

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



**OVERVIEW OF DISTRICT PERFORMANCE IN  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS, AND SCIENCE  
AND  
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT SUBGROUP PERFORMANCE  
for  
Elwood Union Free School District**

**February 2005**

# THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

## Regents of The University

ROBERT M. BENNETT, <i>Chancellor</i> , B.A., M.S. ....	Tonawanda
ADELAIDE L. SANFORD, <i>Vice Chancellor</i> , 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
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
JAMES R. TALLON, JR., B.A., M.A. ....	Binghamton
MILTON L. COFIELD, B.S., M.B.A., Ph.D. ....	Rochester
JOHN BRADEMAS, B.A., Ph.D. ....	New York

### President of The University and Commissioner of Education

RICHARD P. MILLS

### Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education

JAMES A. KADAMUS

### Assistant Commissioner for Standards, Assessment and Reporting

DAVID M. ABRAMS

### 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](mailto:RPTCARD@mail.nysed.gov)

The *New York State District 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 district performance. Knowledge gained from the district report card on a district's strengths and weaknesses can be used to improve instruction and services to students.

The *New York State District Report Card* consists of three parts: the *Overview of District Performance in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science and Analysis of Student Subgroup Performance*, the *Comprehensive Information Report*, and the *Accountability Status 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 *Accountability Status Report* provides information as to whether a district 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, mathematics, and science 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. 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 district, including general-education students and students with disabilities. In the *Overview*, 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, limited English proficient status, income level, and migrant status.

Explanations of terms referred to or symbols used in this part of the district report card may be found in the glossary on the last page. Further information on the district report card may be found in the guide, *Understanding Your School Report Card: February 2005*, available on the Information and Reporting Services Web site at [www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts](http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts).

# Overview of District Performance in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science

## District Profile

Superintendent: William J. Swart		Phone: (631)266-5402
<b>Organization</b> <b>2003–04</b>	Grade Range	Student Enrollment
	NA	2512

<b>2002–03 District-wide Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$13,284
<b>2002–03 NYS Public Schools Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$13,085

### 2003–04 Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers\*

Total Number of Core Classes	Percent Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
460	100%


\*To meet the federal definition of “highly qualified,” public school teachers of core academic subjects must have at least a bachelor’s degree and be State certified for and demonstrate subject matter competency in the core academic subject(s) they teach.

### 2003–04 Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate\*

Total Number of Teachers	Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate
179	0%

\*Includes teachers with a modified temporary license.

## Elementary Level English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 455–602	Level 2 603–644	Level 3 645–691	Level 4 692–800	Total Tested	
Jan–Feb 2002	2	25	84	79	190	686
Feb 2003	3	22	74	113	212	692
Feb 2004	6	24	90	94	214	685

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


### Performance of Limited English Proficient Students Taking the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) as the Measure of English Language Arts Achievement

Grade 4	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested
2004	#	#	#	#	3

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

Elementary Level	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4	Total Tested
2003–04	0	0	0	0	0

## Elementary Level Mathematics



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 448–601	Level 2 602–636	Level 3 637–677	Level 4 678–810	Total Tested	
May 2002	1	22	80	86	189	673
May 2003	1	7	92	114	214	682
May 2004	2	10	79	126	217	684


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

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Mathematics

Elementary Level	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
<b>2003-04</b>	0	0	0	0	0

# Elementary Level

## Science\*



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 0-44	Level 2 45-64	Level 3 65-84	Level 4 85-100	Total Tested	
May 2004	3	5	72	138	218	85


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

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Science

Elementary Level	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
2003-04	0	0	0	0	0

\*Only one year of data is shown because a new assessment in elementary-level science was administered for the first time in 2003-04.

## Middle Level English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 527-659	Level 2 660-698	Level 3 699-737	Level 4 738-830	Total Tested	
March 2002	4	36	75	47	162	718
	Level 1 527-657	Level 2 658-696	Level 3 697-736	Level 4 737-830	Total Tested	
January 2003	6	41	91	40	178	714
January 2004	5	54	97	56	212	719

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

### Performance of Limited English Proficient Students Taking the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) as the Measure of English Language Arts Achievement


Grade 8	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested
2004	0	0	0	0	0

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

Middle Level	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
2003-04	#	#	#	#	1



## Middle Level Mathematics



Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 517-680	Level 2 681-715	Level 3 716-759	Level 4 760-882	Total Tested	
May 2002	11	37	79	42	169	735
May 2003	8	41	115	16	180	728
May 2004	7	23	120	59	209	744


