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

# SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, AND GRADUATION RATE

**for**

## PS 71

**in**

## BUFFALO CITY SD

**2003–04 School Accountability Status:**

## School in Good Standing

### Title I Funding

**This school received Title I funding in:**

**2001–02: Yes**
**2002–03: Yes**
**2003–04: Yes**

# District/School Accountability Status Categories

The list below defines the district or school status categories under New York State's district and school accountability system, which is divided into a Federal Title I component and a State component. A district or school that does not receive Title I funding in a school year does not have a federal status in that year. Schools receiving Title I funds that are not in good standing must provide school choice for their students; those in need of improvement year 2 and beyond must also provide Supplemental Education Services to eligible students. Other consequences for districts and schools not in good standing can be found at: www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/nclb/accountability/siinfo.htm. To be removed from any improvement status, a district or school must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years, or in the case of a School Under Registration Review, achieve the performance targets established for the school by the Commissioner.

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

**District/School Requiring Academic Progress:** Under the State component of New York's accountability system, a district or school that did not make AYP in the same grade and subject for two consecutive years is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) the following year. In each succeeding year that the school fails to make AYP, the year designation is incremented by one.

**District/School in Need of Improvement (Year 1):** A district or school that has not made AYP for two consecutive years in the same grade or subject while receiving Title I funds is considered a District/School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) the following year.

**District/School in Need of Improvement (Year 2):** A District or School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that does not make AYP in the grade or subject for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a District or School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) the following year.

**District/School Requiring Corrective Action:** A District or School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that does not make AYP in the grade or subject for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a District or School Requiring Corrective Action the following year.

**District/School Planning for Restructuring:** A District or School Requiring Corrective Action that does not make AYP in the grade or subject for which it was identified while receiving Title I funds is considered a District or School Planning for Restructuring the following year.

**School Under Registration Review (SURR):** Schools that are farthest from the State standard and have been determined by the Commissioner to be most in need of improvement are Schools Under Registration Review. These schools must achieve performance targets specified by the Commissioner of Education in their area(s) of identification within a prescribed timeframe or risk having their registration revoked by the Board of Regents.

# Elementary-Level English Language Arts

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

**For a school to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2002–03, every accountability group must make AYP.**

**For an accountability group to make AYP in 2002–03, it must**

1. meet the 95 percent participation requirement (***2002–03 Participation***), *and*
2. *either* meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (***2002–03 Performance*** and ***Standards***).

To meet the participation requirement, 95 percent of the grade 4 enrollment in each accountability group with 40 or more students must be tested. To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled students must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its ELA safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the elementary-level science qualification for safe harbor. (See the elementary-level science page of this report for further information on meeting the science qualification for safe harbor.)

***ELA Safe Harbor Targets:*** The elementary-level 2002–03 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2001–02 PI + (200 – the 2001–02 PI) × 0.10. The 2003–04 ELA Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2003–04 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2002–03.

| Accountability Group | 2002–03 Participation | | 2002–03 Performance* | | 2002–03 Standards | | | Made AYP in ELA in 2002–03 | 2003–04 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grade 4 Enrollment | Percent of Enrollment Tested | Count of Continuously Enrolled Students | Performance Index | Effective AMO | ELA Safe Harbor Target | Met the Science Qualification for Safe Harbor | | ELA Safe Harbor Target |
| All Students | 89 | 100% | 88 | 114 | 112 | | | **Yes** | |
| Students with Disabilities | 17 | | 17 | | | | | | |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 83 | 100% | 82 | 111 | 112 | 100 | Yes | **Yes** | 120 |
| Hispanic | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 5 | | 5 | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 81 | 100% | 80 | 110 | 112 | 100 | Yes | **Yes** | 119 |
| Final AYP Determination | | | | | | | | **Yes** | |

*For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2002–03, data for 2001–02 and 2002–03 were combined to determine counts and PIs.

