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

South Seneca Central School District

February 2004

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University

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

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

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

Coordinator, School Operations and Management Services
CHARLES SZUBERLA

Coordinator, Information and Reporting Services
MARTHA P. MUSSER

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

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

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

The *New York State 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 *District Accountability Report*. The *Overview and Analysis* presents performance data on measures required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act: English, mathematics, science, and graduation rate. Performance data on other State assessments can be found in the *Comprehensive Information Report*. The *District Accountability 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 and mathematics and on the middle-level science test is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of students scoring at each of the four levels. These levels indicate performance on the standards from seriously deficient to advanced proficiency. Performance on the elementary-level science test is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of students making appropriate progress. Regents examination scores are reported in four score ranges. Scores of 65 to 100 are passing; scores of 55 to 64 earn credit toward a local diploma (with the approval of the local board of education). Though each elementary- and middle-level assessment is administered to students in a specific grade, secondary-level assessments are taken by students when they complete the coursework for the core curriculum. Therefore, the performance of students at the secondary level is measured for a student cohort rather than a group of students at a particular grade level. Students are grouped in cohorts according to the year in which they first entered grade 9.

The assessment data in the *Overview and Analysis* are for all tested students in the 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, LEP 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 2004*, available on the Information and Reporting Services Web site at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

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

District Profile

Superintendent: Janie L. Nusser		Phone: (607)869-9636
Organization 2002–03	Grade Range	Student Enrollment
	NA	1040

2001–02 District-wide Total Expenditure per Pupil	$13,865
2001–02 NYS Public Schools Total Expenditure per Pupil	$12,265

2002–03 Percentage of Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers*

Number of Core Classes	Percent Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
243	95%

*For the 2002-03 school year, SED is reporting that teachers of core classes are highly qualified if they are certified to teach those classes. However, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) imposes requirements beyond certification for some teachers to be considered highly qualified. In future years, when New York State uses the NCLB criteria for reporting, certified teachers must fulfill all NCLB requirements to be counted as highly qualified.

2002–03 Percentage of Teachers with No Valid Teaching Certificate*

Number of Teachers	Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate
98	4%

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

Elementary Level

English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 455–602	Level 2 603–644	Level 3 645–691	Level 4 692–800	Total	
Jan–Feb 2001	9	33	27	4	73	641
Jan–Feb 2002	6	35	37	9	87	650
Feb 2003	7	35	41	7	90	647

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

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

Grade 4	Number Tested	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
2003	0	0	0	0	0

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

Elementary Level	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2002–03	0	0	0	0	0

Elementary Level

Mathematics



Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 448–601	Level 2 602–636	Level 3 637–677	Level 4 678–810	Total	
May 2001	11	23	31	9	74	640
May 2002	4	20	45	21	90	652
May 2003	2	14	44	27	87	661

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

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

Elementary Level	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2002–03	0	0	0	0	0

Elementary Level

Science Multiple-Choice



All Students

	Number Tested	Number Above SDL	Mean Score
May 2001	74	47	32
May 2002	90	56	32
May 2003	85	71	35

Grade 4 Science — Knowledge, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Standards	
Multiple-Choice Test Component	This component contains 45 multiple-choice questions based upon the New York State *Elementary Science Syllabus* and referenced to the New York State *Learning Standards for Mathematics, Science and Technology* (Elementary Level).
State Designated Level (SDL)	Students who correctly answer fewer than 30 of the 45 questions of the multiple-choice test component must receive academic intervention services in the following term of instruction.
Mean Scores	For the multiple-choice test component, the mean score is the average number of correct answers for students tested. If all tested students answered all questions correctly, this score would be 45.

Elementary Level

Science Performance Test

The elementary-level science test is composed of two sections, the multiple-choice section (described above) and the performance test. The performance test is not used to determine the need for academic intervention services or for accountability purposes because not all students are administered the same three tasks.

