Male	17	65%	29%	0%	11	100%	36%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	25	80%	40%	0%	21	90%	43%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	5	–	–	–	5	100%	0%	0%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	3	–	–	–				
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	9	67%	56%	0%				
General-Education Students	24	79%	63%	0%	20	100%	40%	0%
Students with Disabilities	10	70%	0%	0%	6	67%	17%	0%
English Proficient	33	–	–	–	26	92%	35%	0%
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–				
Economically Disadvantaged	30	–	–	–	24	–	–	–
Not Disadvantaged	4	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
Migrant								
Not Migrant	34	76%	44%	0%	26	92%	35%	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.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent	0				0			
New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)†: Grade 6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total				Total			
Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3 Overview of School Performance

School **SCHOOL 54-FLOWER CITY COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
School ID **26-16-00-01-0054**

District **ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This School's Results in Grade 6 Mathematics



Results by Student Group

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Percentage scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
All Students	**34**	**88%**	**24%**	**0%**	**26**	**96%**	**38%**	**8%**
Female	17	94%	29%	0%	15	93%	33%	7%
Male	17	82%	18%	0%	11	100%	45%	9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	–	–	–				
Black or African American	25	84%	28%	0%	21	95%	38%	5%
Hispanic or Latino	5	–	–	–	5	100%	40%	20%
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander								
White	3	–	–	–				
Multiracial								
Small Group Totals	9	100%	11%	0%				
General-Education Students	24	100%	33%	0%	20	100%	45%	10%
Students with Disabilities	10	60%	0%	0%	6	83%	17%	0%
English Proficient	33	–	–	–	26	96%	38%	8%
Limited English Proficient	1	–	–	–				
Economically Disadvantaged	30	–	–	–	24	–	–	–
Not Disadvantaged	4	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
Migrant								
Not Migrant	34	88%	24%	0%	26	96%	38%	8%

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.

* These ranges are for 2010–11 data only. Ranges for the 2009–10 data are available in the 2009–10 *Accountability and Overview Reports.*

Other Assessments

	2010–11 School Year				2009–10 School Year			
	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4	Total Tested	Number scoring at level(s): 2–4	3–4	4
New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent	0				0			