The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department

OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS, AND SCIENCE

AND

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT SUBGROUP PERFORMANCE

for

Oneida Middle School

in

Schenectady City School District

March 2003

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University

ROBERT M. BENNETT, *Chancellor,* B.A., M.S.	Tonawanda
ADELAIDE L. SANFORD, *Vice Chancellor,* B.A., M.A., P.D.	Hollis
DIANE O'NEILL MCGIVERN, B.S.N., M.A., Ph.D.	Staten Island
SAUL B. COHEN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	New Rochelle
JAMES C. DAWSON, A.A., B.A., M.S., Ph.D.	Peru
ROBERT M. JOHNSON, B.S., J.D.	Huntington
ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.	North Syracuse
MERRYL H. TISCH, B.A., M.A.	New York
GERALDINE D. CHAPEY, B.A., M.A., Ed.D.	Belle Harbor
ARNOLD B. GARDNER, B.A., LL.B.	Buffalo
HARRY PHILLIPS, 3rd, B.A., M.S.F.S.	Hartsdale
JOSEPH E. BOWMAN, JR., B.A., M.L.S., M.A., M.Ed., Ed.D	Albany
LORRAINE A. CORTÉS-VÁZQUEZ, B.A., M.P.A.	Bronx
JUDITH O. RUBIN, A.B.	New York
JAMES R. TALLON, JR., B.A., M.A.	Binghamton
MILTON L. COFIELD, B.S., M.B.A., Ph.D.	Rochester

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
RICHARD P. MILLS

Chief Operating Officer
RICHARD H. CATE

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education
JAMES A. KADAMUS

Coordinator, School Operations and Management Services
CHARLES SZUBERLA

Coordinator, Information and Reporting Services
MARTHA P. MUSSER

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or sexual orientation in its educational programs, services and activities. Portions of this publication can be made available in a variety of formats, including braille, large print or audio tape, upon request. Inquiries concerning this policy of nondiscrimination should be directed to the Department's Office for Diversity, Ethics, and Access, Room 530, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234. **Requests for additional copies of this publication may be made by contacting the Publications Sales Desk, Room 309, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234.**

Please address all correspondence about this report that is not related to data corrections to:

School Report Card Coordinator
Information and Reporting Services Team
New York State Education Department
Room 863 EBA
89 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12234
E-mail: *RPTCARD@mail.nysed.gov*

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 student performance and 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.

The *New York State School Report Card* consists of three parts: the *Overview of School Performance in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science and Analysis of Student Subgroup Performance,* the *Comprehensive Information Report,* and the *School Accountability Report*. The *Overview and Analysis* presents performance data on measures required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act: English, mathematics, science, and graduation rate. Performance data on other State assessments can be found in the *Comprehensive Information Report*. The *School Accountability Report* provides information as to whether a school is making adequate progress toward enabling all students to achieve proficiency in English and mathematics.

State assessments are designed to help ensure that all students reach high learning standards. They show whether students are getting the foundation knowledge 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.

In the *Overview*, performance on the elementary- and middle-level assessments in English language arts and mathematics and on the middle-level science test is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of students scoring at each of the four levels. These levels indicate performance on the standards from seriously deficient to advanced proficiency. Performance on the elementary-level science test is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of students making appropriate progress. Regents examination scores are reported in four score ranges. Scores of 65 to 100 are passing; scores of 55 to 64 earn credit toward a local diploma (with the approval of the local board of education). Though each elementary- and middle-level assessment is administered to students in a specific grade, secondary-level assessments are taken by students when they complete the coursework for the core curriculum. Therefore, the performance of students at the secondary level is measured for a student cohort rather than a group of students at a particular grade level. Students are grouped in cohorts according to the year in which they first entered grade 9.

The assessment data in the *Overview and Analysis* are for all tested students in the school, including general-education students and students with disabilities. In the *Overview*, each school's performance is compared with that of schools similar in grade level, district resources, and student needs as indicated by income and limited English proficiency (LEP) status. Each district's performance is compared with that of all public schools statewide. In the *Analysis*, performance is disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability status, gender, LEP status, income level, and migrant status.

Explanations of terms referred to or symbols used in this part of the school report card may be found in the glossary on the last page. Further information on the school report card may be found in the guide, *Understanding Your School Report Card 2003*, available at your school or on the Information and Reporting Services Web site at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

Overview of School Performance in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science

School Profile

Principal: Ms. Nora Cietek			Phone: (518)370-8260
Organization 2001–02		School Staff[1] (both full- and part-time)	
Grade Range	Student Enrollment	Count of Teachers	Count of Other Professionals
6-8	666	49	27

2000–01 School District-wide Total Expenditure per Pupil	$11,272

Student Demographics Used To Determine Similar Schools Group	1999–2000		2000–2001		2001–2002	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Limited English Proficient	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligible for Free Lunch	260	39.4%	241	39.6%	260	39.0%

Similar Schools Group	This school is in Similar Schools Group 26. All schools in this group are middle level schools in urban or suburban school districts with high student needs in relation to district resources. The schools in this group are in the middle range of student needs for middle level schools in these districts.