**Groups with a "**" are not required to meet the science qualification for safe harbor to make safe harbor in English and mathematics because fewer than 30 students in the group were administered the science test.

**State accountability status in elementary-level English language arts: School in Good Standing**

**Title I accountability status in elementary-level English language arts: School in Good Standing**

# Elementary-Level Mathematics

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

**For a school to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2002–03, every accountability group must make AYP.**

**For an accountability group to make AYP in 2002–03, it must**

1. meet the 95 percent participation requirement (***2002–03 Participation***), *and*
2. *either* meet its Effective AMO *or* make safe harbor (***2002–03 Performance*** and ***Standards***).

To meet the participation requirement, 95 percent of the grade 4 enrollment in each accountability group with 40 or more students must be tested. To meet the Effective AMO, the Performance Index for each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled students must equal or exceed the Effective AMO. To make safe harbor, the Performance Index of each of these groups must equal or exceed its math safe harbor target *and* the group must meet the elementary-level science qualification for safe harbor. (See the elementary-level science page of this report for further information on meeting the science qualification for safe harbor.)

***Math Safe Harbor Targets:*** The elementary-level 2002–03 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2001–02 PI + (200 – the 2001–02 PI) × 0.10. The 2003–04 Math Safe Harbor Target is calculated by using the following equation: 2002–03 PI + (200 – the 2002–03 PI) × 0.10. The 2003–04 target is provided for groups whose PI was below the Effective AMO in 2002–03.

| Accountability Group | 2002–03 Participation | | 2002–03 Performance* | | 2002–03 Standards | | | Made AYP in Math in 2002–03 | 2003–04 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grade 4 Enrollment | Percent of Enrollment Tested | Count of Continuously Enrolled Students | Performance Index | Effective AMO | Math Safe Harbor Target | Met the Science Qualification for Safe Harbor | | **Math Safe Harbor Target** |
| All Students | 90 | 100% | 86 | 129 | 125 | | | **Yes** | |
| Students with Disabilities | 17 | | 17 | | | | | | |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 83 | 100% | 80 | 126 | 126 | | | **Yes** | |
| Hispanic | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 6 | | 5 | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 82 | 100% | 78 | 127 | 125 | | | **Yes** | |
| Final AYP Determination | | | | | | | | **Yes** | |

*For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students in 2002–03, data for 2001–02 and 2002–03 were combined to determine counts and PIs.
**Groups with a "**" are not required to meet the science qualification for safe harbor to make safe harbor in English and mathematics because fewer than 30 students in the group were administered the science test.

**State accountability status in elementary-level mathematics: School in Good Standing**

**Title I accountability status in elementary-level mathematics: School in Good Standing**

# Elementary-Level Science

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

***Made AYP in Science in 2002–03:*** For a school to make AYP in science, the Percent At or Above SDL for the "All Students" group must equal or exceed the State Science Standard or the Science Progress Target.

***State Designated Level (SDL):*** The score that students taking the elementary-level science test must equal or exceed on the written portion of the test to meet the State Science Standard.

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

***Science Progress Targets:*** The elementary-level 2002–03 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2001–02 Percent At or Above SDL. The 2003–04 Science Progress Target is calculated by multiplying the 2002–03 Percent At or Above SDL by two and then adding one point. The 2003–04 target is provided for groups whose Percent At or Above SDL was below the State Science Standard in 2002–03.

| Accountability Group | 2002–03 Performance* | | 2002–03 Standards | | Made AYP in Science in 2002–03 | 2002–03 | 2003–04 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Count of Continuously Enrolled Students | Percent At or Above SDL | State Science Standard | Science Progress Target | | Qualified for Safe Harbor in Elementary-Level ELA and Math | Science Progress Target |
| All Students | 84 | 43 | 40 | | **Yes** | Yes | |
| Students with Disabilities | 16 | | | | | | |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | | | | | | | |
| Black | 78 | 42 | 40 | | | Yes | |
| Hispanic | 1 | | | | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | | | | | |
| White | 5 | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 76 | 41 | 40 | | | Yes | |
| Final AYP Determination | | | | | **Yes** | | |

*For schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled students in 2002–03, data for 2001–02 and 2002–03 were combined to determine counts and percents at or above SDL.