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

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Mathematics

Middle Level	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
<b>2003-04</b>	#	#	#	#	1

## Middle Level

### Science



Performance at This District		Counts of Students					Mean Score
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested	
June 2002	Middle-Level Science	3	7	58	48	116	80
	Regents Science	0	0	6	47	53	90
January/ June 2003	Middle-Level Science	0	19	65	46	130	79
	Regents Science	0	0	9	43	52	91
January/ June 2004	Middle-Level Science	1	17	74	60	152	79
	Regents Science	0	0	14	41	55	89

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

### Performance of Students with Severe Disabilities on the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in Science

Middle Level	AA-Level 1	AA-Level 2	AA-Level 3	AA-Level 4	Total Tested
2003-04	#	#	#	#	1

# High School English Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graphs and tables below present performance of the 1998, 1999, and 2000 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in English. In the graph, students passing approved alternatives to this examination are counted as scoring in the 65 to 84 range. RCT results are not included in the graph. The data in these tables and charts show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. Data for the 1999 and 2000 cohorts include all students in cohorts in the district's schools, students continuously enrolled in the district who transferred between schools within the district, and students placed outside the district but who are the reporting responsibility of the district. Data for the 1998 cohort include all students in the cohort in the district's schools.



English Graduation Requirement Achievement after Four Years of High School*						
	Cohort Members All Students	Highest Score Between 0 and 54	Highest Score Between 55 and 64	Highest Score Between 65 and 84	Highest Score Between 85 and 100	Approved Alternative Credit
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	128	1	6	49	65	0
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	131	7	2	45	73	0
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	155	13	4	51	83	0


\*Assessments used to determine counts in this table include the Regents examination in comprehensive English, the component retest in English, and approved alternatives.

Performance of Students Who Took the Regents Competency Tests in Reading and Writing to Meet the Graduation Requirement*		
	Passed the RCTs	Failed RCT in Reading and/or Writing
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	0	4
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	0	1
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	0	4

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative. Some students in the "Passed the RCTs" counts are also included in the 0-54 counts in the graph above.

# High School Mathematics Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graphs and tables below present performance of the 1998, 1999, and 2000 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in mathematics. In the graph, students passing approved alternatives to these examinations are counted as scoring in the 65 to 84 range. RCT results are not included in the graph. The data in these tables and charts show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. Data for the 1999 and 2000 cohorts include all students in cohorts in the district's schools, students continuously enrolled in the district who transferred between schools within the district, and students placed outside the district but who are the reporting responsibility of the district. Data for the 1998 cohort include all students in the cohort in the district's schools.



Mathematics Graduation Requirement Achievement after Four Years of High School*						
	Cohort Members All Students	Highest Score Between 0 and 54	Highest Score Between 55 and 64	Highest Score Between 65 and 84	Highest Score Between 85 and 100	Approved Alternative Credit
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	128	7	2	42	76	0
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	131	7	2	40	81	0
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	155	10	5	49	86	0


\*Assessments used to determine counts in this table include a Regents examination in mathematics, the component retest in mathematics, and approved alternatives.

Performance of Students Who Took the Regents Competency Test in Mathematics to Meet the Graduation Requirement*		
	Passed the RCT	Failed at Least One RCT
<b>1998 Cohort</b>	0	0
<b>1999 Cohort</b>	0	0
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	3	0

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative. Some students in the "Passed the RCTs" counts are also included in the 0-54 counts in the graph above.

## Cohort Graduation Rates

Students were counted as graduates if they earned a local diploma with or without a Regents endorsement by August 31<sup>st</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. The graduation-rate cohort includes students who transferred to general education development (GED) programs. These students were not counted in the 1998 and 1999 school accountability cohort for English and mathematics.



Cohort Graduation Rates				
	Cohort Members* (a)	Transfers to GED (b)	Graduation Rate Cohort Members (a+b)	Number Graduated
1998 Cohort	130	2	132	124
1999 Cohort	131	2	133	117

\*Count as of August 31<sup>st</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9.

## 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 district report card provides performance data for two years 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 district should examine the reasons for this lower performance and make necessary changes in curriculum, instruction, and student support services to remedy these performance gaps. If your district did not report data for the 2003–04 school year for a subject and grade, a table showing data for subgroups in that subject and grade will not be included in the *Analysis*.