2001–02 Percentage of Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers*

Number of Core Classes	Percent Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
140	85%

*For the 2001–02 school year only, teachers of core classes are considered to be highly qualified if they are certified to teach that subject.

2001–02 Percentage of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate*

Number of Teachers	Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate
48	6%

*This count includes teachers with temporary licenses who do not have a valid permanent or provisional teaching certificate.

[1] District-employed staff who serve in more than one school are not included in these counts.

Middle Level

English Language Arts



Performance at This School	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 527–661	Level 2 662–700	Level 3 701–738	Level 4 739–830	Total	
May 2000	23	93	62	11	189	695
May 2001	27	90	47	3	167	685
	Level 1 527–659	Level 2 660–698	Level 3 699–737	Level 4 738–830	Total	
March 2002	19	113	55	7	194	686

Middle-Level English Language Arts Levels — Listening, Reading, and Writing Standards	
Level 4	These students **exceed the standards** and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examination.
Level 3	These students **meet the standards** and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examination.
Level 2	These students **need extra help** to meet the standards and pass the Regents examination.
Level 1	These students have **serious academic deficiencies**.

Performance of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

Grade 8	English Proficiency Below Effective Participation Level	Making Appropriate Progress
2002	0	0

Performance of Middle-Level Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in English

	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2001–02	2	#	#	#	#

Middle Level

Mathematics



Performance at This School	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 517–680	Level 2 681–715	Level 3 716–759	Level 4 760–882	Total	
May 2000	**57**	**73**	**52**	**3**	**185**	**696**
May 2001	**72**	**64**	**28**	**1**	**165**	**680**
May 2002	**63**	**81**	**50**	**8**	**202**	**697**

Middle-Level Mathematics Levels — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards	
Level 4	These students **exceed the standards** and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examination.
Level 3	These students **meet the standards** and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examination.
Level 2	These students **need extra help** to meet the standards and pass the Regents examination.
Level 1	These students have **serious academic deficiencies**.

Performance of Middle-Level Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Mathematics, Science, and Technology

	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2001–02	2	#	#	#	#

Middle Level

Science



Performance at This School		Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	
June 2002	Middle-Level Science	5	46	103	45	199	73
	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0

Middle-Level Science Levels — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards*	
Level 4	These students **exceed the standards** on the middle-level science test and are moving toward high performance on the Regents examinations ***or*** score 85–100 on a Regents science examination.
Level 3	These students **meet the standards** on the middle-level science test and, with continued steady growth, should pass the Regents examinations ***or*** score 65–84 on a Regents science examination.
Level 2	These students **need extra help** to meet the standards for middle-level science and to pass the Regents examinations ***or*** score 55–64 on a Regents science examination.
Level 1	These students have **serious academic deficiencies** as evidenced in the middle-level science test ***or*** score 0–54 on a Regents science examination.

*Students may demonstrate proficiency in middle-level science by scoring at level 3 or above on the middle-level science test or by scoring 65 or above on a Regents examination in science.

Analysis of Student Subgroup Performance

Historically, on State assessments the average performance of Black, Hispanic, and Native American students has been lower than that of White and Asian students. Similarly, students from low-income families have not performed as well as those from higher income families. A high priority of the Board of Regents is to eliminate these gaps in student performance. In addition, Title I of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act includes explicit requirements "to ensure that students served by Title I are given the same opportunity to achieve to high standards and are held to the same high expectations as all students in each State."

This section of the school report card provides performance data by racial/ethnic group, disability status, gender, English proficiency status, income level, and migrant status. The purpose of the student subgroup analyses is to determine if students who perform below the standards in any school tend to fall into particular groups, such as minority students, limited English proficient students, or economically disadvantaged students. If these analyses provide evidence that students in one of the groups achieve at a lower level than other students, the school and community should examine the reasons for this lower performance and make necessary changes in curriculum, instruction, and student support services to remedy these performance gaps.

Middle Level

English Language Arts

Student Subgroup	2000–01				2001–02			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	s	s	s	2	s	s	s
Black	46	78%	17%	0%	57	89%	21%	0%
Hispanic	7	s	s	s	16	63%	13%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	9	56%	0%	0%	7	s	s	s
White	101	88%	40%	3%	112	94%	42%	6%
Total	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	11	91%	18%	0%	9	100%	11%	0%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	146	92%	34%	2%	191	s	s	s
Students with disabilities	21	29%	0%	0%	3	s	s	s
Total	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%
Results by Gender								
Female	89	83%	33%	3%	102	93%	35%	5%
Male	78	85%	27%	0%	92	87%	28%	2%
Total	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%
Results by English Proficiency Status								
English proficient	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	58	78%	16%	0%	97	86%	22%	1%
Not disadvantaged	109	87%	38%	3%	97	95%	42%	6%
Total	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%
Total	167	84%	30%	2%	194	90%	32%	4%

