

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**

**White Plains City School District**

**April 2006**

# 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
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., Ed. D. ....	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
CAROL BELLAMY, A.B., J.D. ....	Brooklyn
ROGER B. TILLES, B.A., J.D. ....	Great Neck

### President of The University and Commissioner of Education

RICHARD P. MILLS

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

JEAN STEVENS

### 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: April 2006*, 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: Timothy P. Connors		Phone: (914)422-2019
<b>Organization</b> <b>2004–05</b>	Grade Range	Student Enrollment
	NA	6721

<b>2003–04 District-wide Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$20,570
<b>2003–04 NYS Public Schools Total Expenditure per Pupil</b>	\$13,826

### 2004–05 Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers\*

Total Number of Core Classes	Percent Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
1,775	96%


\*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.

### 2004–05 Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate\*

Total Number of Teachers	Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate
593	1%

\*Includes teachers with a modified temporary license.

## Elementary Level English Language Arts



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

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	
Feb 2003	19	135	221	112	487	664
Feb 2004	19	127	227	88	461	662
Feb 2005	14	93	217	97	421	668

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	Levels 3 & 4	Total Tested
2005	17	5	38	60

### 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
2004–05	0	0	0	9	9

## Elementary Level Mathematics



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.


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 2003	21	82	273	149	525	661
May 2004	17	98	244	150	509	663
May 2005	15	71	239	153	478	664

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>2004-05</b>	0	0	0	9	9

## Elementary Level Science\*



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

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	
<b>May 2004</b>	16	76	211	207	510	78
<b>May 2005</b>	15	67	186	209	477	79


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
<b>2004–05</b>	0	0	0	9	9

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

## Middle Level English Language Arts



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

Performance at This District	Counts of Students					Mean Score
	Level 1 527–657	Level 2 658–696	Level 3 697–736	Level 4 737–830	Total Tested	
January 2003	26	212	164	52	454	698
January 2004	18	212	196	61	487	703
January 2005	27	194	196	57	474	702

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	Levels 3 & 4	Total Tested
2005	1	4	45	50

### 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
2004–05	0	0	0	7	7



## 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 2003	71	165	203	48	487	718
May 2004	47	122	247	91	507	727
May 2005	43	154	270	62	529	725

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
2004-05	0	0	0	7	7

## Middle Level Science



Performance at This District		Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Tested	
January/	Middle-Level Science	5	79	223	166	473	77
June 2003	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
January/	Middle-Level Science	17	88	250	156	511	75
June 2004	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
January/	Middle-Level Science	18	101	208	184	511	76
June 2005	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0

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
<b>2004–05</b>	0	0	0	7	7

# High School English Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graphs and tables below present performance of the 1999, 2000, and 2001 district accountability 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.



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>1999 Cohort</b>	403	26	55	151	137	0
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	414	18	21	186	148	0
<b>2001 Cohort</b>	498	19	37	204	187	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>1999 Cohort</b>	16	4
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	9	3
<b>2001 Cohort</b>	7	8

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative.

# High School Mathematics Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graphs and tables below present performance of the 1999, 2000, and 2001 district accountability 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.



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

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>1999 Cohort</b>	403	41	38	130	161	0
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	414	43	46	159	127	0
<b>2001 Cohort</b>	498	36	29	290	114	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>1999 Cohort</b>	22	1
<b>2000 Cohort</b>	25	0
<b>2001 Cohort</b>	25	3

\*Includes only students eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or higher on the Regents examination or an approved alternative.

## 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, 1999, and 2000 district accountability cohorts for English and mathematics.



Percentages less than 0.51 will appear as zero because of rounding.