## Elementary Level English Language Arts

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	17	94%	59%	41%	20	90%	65%	25%
Hispanic	14	86%	43%	29%	18	100%	72%	28%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	100%	100%	40%	7	100%	100%	43%
White	176	100%	94%	57%	169	98%	89%	48%
Total	212	99%	88%	53%	214	97%	86%	44%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	199	100%	93%	57%	203	100%	90%	46%
Students with disabilities	13	77%	15%	0%	11	55%	18%	0%
Total	212	99%	88%	53%	214	97%	86%	44%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	104	100%	92%	67%	110	99%	86%	48%
Male	108	97%	84%	40%	104	95%	86%	39%
Total	212	99%	88%	53%	214	97%	86%	44%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	209	s	s	s	203	97%	87%	46%
Limited English proficient	3	s	s	s	11	100%	64%	0%
Total	212	99%	88%	53%	214	97%	86%	44%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	20	95%	45%	20%	17	100%	65%	29%
Not disadvantaged	192	99%	93%	57%	197	97%	88%	45%
Total	212	99%	88%	53%	214	97%	86%	44%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	212	99%	88%	53%	214	97%	86%	44%
Total	212	99%	88%	53%	214	97%	86%	44%

## Elementary Level Mathematics

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	16	94%	75%	19%	20	100%	85%	30%
Hispanic	15	100%	80%	20%	19	100%	89%	32%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6	100%	100%	67%	7	100%	86%	71%
White	177	100%	99%	59%	171	99%	96%	64%
Total	214	100%	96%	53%	217	99%	94%	58%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	201	100%	99%	56%	205	100%	97%	60%
Students with disabilities	13	92%	62%	8%	12	83%	58%	17%
Total	214	100%	96%	53%	217	99%	94%	58%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	103	100%	99%	62%	111	100%	97%	55%
Male	111	99%	94%	45%	106	98%	92%	61%
Total	214	100%	96%	53%	217	99%	94%	58%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	209	100%	97%	54%	204	99%	95%	61%
Limited English proficient	5	100%	80%	20%	13	100%	85%	8%
Total	214	100%	96%	53%	217	99%	94%	58%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	21	100%	81%	19%	18	100%	78%	28%
Not disadvantaged	193	99%	98%	57%	199	99%	96%	61%
Total	214	100%	96%	53%	217	99%	94%	58%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	214	100%	96%	53%	217	99%	94%	58%
Total	214	100%	96%	53%	217	99%	94%	58%



# Elementary Level

## Science\*

Student Subgroup	2003–04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	20	95%	95%	35%
Hispanic	20	100%	85%	45%
Asian or Pacific Islander	7	100%	100%	57%
White	171	99%	98%	69%
Total	218	99%	96%	63%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>				
General-education students	206	100%	97%	66%
Students with disabilities	12	83%	83%	25%
Total	218	99%	96%	63%
<b>Results by Gender</b>				
Female	111	99%	96%	62%
Male	107	98%	96%	64%
Total	218	99%	96%	63%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>				
English proficient	204	99%	98%	67%
Limited English proficient	14	100%	71%	14%
Total	218	99%	96%	63%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>				
Economically disadvantaged	19	95%	84%	32%
Not disadvantaged	199	99%	97%	66%
Total	218	99%	96%	63%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>				
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	218	99%	96%	63%
Total	218	99%	96%	63%

\*Only one year of data is shown because a new assessment in elementary-level science was administered for the first time in 2003–04.

**Middle Level**  
English Language Arts

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	25	84%	32%	4%	23	96%	35%	9%
Hispanic	12	83%	58%	0%	19	89%	42%	16%
Asian or Pacific Islander	14	100%	93%	36%	11	100%	73%	36%
White	127	100%	81%	27%	159	99%	81%	30%
Total	178	97%	74%	22%	212	98%	72%	26%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	161	99%	80%	25%	193	100%	79%	29%
Students with disabilities	17	71%	12%	0%	19	74%	5%	0%
Total	178	97%	74%	22%	212	98%	72%	26%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	73	99%	82%	26%	103	100%	81%	38%
Male	105	95%	68%	20%	109	95%	64%	16%
Total	178	97%	74%	22%	212	98%	72%	26%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	178	97%	74%	22%	210	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	2	s	s	s
Total	178	97%	74%	22%	212	98%	72%	26%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	25	92%	44%	8%	26	96%	35%	4%
Not disadvantaged	153	97%	78%	25%	186	98%	77%	30%
Total	178	97%	74%	22%	212	98%	72%	26%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	178	97%	74%	22%	212	98%	72%	26%
Total	178	97%	74%	22%	212	98%	72%	26%