Middle Level

Mathematics

Student Subgroup	2000–01				2001–02			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	s	s	s	2	s	s	s
Black	45	36%	7%	0%	59	68%	22%	0%
Hispanic	7	s	s	s	16	25%	0%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	9	56%	11%	0%	9	s	s	s
White	100	69%	24%	1%	116	78%	37%	6%
Total	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	11	27%	9%	0%	11	45%	18%	9%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	146	62%	20%	1%	199	s	s	s
Students with disabilities	19	16%	0%	0%	3	s	s	s
Total	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%
Results by Gender								
Female	88	53%	16%	0%	101	71%	30%	4%
Male	77	60%	19%	1%	101	66%	28%	4%
Total	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%
Results by English Proficiency Status								
English proficient	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	59	41%	5%	0%	100	60%	18%	1%
Not disadvantaged	106	65%	25%	1%	102	77%	39%	7%
Total	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%
Total	165	56%	18%	1%	202	69%	29%	4%

Middle Level

Science

Student Subgroup	2001–02			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	s	s	s
Black	58	98%	76%	16%
Hispanic	14	86%	57%	7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8	s	s	s
White	117	98%	78%	29%
Total	199	97%	74%	23%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	10	100%	50%	10%
Results by Disability Status				
General-education students	195	s	s	s
Students with disabilities	4	s	s	s
Total	199	97%	74%	23%
Results by Gender				
Female	101	97%	73%	20%
Male	98	98%	76%	26%
Total	199	97%	74%	23%
Results by English Proficiency Status				
English proficient	199	97%	74%	23%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	199	97%	74%	23%
Results by Income Level				
Economically disadvantaged	98	98%	70%	12%
Not disadvantaged	101	97%	78%	33%
Total	199	97%	74%	23%
Results by Migrant Status				
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	199	97%	74%	23%
Total	199	97%	74%	23%

Glossary

Cohort Data: A student cohort is all students, regardless of grade status, who were enrolled in school on BEDS day two years after the year in which they entered grade 9, or, in the case of ungraded students with disabilities, the year in which they reached their seventeenth birthday. (For example, the 1998 cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 1998 who were enrolled on October 4, 2000). Certain severely disabled students, new immigrants, and students who transfer to programs leading to a high school diploma or high school equivalency diploma are not included in the school cohort. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (8) (iii) of the Commissioner's Regulations. Data for the 1997 cohort are based on the Special Regents Examination Report for the 1997 Cohort. Data for the 1998 cohort are based on the 2002 STEP file submitted by each district.

Component Retests: Component retests were offered in Regents English and Mathematics A to graduating seniors who were at risk of not meeting the State learning Standards. Component retesting is the process by which a student who has failed a Regents examination in English or Mathematics A twice is retested only on the areas of the learning standards in which the student has been proven deficient. Component retesting eliminates the need for the student to retake the full Regents examination multiple times. Students who earn credit through component retesting are counted as if they scored in the 55–64 range or in the 65–84 range, as determined by the results of the component retest.

Counts of Students Tested: "Counts of Students Tested" includes only students who completed sufficient test questions to receive a score.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students: Schools teach English to students for whom English is a second language so they can participate effectively in the academic program. Students are considered LEP if, by reason of foreign birth or ancestry, they speak a language other than English and (1) either understand and speak little or no English or (2) score at or below the 40th percentile on an English language assessment instrument. LEP students without sufficient proficiency in English were not required to take the grade 4 or grade 8 English language arts test. Their reported progress in learning English was measured using standardized tests.

New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): The district Committee on Special Education designates severely disabled students who meet criteria established in Commissioner's Regulations to take the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA).

Similar Schools: Similar schools are schools that are grouped by common district and student demographic characteristics, including grade range of students served by the school, school district financial resources, and needs of the school student population. More information about similar school groups may be found on the Web at http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repcrd2002/similar.html.

Student Confidentiality/Suppressed Data (# and s): To ensure student confidentiality, the Department does *not* publish data for groups with fewer than five students or data that would allow readers to easily determine the performance of a group with fewer than five students. In the *Overview,* the pound character (#) appears when fewer than five students in a group were tested. In the *Analysis*, when fewer than five students in a group (e.g., Hispanic) were tested, percentages of tested students scoring at various levels were suppressed for that group and the next smallest group. Suppressed data are indicated with an **(s)**. However, the performance of tested students in these groups is aggregated and shown in the Small Group Total row.

Validity and Reliability of Small Group Data: It is important that programmatic decisions are based on valid and reliable data. Data for fewer than 40 students in a group are neither valid nor reliable. If a school does not have 40 students in a grade or a subgroup in a given year, the school should evaluate results for students in this group over a period of years to make programmatic decisions.