Cohort Graduation Rates				
	Cohort Members* (a)	Transfers to GED (b)	Graduation Rate Cohort Members (a+b)	Number Graduated
1998 Cohort	390	12	402	322
1999 Cohort	395	12	407	335
2000 Cohort	413	4	417	328

\*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 district 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 2004–05 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	2003-04				2004-05			
	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	99	91%	44%	8%	95	93%	63%	12%
Hispanic	172	97%	60%	6%	154	97%	68%	16%
Asian or Pacific Islander	12	100%	100%	33%	13	100%	92%	31%
White	178	98%	88%	37%	159	99%	87%	36%
Total	461	96%	68%	19%	421	97%	75%	23%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	427	98%	72%	20%	385	99%	79%	24%
Students with disabilities	34	71%	26%	3%	36	75%	25%	8%
Total	461	96%	68%	19%	421	97%	75%	23%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	205	98%	75%	25%	210	99%	82%	27%
Male	256	95%	63%	14%	211	94%	67%	19%
Total	461	96%	68%	19%	421	97%	75%	23%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	460	s	s	s	418	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	1	s	s	s	3	s	s	s
Total	461	96%	68%	19%	421	97%	75%	23%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	202	93%	50%	5%	184	95%	65%	9%
Not disadvantaged	259	98%	82%	30%	237	98%	82%	34%
Total	461	96%	68%	19%	421	97%	75%	23%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	461	96%	68%	19%	421	97%	75%	23%
Total	461	96%	68%	19%	421	97%	75%	23%

## Elementary Level Mathematics

Student Subgroup	2003-04				2004-05			
	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	99	96%	65%	11%	98	95%	70%	19%
Hispanic	221	95%	68%	16%	205	96%	80%	21%
Asian or Pacific Islander	12	100%	100%	83%	15	100%	93%	73%
White	177	99%	95%	53%	160	99%	91%	49%
Total	509	97%	77%	29%	478	97%	82%	32%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	470	98%	80%	31%	433	99%	85%	34%
Students with disabilities	39	79%	46%	8%	45	78%	49%	13%
Total	509	97%	77%	29%	478	97%	82%	32%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	224	96%	80%	32%	239	97%	82%	35%
Male	285	97%	75%	28%	239	97%	82%	29%
Total	509	97%	77%	29%	478	97%	82%	32%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	457	98%	83%	32%	416	98%	86%	36%
Limited English proficient	52	87%	31%	4%	62	89%	55%	6%
Total	509	97%	77%	29%	478	97%	82%	32%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	251	94%	63%	13%	236	95%	74%	17%
Not disadvantaged	258	100%	91%	46%	242	98%	90%	47%
Total	509	97%	77%	29%	478	97%	82%	32%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	509	97%	77%	29%	478	97%	82%	32%
Total	509	97%	77%	29%	478	97%	82%	32%



## Elementary Level Science

Student Subgroup	2003-04				2004-05			
	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	101	96%	74%	19%	99	93%	75%	29%
Hispanic	220	95%	73%	25%	205	97%	76%	31%
Asian or Pacific Islander	13	100%	100%	77%	14	100%	93%	71%
White	176	99%	97%	70%	159	99%	96%	67%
Total	510	97%	82%	41%	477	97%	83%	44%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	471	98%	84%	43%	431	98%	86%	46%
Students with disabilities	39	85%	56%	13%	46	83%	50%	22%
Total	510	97%	82%	41%	477	97%	83%	44%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	225	96%	83%	44%	238	97%	83%	46%
Male	285	97%	81%	38%	239	96%	83%	42%
Total	510	97%	82%	41%	477	97%	83%	44%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	458	99%	88%	44%	415	99%	88%	48%
Limited English proficient	52	81%	29%	8%	62	85%	50%	13%
Total	510	97%	82%	41%	477	97%	83%	44%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	252	94%	71%	21%	236	95%	73%	25%
Not disadvantaged	258	100%	93%	60%	241	99%	92%	63%
Total	510	97%	82%	41%	477	97%	83%	44%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	510	97%	82%	41%	477	97%	83%	44%
Total	510	97%	82%	41%	477	97%	83%	44%