**Middle Level  
Mathematics**

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	26	92%	35%	0%	23	91%	61%	17%
Hispanic	13	77%	46%	8%	19	89%	58%	5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	15	100%	87%	20%	11	100%	82%	55%
White	126	98%	82%	10%	156	98%	93%	31%
Total	180	96%	73%	9%	209	97%	86%	28%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	164	98%	78%	10%	190	99%	92%	31%
Students with disabilities	16	69%	19%	0%	19	68%	26%	5%
Total	180	96%	73%	9%	209	97%	86%	28%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	75	97%	79%	7%	102	99%	90%	31%
Male	105	94%	69%	10%	107	94%	81%	25%
Total	180	96%	73%	9%	209	97%	86%	28%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	176	s	s	s	207	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	4	s	s	s	2	s	s	s
Total	180	96%	73%	9%	209	97%	86%	28%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	27	89%	41%	0%	26	85%	46%	8%
Not disadvantaged	153	97%	78%	10%	183	98%	91%	31%
Total	180	96%	73%	9%	209	97%	86%	28%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	180	96%	73%	9%	209	97%	86%	28%
Total	180	96%	73%	9%	209	97%	86%	28%

## Middle Level

### Science

Student Subgroup	2002-03				2003-04			
	Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Total Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2-4	3-4	4		2-4	3-4	4
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	25	100%	76%	4%	22	95%	73%	18%
Hispanic	12	100%	67%	42%	18	100%	78%	39%
Asian or Pacific Islander	10	100%	90%	20%	7	100%	86%	57%
White	83	100%	90%	46%	105	100%	93%	43%
Total	130	100%	85%	35%	152	99%	88%	39%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	113	100%	90%	40%	133	100%	96%	42%
Students with disabilities	17	100%	53%	6%	19	95%	32%	21%
Total	130	100%	85%	35%	152	99%	88%	39%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	51	100%	86%	35%	70	100%	93%	39%
Male	79	100%	85%	35%	82	99%	84%	40%
Total	130	100%	85%	35%	152	99%	88%	39%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	126	s	s	s	150	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	4	s	s	s	2	s	s	s
Total	130	100%	85%	35%	152	99%	88%	39%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	26	100%	69%	19%	24	100%	67%	8%
Not disadvantaged	104	100%	89%	39%	128	99%	92%	45%
Total	130	100%	85%	35%	152	99%	88%	39%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	130	100%	85%	35%	152	99%	88%	39%
Total	130	100%	85%	35%	152	99%	88%	39%

## 1999 and 2000 High School Cohorts

General-education students who first entered ninth grade in 1999 or 2000 must score 55 or higher on Regents English and mathematics examinations to graduate. During the phase-in of the Regents examination graduation requirements, all students (with district board of education approval) may qualify for a local diploma by earning a score of 55–64 on the required Regents examinations; a score of 65 or higher is required for a Regents diploma. Students with disabilities and certain students with a Section 504 Accommodation Plan may qualify for a local diploma by passing Regents competency tests. The data in these tables show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9.

### Performance on the English Assessment Requirement for Graduation after Four Years of High School

Student Subgroup	1999 Cohort					2000 Cohort				
	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement
		Regents		Pass-ed RCTs			Regents		Pass-ed RCTs	
		55–64	65–100				55–64	65–100		
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	15	1	11	0	80%	19	3	12	0	79%
Hispanic	5	1	3	0	80%	5	0	4	0	80%
Asian or Pacific Islander	10	0	9	0	90%	20	0	19	0	95%
White	101	0	95	0	94%	111	1	99	0	90%
Total	131	2	118	0	92%	155	4	134	0	89%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	111	2	106	0	97%	139	1	130	0	94%
Students with disabilities	20	0	12	0	60%	16	3	4	0	44%
Total	131	2	118	0	92%	155	4	134	0	89%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	62	2	57	0	95%	90	1	83	0	93%
Male	69	0	61	0	88%	65	3	51	0	83%
Total	131	2	118	0	92%	155	4	134	0	89%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	131	2	118	0	92%	152	s	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	3	s	s	s	s
Total	131	2	118	0	92%	155	4	134	0	89%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	0	0	0	0	0%	16	2	11	0	81%
Not disadvantaged	131	2	118	0	92%	139	2	123	0	90%
Total	131	2	118	0	92%	155	4	134	0	89%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	131	2	118	0	92%	155	4	134	0	89%
Total	131	2	118	0	92%	155	4	134	0	89%

