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



### ACCOUNTABILITY STATUS REPORT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, AND GRADUATION RATE for CARTHAGE CSD

2004-05 Accountability Status: District In Good Standing

Title I Funding This school received Title I funding in: 2002-03: Yes 2003-04: Yes 2004-05: Yes

### **District Accountability Status Categories**

The list below defines the district status categories of New York State's district accountability system, which is divided into a Federal Title I component and a State component. A district that does not receive Title I funding in a school year does not have a federal status in that year. Consequences for districts not in good standing can be found at: http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/DINI/DINI2004-05.shtml. To be removed from any improvement status, a district must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) at an applicable grade level in the subject area for which it was identified for two consecutive years.

**District in Good Standing:** A district is considered to be in good standing if it has not been identified as a District in Need of Improvement, Requiring Corrective Action, Planning for Restructuring, or Requiring Academic Progress.

**District Requiring Academic Progress:** Under the State component of New York's accountability system, a district that misses making AYP at every applicable grade level in a subject area for two consecutive years is considered a District Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) for the following year. In each succeeding year that the school fails to make AYP, the year designation is incremented by one.

**District in Need of Improvement (Year 1):** A district that misses making AYP at every applicable grade level in the same subject area for two consecutive years while receiving Title I funds is considered a District in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for the following year.

**District in Need of Improvement (Year 2):** A District in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that misses making AYP at every applicable grade level in the subject area for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a District in Need of Improvement (Year 2) for the following year.

**District Requiring Corrective Action:** A District in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that misses making AYP at every applicable grade level in the subject area for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a District Requiring Corrective Action for the following year.

**District Planning for Restructuring:** A District Requiring Corrective Action that misses making AYP at every applicable grade level in the subject area for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a District Planning for Restructuring for the following year.

**District Restructuring:** A District Planning for Restructuring that misses making AYP at every applicable grade level in the subject area for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a District Restructuring for the following year.

### **Elementary-Level English Language Arts**

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

### For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make.

For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04, it must

- 1. meet the 95 percent participation requirement (**2003–04** *Participation*), *and*
- 2. *either* meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (**2003–04** *Performance* and *Standards*).

To meet the participation requirement, 95 percent of the grade 4 enrollment in each accountability group with 40 or more students must

be tested. To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled students must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its ELA safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the elementary-level science qualification for safe harbor. (See the elementary-level science page of this report for further information on meeting the science qualification for safe harbor.)

**ELA Safe Harbor Targets:** The elementary-level 2003–04 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

	2003–04 Pa	articipation*	2003–04 Pe	rformance**	20	003–04 Stan	dards	Made	2004–05
Accountability Group	Grade 4 Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment Tested	Count of Continuously Enrolled Students	Performance Index	Effective AMO	ELA Safe Harbor Target	Met the Science Qualification for Safe Harbor	AYP in ELA in 2003–04	ELA Safe Harbor Target
All Students	231	100%	226	153	116			YES	
Students with Disabilities	41	100%	40	108	108			YES	
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black	19		19						
Hispanic	9		9						
Asian or Pacific Islander	2		2						
White	201	100%	196	157	115			YES	
Limited English Proficient	1		1						
Economically Disadvantaged	116	100%	113	142	113			YES	
Final AYP Determination								YES	

\*Students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count. If the participation rate of an accountability group fell below 95 percent in 2003–04, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2002–03 and 2003–04 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years. \*\*For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2003–04, data for 2002–03 and 2003–04 were combined to determine counts and PIs.

### **Elementary-Level Mathematics**

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make AYP.

For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04, it must

- 1. meet the 95 percent participation requirement (2003–04 *Participation*), and
- 2. *either* meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (**2003–04** *Performance* and *Standards*).

To meet the participation requirement, 95 percent of the grade 4 enrollment in each accountability group with 40 or more students must

be tested. To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled students must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its math safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the elementary-level science qualification for safe harbor. (See the elementary-level science page of this report for further information on meeting the science qualification for safe harbor.)

**Math Safe Harbor Targets:** The elementary-level 2003–04 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

	2003–04 Pa	articipation*	2003–04 Pe	rformance**	20	003–04 Stan	dards	Made	2004–05
Accountability Group	Grade 4 Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment Tested	Count of Continuously Enrolled Students	Performance Index	Effective AMO	Math Safe Harbor Target	Met the Science Qualification for Safe Harbor	AYP in Math in 2003–04	Math Safe Harbor Target
All Students	230	100%	221	184	129			YES	
Students with Disabilities	39		36	161	120			YES	
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black	19		19						
Hispanic	9		9						
Asian or Pacific Islander	2		2						
White	200	100%	191	186	128			YES	
Limited English Proficient	1		1						
Economically Disadvantaged	117	100%	110	175	126			YES	
Final AYP Determination								YES	

\*Students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count. If the participation rate of an accountability group fell below 95 percent in 2003–04, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2002–03 and 2003–04 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

\*\* For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2003–04, data for 2002–03 and 2003–04 were combined to determine counts and PIs.