**Middle Level**  
**English Language Arts**

Student Subgroup	2003-04				2004-05			
	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	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	128	91%	33%	4%	107	92%	25%	2%
Hispanic	148	97%	41%	5%	167	93%	43%	2%
Asian or Pacific Islander	15	s	s	s	14	100%	79%	36%
White	195	98%	74%	23%	186	96%	77%	25%
Total	487	96%	53%	13%	474	94%	53%	12%
Small Group Totals (s)	16	100%	63%	25%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	429	99%	59%	14%	410	99%	60%	14%
Students with disabilities	58	74%	9%	0%	64	67%	14%	0%
Total	487	96%	53%	13%	474	94%	53%	12%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	225	98%	58%	18%	218	98%	58%	17%
Male	262	95%	48%	8%	256	91%	50%	8%
Total	487	96%	53%	13%	474	94%	53%	12%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	486	s	s	s	473	s	s	s
Limited English proficient	1	s	s	s	1	s	s	s
Total	487	96%	53%	13%	474	94%	53%	12%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	176	94%	32%	5%	192	90%	33%	2%
Not disadvantaged	311	98%	65%	17%	282	98%	67%	19%
Total	487	96%	53%	13%	474	94%	53%	12%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	487	96%	53%	13%	474	94%	53%	12%
Total	487	96%	53%	13%	474	94%	53%	12%

**Middle Level  
Mathematics**

Student Subgroup	2003-04				2004-05			
	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	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	125	81%	50%	4%	112	84%	43%	4%
Hispanic	176	91%	55%	9%	213	91%	53%	2%
Asian or Pacific Islander	14	s	s	s	17	100%	100%	29%
White	191	96%	86%	33%	187	97%	82%	26%
Total	507	91%	67%	18%	529	92%	63%	12%
Small Group Totals (s)	15	100%	93%	53%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	449	95%	72%	20%	471	96%	68%	13%
Students with disabilities	58	59%	22%	0%	58	62%	21%	0%
Total	507	91%	67%	18%	529	92%	63%	12%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	236	91%	70%	19%	245	94%	67%	12%
Male	271	91%	63%	17%	284	90%	60%	11%
Total	507	91%	67%	18%	529	92%	63%	12%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	464	92%	69%	19%	478	92%	67%	13%
Limited English proficient	43	74%	42%	7%	51	86%	25%	0%
Total	507	91%	67%	18%	529	92%	63%	12%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	193	86%	49%	7%	240	87%	50%	1%
Not disadvantaged	314	94%	77%	25%	289	96%	74%	20%
Total	507	91%	67%	18%	529	92%	63%	12%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	507	91%	67%	18%	529	92%	63%	12%
Total	507	91%	67%	18%	529	92%	63%	12%

**Middle Level  
Science**

Student Subgroup	2003-04				2004-05			
	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	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	128	93%	65%	13%	106	95%	67%	15%
Hispanic	173	96%	73%	17%	207	94%	68%	18%
Asian or Pacific Islander	16	s	s	s	17	100%	94%	59%
White	193	99%	93%	52%	181	99%	91%	66%
Total	511	97%	79%	31%	511	96%	77%	36%
Small Group Totals (s)	17	100%	100%	53%	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>								
General-education students	455	98%	83%	33%	460	97%	81%	39%
Students with disabilities	56	82%	48%	7%	51	88%	39%	10%
Total	511	97%	79%	31%	511	96%	77%	36%
<b>Results by Gender</b>								
Female	240	97%	78%	30%	236	98%	79%	37%
Male	271	97%	80%	31%	275	95%	75%	35%
Total	511	97%	79%	31%	511	96%	77%	36%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>								
English proficient	474	97%	83%	33%	463	98%	82%	40%
Limited English proficient	37	86%	32%	0%	48	81%	25%	0%
Total	511	97%	79%	31%	511	96%	77%	36%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>								
Economically disadvantaged	197	94%	66%	14%	233	92%	63%	16%
Not disadvantaged	314	98%	88%	41%	278	100%	88%	53%
Total	511	97%	79%	31%	511	96%	77%	36%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	511	97%	79%	31%	511	96%	77%	36%
Total	511	97%	79%	31%	511	96%	77%	36%