**State accountability status in elementary-level science: School in Good Standing**

**Title I accountability status in elementary-level science: School in Good Standing**

# Glossary

**Accountability Cohort: Accountability Cohort:** The 1999 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of 1999, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 1999–2000 school year, who were enrolled on October 3, 2001. Certain students with severe disabilities, new immigrants, and students who transfer to programs leading to a high school diploma or high school equivalency diploma were not included in the 1999 school accountability cohort. The 1999 district accountability cohort consists of all students in each school accountability cohort plus students who transferred within the district after BEDS day *plus* students who were placed outside the district by the CSE or district administrators and who met the other requirements for cohort membership. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (8) of the Commissioner's Regulations.

**Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):** Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) indicates satisfactory progress by a district/school toward the goal of proficiency for all students.

**Annual Measurable Objective (AMO):** The Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) signifies that an accountability group is making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will be proficient in the State's learning standards for English language arts and mathematics by 2013–14. The AMO will be increased in regular increments beginning in 2004–05 until it reaches 200 in 2013–14. (See Effective AMO for further information.)

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

**Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO):** The Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO) is the PI value that each accountability group within a school or district is expected to achieve to make AYP. The Effective AMO is the lowest PI that an accountability group of a given size can achieve in a subject for the group's PI not to be considered significantly different from the AMO for that subject. If an accountability group's PI equals or exceeds the Effective AMO, it is considered to have made AYP. A more complete definition of Effective AMO and a table showing the PI values that each group size must equal or exceed to make AYP are available at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

**Graduation-Rate Cohort:** Graduation-rate cohort for each year includes all students in the accountability cohort in the previous year plus all students excluded from that accountability cohort solely because they transferred to a general education development (GED) program.

**Graduation-Rate Standard:** The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory percentage of cohort members earning a local diploma. The State Graduation-Rate Standard is 55 percent. The Commissioner may raise the Graduation-Rate Standard at his discretion in future years.

**Performance Index (PI):** A Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group, indicating how that group performed on a required State test (or approved alternative) in English language arts, mathematics, or science. Student scores on the tests are converted to four achievement levels, from Level 1 (indicating no proficiency) to Level 4 (indicating advanced proficiency). ***At the elementary and middle levels, the PI is calculated using the following equation: (Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) ÷ Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students. At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: (Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) ÷ Count of All Cohort Members.*** A list of tests used to measure student performance for accountability is available at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

**Progress Target:** For accountability groups below the State Standard in science or graduation rate, the Progress Target is an alternative method for making AYP or qualifying for safe harbor in English language arts and mathematics based on improvement over the previous year's performance.

**Safe Harbor:** Safe Harbor provides an alternative means to demonstrate AYP for accountability groups that do not achieve their Effective AMOs in English or mathematics.

**Science Standard:** The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory performance in science. In 2002–03, the elementary-level Science Standard was 40 percent of tested students scoring at or above the State Designated Level. In 2003–04 and future years, with the introduction of the new science test, the elementary-level science standard is a PI of 100. In 2002–03 and future years, the middle-level Science Standard is a PI of 100. The Commissioner may raise the State Science Standard at his discretion in future years.

## School Under Registration Review (SURR)

This school is presently identified as a School Under Registration Review (SURR). Commissioner's Regulations require the Commissioner to annually place under Registration Review those schools that are determined to be farthest from State standards and most in need of improvement. The Commissioner establishes a timeline by which each SURR must meet performance targets in its area(s) of identification. A school that meets these targets may be removed from registration review, except that in the school's first year of identification the school must not only achieve its performance targets, but also meet all State standards in its area(s) of identification to be removed from registration review. The Commissioner may recommend that the Board of Regents revoke the registration of a school that does not perform satisfactorily. Revocation of registration will prevent the school from further operation as a public school. When circumstances warrant, the Commissioner may extend the time frame for a school to make the required progress.