### **Elementary-Level Science**

Definitions of terms, such as Progress Target and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

*Made AYP in Science in 2003–04:* For a school or a district to make AYP in science, the Performance Index (PI) for the "All Students" group must equal or exceed the State Science Standard or the Science Progress Target.

*State Designated Level (SDL):* The score that students taking the elementary-level science test in 2002–03 must have equaled or exceeded on the written portion of the test to have met the State Science Standard.

**Qualification for Safe Harbor in Elementary-Level ELA and Math:** For an accountability group to be considered Qualified for Safe Harbor in Elementary-Level ELA and Math, the PI must equal or exceed the State Science Standard or the Science Progress Target in elementarylevel science for that group. Groups with fewer than 30 students tested in elementary-level science are not subject to this qualification criterion.

**Science Progress Targets:** The elementary-level 2003–04 Science Progress Target is calculated by multiplying the 2002–03 Percent At or Above SDL by two and then adding one point. The 2004–05 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2003–04 PI. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the State Science Standard in 2003–04.

	2003–04 Pe	erformance*	2003–04 \$	Standards		2003–04	2004–05
Accountability Group	Count of Continuously Enrolled Students	Performance Index	State Science Standard	Science Progress Target	Made AYP in Science in 2003–04	Qualified for Safe Harbor in Elementary- Level ELA and Math	Science Progress Target
All Students	218	190	100		YES	YES	
Students with Disabilities	35	183	100			YES	
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
Black	18						
Hispanic	9						
Asian or Pacific Islander	2						
White	189	193	100			YES	
Limited English Proficient	1						
Economically Disadvantaged	107	183	100			YES	
Final AYP Determination					YES		

\*For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled students in 2003–04, data for 2002–03 and 2003–04 were combined to determine counts and Performance Indices.

### Middle-Level English Language Arts

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

### For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make AYP.

For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04, it must

- 1. meet the 95 percent participation requirement (**2003–04** *Participation*), *and*
- 2. *either* meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (**2003–04** *Performance* and *Standards*).

To meet the participation requirement, 95 percent of the grade 8 enrollment in each accountability group with 40 or more students must

be tested. To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled students must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its ELA safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the middle-level science qualification for safe harbor. (See the middle-level science page of this report for further information on meeting the science qualification for safe harbor.)

**ELA Safe Harbor Targets:** The middle-level 2003–04 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI)  $\times$  0.10. The 2004–05 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI)  $\times$  0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

	2003–04 Pa	articipation*	2003–04 Pe	rformance**	20	003–04 Stan	dards	Made	2004–05
Accountability Group	Grade 8 Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment Tested	Count of Continuously Enrolled Students	Performance Index	Effective AMO	ELA Safe Harbor Target	Met the Science Qualification for Safe Harbor	AYP in ELA in 2003–04	ELA Safe Harbor Target
All Students	212	100%	204	136	99			YES	
Students with Disabilities	34		32	59	90	78	***	NO	73
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black	9		8						
Hispanic	6		5						
Asian or Pacific Islander	8		8						
White	189	99%	183	134	99			YES	
Limited English Proficient									
Economically Disadvantaged	77	99%	72	121	96			YES	
Final AYP Determination								NO	

\*Students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count. If the participation rate of an accountability group fell below 95 percent in 2003–04, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2002–03 and 2003–04 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

\*\* For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2003–04, data for 2002–03 and 2003–04 were combined to determine counts and PIs.

### Middle-Level Mathematics

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

### For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make AYP.

For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04, it must

- 1. meet the 95 percent participation requirement (**2003–04** *Participation*), *and*
- 2. *either* meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (**2003–04** *Performance* and *Standards*).

To meet the participation requirement, 95 percent of the grade 8 enrollment in each accountability group with 40 or more students must be tested. To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled students must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its math safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the middle-level science qualification for safe harbor. (See the middle-level science page of this report for further information on meeting the science qualification for safe harbor.)