All Students

	Number Tested	Mean Score
May 2001	74	31
May 2002	90	33
May 2003	86	31

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

Elementary Level	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2002–03	0	0	0	0	0

Middle Level

English Language Arts



Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 527–661	Level 2 662–700	Level 3 701–738	Level 4 739–830	Total	
May 2001	6	39	21	3	69	694
	Level 1 527–659	**Level 2 660–698**	**Level 3 699-737**	**Level 3 738-830**	**Total**	
March 2002	3	38	38	9	88	702
	Level 1 527–657	**Level 2 658–696**	**Level 3 697–736**	**Level 4 737–830**	**Total**	
January 2003	5	49	38	1	93	691

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

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

Grade 8	Number Tested	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
2003	0	0	0	0	0

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

Grade 8	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2002–03	0	0	0	0	0

Middle Level

Mathematics



Performance at This District	Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
	Level 1 517–680	Level 2 681–715	Level 3 716–759	Level 4 760–882	Total	
May 2001	7	30	19	7	63	714
May 2002	9	33	36	10	88	717
May 2003	7	40	39	8	94	715

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

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

Middle Level	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2002–03	0	0	0	0	0

Middle Level

Science



Performance at This District		Counts of Students Tested					Mean Score
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	
June 2002	Middle-Level Science	1	5	50	30	86	80
	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
January/ June 2003	Middle-Level Science	1	13	56	16	86	75
	Regents Science	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

Middle-Level	Number Tested	AA–Level 1	AA–Level 2	AA–Level 3	AA–Level 4
2002–03	0	0	0	0	0

High School English Achievement after Four Years of Instruction

The graph and table below present performance of the 1997, 1998, and 1999 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in English. A score of 65 or above on the Regents comprehensive examination in English is considered passing. Only the highest score of each student is counted, regardless of how many times the student took the examination. 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. In the first table, the numbers of students who met the graduation requirement by passing an approved alternative are listed separately. The second table shows the competency test performance of students with disabilities eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or above on a Regents examination or approved alternative. Students who score 55 to 64 on the Regents examination in comprehensive English may be given credit towards a local high school diploma if allowed by the district board of education. The data in these tables and chart show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30th of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. Data for the 1999 cohort 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 cohorts 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
1997 Cohort	73	2	14	41	8	0
1998 Cohort	59	0	9	28	13	0
1999 Cohort	83	0	9	35	26	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
1997 Cohort	4	0
1998 Cohort	0	0
1999 Cohort	0	1

*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 graph and table below present performance of the 1997, 1998, and 1999 cohort members, four years after entering grade 9, in meeting the graduation assessment requirement in mathematics. A score of 65 or above on a Regents examination in mathematics is considered passing. Only the highest score of each student is counted, regardless of how many times the student took the examination. 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. In the first table, the numbers of students who met the graduation requirement by passing an approved alternative are listed separately. The second table shows the competency test performance of students with disabilities eligible for the safety net who did not score 55 or above on a Regents examination or approved alternative. Students who score 55 to 64 on a Regents examination in mathematics may be given credit towards a local high school diploma if allowed by the district board of education. The data in these tables and chart show the performance of the cohorts as of June 30th of the fourth year after first entering grade 9. Data for the 1999 cohort 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 cohorts 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
1997 Cohort	73	0	18	34	17	0
1998 Cohort	59	1	11	22	16	0
1999 Cohort	83	2	10	29	30	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
1997 Cohort	2	0
1998 Cohort	3	1
1999 Cohort	1	0

*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 31st 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 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	59	0	59	57

*Count as of August 31st 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 2002-03 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	2001–02				2002–03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	87	93%	53%	10%	89	s	s	s
Total	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	0	0%	0%	0%	90	92%	53%	8%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	63	98%	68%	13%	69	97%	67%	9%
Students with disabilities	24	79%	13%	4%	21	76%	10%	5%
Total	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%
Results by Gender								
Female	38	97%	63%	16%	36	89%	58%	14%
Male	49	90%	45%	6%	54	94%	50%	4%
Total	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%
Results by English Proficiency Status								
English proficient	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	33	88%	39%	0%	32	84%	47%	9%
Not disadvantaged	54	96%	61%	17%	58	97%	57%	7%
Total	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%
Total	87	93%	53%	10%	90	92%	53%	8%

Elementary Level

Mathematics

Student Subgroup	2001–02				2002–03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	0%	0%	1	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	90	96%	73%	23%	86	s	s	s
Total	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	0	0%	0%	0%	87	98%	82%	31%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	63	100%	90%	32%	68	100%	90%	34%
Students with disabilities	27	85%	33%	4%	19	89%	53%	21%
Total	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%
Results by Gender								
Female	38	97%	82%	29%	35	97%	80%	40%
Male	52	94%	67%	19%	52	98%	83%	25%
Total	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%
Results by English Proficiency Status								
English proficient	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	36	89%	56%	14%	29	93%	69%	28%
Not disadvantaged	54	100%	85%	30%	58	100%	88%	33%
Total	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%
Total	90	96%	73%	23%	87	98%	82%	31%