When a school is identified for registration review, a team of experts visits the school and prepares a report. Each district develops a Corrective Action Plan and each school develops a Comprehensive Education Plan to address the recommendations contained in the report. Both the State Education Department and the local school district provide additional support and resources to assist the school to improve.

A school identified for SURR may also be identified as a School In Need of Improvement for failure to make Adequate Yearly Progress as required by the No Child Left Behind Act. In this case the SURR may also be required to offer school choice and/or supplemental educational services. The following charts display the school's performance on State English language arts and mathematics accountability criteria for the period from 1999-2000 to the end of the target timeline, including the year for which the school was identified, the subsequent history of measured performance, and the minimum and target levels established for the school.

### English Language Arts Performance

| Elementary-Level ELA Measured by the Grade 4 ELA Performance Index (PI) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Year | **1999-2000** | **2000-2001** | **2001-2002** | **2002-2003** | **2003-2004** | **2004-2005** |
| Target PI | NA | NA | NA | NA | Removed | Removed |
| Measured PI | 98 | 113 | 88 | 114 | - | - |
| Minimum PI | NA | NA | NA | NA | Removed | Removed |
| This school was identified for SURR during the 2000-2001 school year. This school was not identified on this accountability criterion. **This school was removed from registration review during the 2003-04 school year because it achieved its performance target(s) during the 2002-03 school year.** | | | | | | |

| Middle-Level ELA Measured by the Grade 8 ELA Performance Index (PI) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Year | **1999-2000** | **2000-2001*** | **2001-2002** | **2002-2003** | **2003-2004** | **2004-2005** |
| Target PI | NA | 110 | 110 | 110 | Removed | Removed |
| Measured PI | 70 | 102 | 106 | - | - | - |
| Minimum PI | NA | 90 | 90 | 90 | Removed | Removed |

This school was identified for SURR during the 2000-2001 school year. This school was given SURR performance targets on this criterion based upon its 1999-2000 school year performance. This school did not have a grade 8 in 2002-03. **This school was removed from registration review during the 2003-04 school year because it achieved its performance target(s) during the 2002-03 school year.**

* To be considered for removal for registration in the year of a school's SURR identification, the school must achieve the State standard on the criteria for which it was identified.

**Mathematics Performance**

| Elementary-Level Mathematics Measured by the Grade 4 Math Performance Index (PI) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Year | **1999-2000** | **2000-2001** | **2001-2002** | **2002-2003** | **2003-2004** | **2004-2005** |
| Target PI | NA | NA | NA | NA | Removed | Removed |
| Measured PI | 118 | 119 | 100 | 129 | - | - |
| Minimum PI | NA | NA | NA | NA | Removed | Removed |

This school was identified for SURR during the 2000-2001 school year. This school was not identified on this accountability criterion. **This school was removed from registration review during the 2003-04 school year because it achieved its performance target(s) during the 2002-03 school year.**

| Middle-Level Mathematics Measured by the Grade 8 Math Performance Index (PI) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Year | **1999-2000** | **2000-2001** | **2001-2002** | **2002-2003** | **2003-2004** | **2004-2005** |
| Target PI | NA | NA | NA | NA | Removed | Removed |
| Measured PI | 40 | 90 | 93 | - | - | - |
| Minimum PI | NA | NA | NA | NA | Removed | Removed |

This school was identified for SURR during the 2000-2001 school year. This school was not identified on this accountability criterion. This school did not have a grade 8 in 2002-03. **This school was removed from registration review during the 2003-04 school year because it achieved its performance target(s) during the 2002-03 school year.**