**Performance on the Mathematics Assessment Requirement  
for Graduation after Four Years of High School**

Student Subgroup	1999 Cohort					2000 Cohort				
	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement	Students in Cohort	Count of Students by Score			Percent Meeting Graduation Requirement
		Regents		Pass-ed RCTs			Regents		Pass-ed RCTs	
		55-64	65-100				55-64	65-100		
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	15	0	11	0	73%	19	2	14	1	89%
Hispanic	5	0	4	0	80%	5	0	4	0	80%
Asian or Pacific Islander	10	0	10	0	100%	20	0	19	0	95%
White	101	2	96	0	97%	111	3	98	2	93%
Total	131	2	121	0	94%	155	5	135	3	92%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	111	1	107	0	97%	139	4	129	0	96%
Students with disabilities	20	1	14	0	75%	16	1	6	3	63%
Total	131	2	121	0	94%	155	5	135	3	92%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	62	0	59	0	95%	90	4	78	0	91%
Male	69	2	62	0	93%	65	1	57	3	94%
Total	131	2	121	0	94%	155	5	135	3	92%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	131	2	121	0	94%	152	s	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	3	s	s	s	s
Total	131	2	121	0	94%	155	5	135	3	92%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	0	0	0	0	0%	16	1	11	1	81%
Not disadvantaged	131	2	121	0	94%	139	4	124	2	94%
Total	131	2	121	0	94%	155	5	135	3	92%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	131	2	121	0	94%	155	5	135	3	92%
Total	131	2	121	0	94%	155	5	135	3	92%

## Cohort Graduation Rates

Students were counted as graduates if they earned a local diploma with or without a Regents endorsement by August 31<sup>st</sup> of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. The graduation-rate cohort includes students who transferred to general education development (GED) programs. These students were not counted in the district accountability cohort for English and mathematics.

Student Subgroup	1998 Cohort as of August 31, 2002		1999 Cohort as of August 31, 2003	
	Graduation Rate Cohort	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate Cohort	Graduation Rate
<b>Results by Race/Ethnicity</b>				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0	0%
Black	25	72%	16	81%
Hispanic	3	s	5	80%
Asian or Pacific Islander	14	s	10	90%
White	90	99%	102	89%
Total	132	94%	133	88%
Small Group Totals (s)	17	100%	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>				
General-education students	120	97%	113	91%
Students with disabilities	12	67%	20	70%
Total	132	94%	133	88%
<b>Results by Gender</b>				
Female	63	90%	63	92%
Male	69	97%	70	84%
Total	132	94%	133	88%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>				
English proficient	132	94%	133	88%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0	0%
Total	132	94%	133	88%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>				
Economically disadvantaged	0	0%	0	0%
Not disadvantaged	132	94%	133	88%
Total	132	94%	133	88%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>				
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%
Not migrant family	132	94%	133	88%
Total	132	94%	133	88%

## Glossary

**Accountability Cohort:** An accountability cohort is all students, regardless of grade status, who were enrolled in school on BEDS day two years after the year in which they first entered grade 9, or, in the case of ungraded students with disabilities, the year in which they reached their seventeenth birthday. (For example, the 1999 accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 1999 who were enrolled on October 3, 2001). Certain students are not included in the school accountability cohort. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (8) of the Commissioner's Regulations.

**Component Retests:** Component retests were offered in Regents English and Mathematics A to certain students 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 on the Regents examination, as determined by the component retest results.

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

**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.

**Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students:** Schools provide special English instruction to students for whom English is a second language so they can participate effectively in the academic program. In 2002–03 and in previous years, students were considered LEP if, by reason of foreign birth or ancestry, they spoke a language other than English and (1) either understood and spoke little or no English or (2) scored at or below the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile on an English language assessment instrument. Beginning in 2003–04, 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 below a state-designated level of proficiency on the Language Assessment Battery-Revised (LAB-R) or the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). The United States Department of Education has approved the use of the NYSESLAT as the required measure of language arts proficiency for LEP students in grades 4 and 8 who have attended school in the United States (not including Puerto Rico) for fewer than three consecutive years and for LEP students who have attended for four or five years and have received an exemption from the general assessment requirement.

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

**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 are 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 30 students in a group may be neither valid nor reliable. If a school does not have 30 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.