Elementary Level

Science Multiple-Choice

Student Subgroup	2001–02		2002–03	
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring above the SDL	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring above the SDL
Results by Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0%	0	0%
Black	0	0%	0	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	1	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%
White	90	62%	84	s
Total	90	62%	85	84%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	0	0%	85	84%
Results by Disability Status				
General-education students	63	76%	68	91%
Students with disabilities	27	30%	17	53%
Total	90	62%	85	84%
Results by Gender				
Female	38	71%	35	86%
Male	52	56%	50	82%
Total	90	62%	85	84%
Results by English Proficiency Status				
English proficient	90	62%	85	84%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0	0%
Total	90	62%	85	84%
Results by Income Level				
Economically disadvantaged	36	50%	28	71%
Not disadvantaged	54	70%	57	89%
Total	90	62%	85	84%
Results by Migrant Status				
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%
Not migrant family	90	62%	85	84%
Total	90	62%	85	84%

Middle Level

English Language Arts

Student Subgroup	2001–02				2002–03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	2	s	s	s	1	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	84	s	s	s	92	s	s	s
Total	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	68	100%	68%	13%	78	99%	49%	1%
Students with disabilities	20	85%	5%	0%	15	73%	7%	0%
Total	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Results by Gender								
Female	41	98%	61%	12%	44	93%	41%	2%
Male	47	96%	47%	9%	49	96%	43%	0%
Total	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Results by English Proficiency Status								
English proficient	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	27	96%	37%	7%	46	93%	33%	2%
Not disadvantaged	61	97%	61%	11%	47	96%	51%	0%
Total	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%
Total	88	97%	53%	10%	93	95%	42%	1%

Middle Level

Mathematics

Student Subgroup	2001–02				2002–03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	2	s	s	s	1	s	s	s
Hispanic	2	s	s	s	1	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	83	89%	52%	10%	92	s	s	s
Total	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	5	100%	60%	40%	94	93%	50%	9%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	70	97%	61%	14%	78	96%	55%	10%
Students with disabilities	18	61%	17%	0%	16	75%	25%	0%
Total	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%
Results by Gender								
Female	42	90%	52%	12%	45	93%	36%	0%
Male	46	89%	52%	11%	49	92%	63%	16%
Total	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%
Results by English Proficiency Status								
English proficient	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	25	88%	44%	12%	47	87%	40%	0%
Not disadvantaged	63	90%	56%	11%	47	98%	60%	17%
Total	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%
Total	88	90%	52%	11%	94	93%	50%	9%

Middle Level

Science

Student Subgroup	2001–02				2002–03			
	Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels			Tested	Percentages of Tested Students Scoring at Levels		
		2–4	3–4	4		2–4	3–4	4
Results by Race/Ethnicity								
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Black	1	s	s	s	0	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	2	s	s	s	1	s	s	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
White	82	s	s	s	85	s	s	s
Total	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Results by Disability Status								
General-education students	68	100%	99%	44%	72	100%	92%	22%
Students with disabilities	18	94%	72%	0%	14	93%	43%	0%
Total	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Results by Gender								
Female	41	100%	95%	34%	41	98%	78%	7%
Male	45	98%	91%	36%	45	100%	89%	29%
Total	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Results by English Proficiency Status								
English proficient	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Total	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Results by Income Level								
Economically disadvantaged	25	96%	84%	28%	42	100%	81%	12%
Not disadvantaged	61	100%	97%	38%	44	98%	86%	25%
Total	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Results by Migrant Status								
Migrant family	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Not migrant family	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%
Total	86	99%	93%	35%	86	99%	84%	19%