**Math Safe Harbor Targets:** The middle-level 2003–04 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

	2003–04 Pa	articipation*	2003–04 Pe	rformance**	2	003–04 Stan	dards	Made	2004–05
Accountability Group	Grade 8 Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment Tested	Count of Continuously Enrolled Students	Performance Index	Effective AMO	Math Safe Harbor Target	Met the Science Qualification for Safe Harbor	AYP in Math in 2003–04	Math Safe Harbor Target
All Students	220	99%	203	163	73			YES	
Students with Disabilities	37		31	58	64	64	***	NO	72
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black	9		8						
Hispanic	6		5						
Asian or Pacific Islander	9		8						
White	196	98%	182	164	73			YES	
Limited English Proficient									
Economically Disadvantaged	81	98%	71	144	70			YES	
Final AYP Determination								NO	

\*Students who were excused from testing for medical reasons are not included in the enrollment count. If the participation rate of an accountability group fell below 95 percent in 2003–04, the enrollment shown is the sum of 2002–03 and 2003–04 enrollments and the percent tested is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

\*\* For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2003–04, data for 2002–03 and 2003–04 were combined to determine counts and PIs.

### Middle-Level Science

Definitions of terms, such as Progress Target and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

*Made AYP in Science in 2003–04:* For a school or a district to make AYP in science, the Performance Index (PI) for the "All Students" group must equal or exceed the State Science Standard or the Science Progress Target.

*Qualification for Safe Harbor in Middle-Level ELA and Math:* For an accountability group to be considered Qualified for Safe Harbor in

Middle-Level ELA and Math, the PI must equal or exceed the State Science Standard or the Science Progress Target in middle-level science for that group. Groups with fewer than 30 students tested in middle-level science are not subject to this qualification criterion.

**Science Progress Targets:** The middle-level 2003–04 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2002–03 PI. The 2004–05 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2003–04 PI. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the State Science Standard in 2003–04.

	2003–04 Pe	erformance*	2003–04 \$	Standards		2003–04	2004–05
Accountability Group	Count of Continuously Enrolled Students	Performance Index	State Science Standard	Science Progress Target	Made AYP in Science in 2003–04	Qualified for Safe Harbor in Middle- Level ELA and Math	Science Progress Target
All Students	200	185	100		YES	YES	
Students with Disabilities	29						
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
Black	8						
Hispanic	5						
Asian or Pacific Islander	8						
White	179	186	100			YES	
Limited English Proficient							
Economically Disadvantaged	69	177	100			YES	
Final AYP Determination					YES		

\*For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled students in 2003–04, data for 2002–03 and 2003–04 were combined to determine counts and PIs.

### Secondary-Level English Language Arts

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

# For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make AYP.

**For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04**, 95 percent of seniors in each accountability group of 40 or more must have taken an English examination that meets the student graduation requirement. Each group must also meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (*2003–04 Performance* and *Standards*). To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more cohort members must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the

Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its ELA safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor. (See the graduation-rate page of this report for further information on meeting the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor.)

**ELA Safe Harbor Targets:** The secondary-level 2003–04 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

	2003–04 Part	cipation	2003–04 Pe	rformance*	20	003–04 St	andards	Made	2004–05
Accountability Group	Count of Seniors in 2003–04	Percent of Seniors Tested	Count of 2000 Accountability Cohort Members	Performance Index	Effective AMO	ELA Safe Harbor Target	Met the Graduation- Rate Qualification for Safe Harbor	AYP in ELA in 2003–04	ELA Safe Harbor Target
All Students	214	93%	188	176	134			NO	
Students with Disabilities	28		23						
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black	9		3						
Hispanic	6		5						
Asian or Pacific Islander	7		5						
White	192	93%	175	174	134			NO	
Limited English Proficient									
Economically Disadvantaged	56	84%	50	162	129			NO	
Final AYP Determination								NO	

\*For schools with fewer than thirty 2000 accountability cohort members, 1999 and 2000 cohort data were combined to determine counts and PIs.

\*\*Groups with a "\*\*" are not required to meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor, because fewer than 30 members in the 1999 graduation-rate cohort were in those groups.

### Secondary-Level Mathematics

Definitions of terms, such as Performance Index and Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

# For a school or a district to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2003–04, every accountability group must make AYP.

**For an accountability group to make AYP in 2003–04,** 95 percent of seniors in each accountability group of 40 or more must have taken a mathematics examination that meets the student graduation requirement. Each group must also meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (*2003–04 Performance* and *Standards*). To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more cohort members must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe

harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its math safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor. (See the graduation-rate page of this report for further information on meeting the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor.)