## 2000 and 2001 High School Cohorts

General-education students who first entered ninth grade in 2000 or 2001 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	2000 Cohort					2001 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	83	7	63	5	90%	111	11	74	4	80%
Hispanic	139	11	91	3	76%	172	20	115	3	80%
Asian or Pacific Islander	18	0	17	0	94%	16	1	14	0	94%
White	174	3	163	1	96%	199	5	188	0	97%
Total	414	21	334	9	88%	498	37	391	7	87%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	368	15	317	0	90%	425	24	360	1	91%
Students with disabilities	46	6	17	9	70%	73	13	31	6	68%
Total	414	21	334	9	88%	498	37	391	7	87%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	192	5	167	4	92%	239	15	194	5	90%
Male	222	16	167	5	85%	259	22	197	2	85%
Total	414	21	334	9	88%	498	37	391	7	87%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	357	18	306	8	93%	460	31	382	6	91%
Limited English proficient	57	3	28	1	56%	38	6	9	1	42%
Total	414	21	334	9	88%	498	37	391	7	87%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	98	7	73	6	88%	135	15	94	4	84%
Not disadvantaged	316	14	261	3	88%	363	22	297	3	89%
Total	414	21	334	9	88%	498	37	391	7	87%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	414	21	334	9	88%	498	37	391	7	87%
Total	414	21	334	9	88%	498	37	391	7	87%

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

Student Subgroup	2000 Cohort					2001 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		Passed RCTs			Regents		Passed 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	83	12	44	12	82%	111	10	71	15	86%
Hispanic	139	24	73	8	76%	172	13	134	6	89%
Asian or Pacific Islander	18	0	17	0	94%	16	0	15	1	100%
White	174	10	152	5	96%	199	6	184	3	97%
Total	414	46	286	25	86%	498	29	404	25	92%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>										
General-education students	368	39	277	3	87%	425	18	375	5	94%
Students with disabilities	46	7	9	22	83%	73	11	29	20	82%
Total	414	46	286	25	86%	498	29	404	25	92%
<b>Results by Gender</b>										
Female	192	14	146	12	90%	239	15	200	12	95%
Male	222	32	140	13	83%	259	14	204	13	89%
Total	414	46	286	25	86%	498	29	404	25	92%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>										
English proficient	357	41	255	24	90%	460	26	380	24	93%
Limited English proficient	57	5	31	1	65%	38	3	24	1	74%
Total	414	46	286	25	86%	498	29	404	25	92%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>										
Economically disadvantaged	98	15	59	8	84%	135	12	105	9	93%
Not disadvantaged	316	31	227	17	87%	363	17	299	16	91%
Total	414	46	286	25	86%	498	29	404	25	92%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	414	46	286	25	86%	498	29	404	25	92%
Total	414	46	286	25	86%	498	29	404	25	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	1999 Cohort as of August 31, 2003		2000 Cohort as of August 31, 2004	
	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	91	80%	84	79%
Hispanic	133	71%	139	60%
Asian or Pacific Islander	7	71%	18	89%
White	176	92%	176	92%
Total	407	82%	417	79%
Small Group Totals (s)	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Results by Disability Status</b>				
General-education students	348	86%	369	81%
Students with disabilities	59	63%	48	63%
Total	407	82%	417	79%
<b>Results by Gender</b>				
Female	181	87%	192	84%
Male	226	78%	225	74%
Total	407	82%	417	79%
<b>Results by English Proficiency Status</b>				
English proficient	351	86%	389	83%
Limited English proficient	56	59%	28	21%
Total	407	82%	417	79%
<b>Results by Income Level</b>				
Economically disadvantaged	98	79%	94	77%
Not disadvantaged	309	83%	323	79%
Total	407	82%	417	79%
<b>Results by Migrant Status</b>				
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%
Not migrant family	407	82%	417	79%
Total	407	82%	417	79%

## 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 2001 accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 2001 who were enrolled on October 8, 2003). Certain students are not included in the school accountability cohort. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (16) 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. 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 cognitive 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.