1998 and 1999 High School Cohorts

General-education students who first entered ninth grade in 1998 or 1999 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 Accomodation 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 30th 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	1998 Cohort					1999 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		
Results by Race/Ethnicity										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	s	s	s	s	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Hispanic	1	s	s	s	s	0	0	0	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	s	s	s	s	0	0	0	0	0%
White	56	s	s	s	s	83	9	61	0	84%
Total	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	59	9	41	0	85%	0	0	0	0	0%
Results by Disability Status										
General-education students	49	6	36	0	86%	68	7	58	0	96%
Students with disabilities	10	3	5	0	80%	15	2	3	0	33%
Total	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%
Results by Gender										
Female	35	8	23	0	89%	39	4	30	0	87%
Male	24	1	18	0	79%	44	5	31	0	82%
Total	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%
Results by English Proficiency Status										
English proficient	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%
Results by Income Level										
Economically disadvantaged	12	3	5	0	67%	21	3	14	0	81%
Not disadvantaged	47	6	36	0	89%	62	6	47	0	85%
Total	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%
Results by Migrant Status										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%
Total	59	9	41	0	85%	83	9	61	0	84%

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

Student Subgroup	1998 Cohort					1999 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		
Results by Race/Ethnicity										
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	s	s	s	s	0	0	0	0	0%
Black	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Hispanic	1	s	s	s	s	0	0	0	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	s	s	s	s	0	0	0	0	0%
White	56	s	s	s	s	83	10	59	1	84%
Total	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	59	11	38	3	88%	0	0	0	0	0%
Results by Disability Status										
General-education students	49	9	35	0	90%	68	7	56	0	93%
Students with disabilities	10	2	3	3	80%	15	3	3	1	47%
Total	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%
Results by Gender										
Female	35	8	22	3	94%	39	2	31	0	85%
Male	24	3	16	0	79%	44	8	28	1	84%
Total	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%
Results by English Proficiency Status										
English proficient	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%
Limited English proficient	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%
Results by Income Level										
Economically disadvantaged	12	3	7	0	83%	21	4	12	1	81%
Not disadvantaged	47	8	31	3	89%	62	6	47	0	85%
Total	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%
Results by Migrant Status										
Migrant family	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%
Not migrant family	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%
Total	59	11	38	3	88%	83	10	59	1	84%

Cohort Graduation Rates

Students were counted as graduates in the first two columns of this table if they earned a local diploma with or without a Regents endorsement by June 30th of the fourth year after first entering grade 9 and in the second two columns if they earned a local diploma with or without a Regents endorsement by August 31st 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 district accountability cohort for English and mathematics.

	1998 Cohort as of June 30, 2002		1998 Cohort as of August 31, 2002	
Student Subgroup	**Graduation Rate Cohort**	**Graduation Rate**	**Graduation Rate Cohort**	**Graduation Rate**
Results by Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	s	1	s
Black	0	0%	0	0%
Hispanic	1	s	1	s
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	s	1	s
White	56	s	56	s
Total	59	97%	59	97%
Small Group Totals **(s)**	59	97%	59	97%
Results by Disability Status				
General-education students	49	96%	49	96%
Students with disabilities	10	100%	10	100%
Total	59	97%	59	97%
Results by Gender				
Female	35	100%	35	100%
Male	24	92%	24	92%
Total	59	97%	59	97%
Results by English Proficiency Status				
English proficient	59	97%	59	97%
Limited English proficient	0	0%	0	0%
Total	59	97%	59	97%
Results by Income Level				
Economically disadvantaged	12	83%	12	83%
Not disadvantaged	47	100%	47	100%
Total	59	97%	59	97%
Results by Migrant Status				
Migrant family	0	0%	0	0%
Not migrant family	59	97%	59	97%
Total	59	97%	59	97%

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 entered grade 9, or, in the case of ungraded students with disabilities, the year in which they reached their seventeenth birthday. (For example, the 1998 accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 1998 who were enrolled on October 4, 2000). Certain students with severe disabilities, new immigrants, and students who transfer to programs leading to a high school diploma or high school equivalency diploma are not included in the school 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 graduating seniors who were at risk of not meeting the State learning standards. Component retesting is the process by which a student who has failed a Regents examination in English or Mathematics A twice is retested only on the areas of the learning standards in which the student has been proven deficient. Component retesting eliminates the need for the student to retake the full Regents examination multiple times. Students who earn credit through component retesting are counted as if they scored in the 55–64 range or in the 65–84 range, as determined by the results of the component retest.

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

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 40th percentile on an English language assessment instrument. The United States Department of Education has approved the use of the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (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.