**Math Safe Harbor Targets:** The secondary-level 2003–04 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2003–04 PI + (200 – the 2003–04 PI) × 0.10. The 2004–05 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2003–04.

	2003-04 Part	icipation	2003–04 Pe	rformance*	20	003–04 St	andards	Made	2004–05
Accountability Group	Count of Seniors in 2003–04	Percent of Seniors Tested	Count of 2000 Accountability Cohort Members	Performance Index	Effective AMO	Math Safe Harbor Target	Met the Graduation- Rate Qualification for Safe Harbor	AYP in Math in 2003–04	Math Safe Harbor Target
All Students	214	94%	188	164	124			NO	
Students with Disabilities	28		23						
American Indian/Alaskan Native									
Black	9		3						
Hispanic	6		5						
Asian or Pacific Islander	7		5						
White	192	94%	175	163	124			NO	
Limited English Proficient									
Economically Disadvantaged	56	84%	50	144	119			NO	
Final AYP Determination								NO	

\*For schools with fewer than thirty 2000 accountability cohort members, 1999 and 2000 cohort data were combined to determine counts and PIs.

\*\*Groups with a "\*\*" are not required to meet the graduation-rate qualification for safe harbor, because fewer than 30 members in the 1999 graduation-rate cohort were in those groups.

### **Graduation Rate**

Definitions of terms, such as Progress Target and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), are in the glossary, which is the last page of this report.

*Made AYP in Graduation Rate in 2003–04:* For a school or a district to make AYP in graduation rate, the Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003 for the "All Students" group must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target.

**Qualification for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math:** For an accountability group to be considered Qualified for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math, the Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target for that group. **Graduation-Rate Progress Targets:** The 2003–04 Graduation-Rate Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the Percent of the 1998 Cohort Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2002. The 2004–05 Graduation-Rate Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the Percent of the 1999 Cohort Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003. This target is provided for each group whose Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003 is below the Graduation-Rate Standard in 2003–04 (55). Groups with fewer than 30 cohort members are not subject to this criterion.

	2003–04	Performance	2003–04 \$	Standards	Mede AVD	2003–04	2004–05
Accountability Group	Count of 1999 Graduation- Rate Cohort Members	Percent Earning a Local Diploma by August 31, 2003	Graduation- Rate Standard	Graduation- Rate Progress Target	Made AYP in Graduation Rate in 2003–04	Qualified for Safe Harbor in Secondary- Level ELA and Math	Graduation- Rate Progress Target
All Students	189	84	55		YES	YES	
Students with Disabilities	21						
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
Black	12						
Hispanic	4						
Asian or Pacific Islander	3						
White	170	83	55			YES	
Limited English Proficient							
Economically Disadvantaged	51	78	55			YES	
Final AYP Determination					YES		

#### Glossary

Accountability Cohort: The 2000 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 2000, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2000–01 school year, who were enrolled on October 2, 2002. Students who transferred to programs leading to a high school diploma or high school equivalency diploma were not included in the 2000 school accountability cohort. The 2000 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 CSE or district administrators and who met the other requirements for cohort membership. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (8) 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 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 AMO will be increased in regular increments beginning in 2004–05 until it reaches 200 in 2013–14. (See Effective AMO for further information.)

**Continuously Enrolled Students:** Students enrolled in the school or district on BEDS day (usually the first Wednesday in October) of the school year and until the day of testing.

**Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO):** The Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO) is the 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.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

**Graduation-Rate Cohort:** Graduation-rate cohort for each year includes all students in the accountability cohort in the previous year plus all students excluded from that accountability cohort solely because they transferred to a general education development (GED) program. Certain students with severe disabilities and new immigrants were excluded from the 1999 graduation-rate cohort.

**Graduation-Rate Standard:** The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory percentage of cohort members earning a local diploma. The State Graduation-Rate Standard is 55 percent. The Commissioner may raise the Graduation-Rate Standard at his discretion in future 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 achievement levels, from Level 1 (indicating no proficiency) to Level 4 (indicating advanced proficiency). At the elementary and middle levels, the *PI is calculated using the following equation:*  $100 \times [(Count of$ *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:* $<math>100 \times [(Count of Cohort Members Performing at$ Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) + Count of All CohortMembers]. A list of tests used to measure student performance foraccountability 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 alternative method for making 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 alternative means to demonstrate AYP for accountability groups that do not achieve their Effective AMOs in English or mathematics.

**Science Standard:** The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory performance in science. In 2003–04, the State Science Standard at the elementary and middle levels was a PI of 100. The Commissioner may raise the State Science Standard at his discretion in future years.