INSTRUCTIONAL DIVISION
Report No. 3

OGDENSBURG CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
OGDENSBURG, NEW YORK

SUBJECT: NEW YORK STATE DISTRICT AND SCHOOL REPORT CARD 2015-2016

DATE: January 17, 2017

REASON FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

To keep the Commissioners informed of the New York State District and School Report Card for 2015-2016.

FACTS AND ANALYSIS:

Mr. Kendall is present this evening to give the Commissioners an overview of the New York State District and School Report Card for 2015-2016:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

No action necessary, information only.

APPROVED FOR PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD:

Timothy M. Kennedy
Superintendent

Attachment
KKK/sac

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***Ogdensburg City School District*** *(cf. District Report Card)*	Area:	***ELA***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 91, PI=67	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 164, PI=151	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Sec ED did not meet E-AMO of 128, PI=127	No	Good Standing ⮝
2012-2013	Elem/Mid Wh did not meet E-AMO of 101, PI=90	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Sec "All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 154, PI=148	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 166, PI=148	No	Good Standing ⮝
2013-2014	Elm/Mid "All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 85, PI = 84	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Elem/Mid Wh did not meet E-AMO of 101, PI=84	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 39, PI=24	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Elem/Mid ED did not meet E-AMO of 70, PI=68	No	Good Standing ⮝
2014-2015	Elem/Mid "All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 93, PI=80	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Elem/Mid WH did not meet E-AMO of 110, PI=80	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 51, PI=23	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Elem/Mid ED did not meet E-AMO of 79, PI=64	No	Good Standing ⮝
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 171, PI=166	No	Good Standing ⮝
2015-2016	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 64, PI=32	No	TBD
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 172, PI=164	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***Ogdensburg City School District*** *(cf. District Report Card)*	Area:	***Math***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 112, PI=78	No	Good Standing⮝
	Elem/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 170, PI=145	No	Good Standing⮝
	Elem/Mid "All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 160, PI=145	No	Good Standing⮝
	Elem/Mid ED did not meet E-AMO of 146, PI=136	No	Good Standing⮝
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 144, PI=138	No	Good Standing⮝
2012-2013	Elm/Mid White made Safe Harbor target of 79, PI=79	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
2013-2014	Elem/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 101, PI=88	No	Good Standing⮝
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 40, PI=39	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	Elem/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 105, PI=100	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 53, PI=37	No	Good Standing⮝
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 156, PI=149	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	Elem/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 111, PI=102	No	TBD
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 65, PI=42	No	TBD
	Elem/Mid ED did not meet E-AMO of 85, PI=84	No	TBD
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 159, PI=152	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***Ogdensburg City School District*** *(cf. District Report Card)*	Area:	***Science***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 138, PI=124	No	Good Standing
2012-2013		Yes	Good Standing⮝
2013-2014	Elm/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 185, PI=184	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	Elm/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 186, PI=179	No	Good Standing⮝
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 152, PI=129	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016		Yes	Good Standing⮝

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OCSD***	Area:	***Graduation Rate***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	*4-year cohort:* ED rate of 55% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 60%	No	Good Standing
	5-year cohort: (1) "All Students" rate of 4% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 73%, (2) WH rate of 4% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 74% and (3) ED rate of 2% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 57%	No	Good Standing
2012-2013	*4-year cohort:* 1) "All Students" rate of 72% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 75%, (2) WH rate of 73% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 75% and (3) SWD rate of 41% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 75%	No	Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing⮝

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OCSD***	Area:	***Graduation Rate***
2013-2014	*4-year cohort:*	Yes	Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort: 1) "All Students" rate of 74% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80%, (2) WH rate of 74% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% (3) SWD rate of 41% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% and (4) ED rate of 63% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 67%.	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	*4-year cohort:* (1) WH rate of 79% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% (2) ED rate of 68% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 69%.	No	Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	*4-year cohort:*	Yes	Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort: (1) WH rate of 79% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% (2) ED rate of 70% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 74%.	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OFA (OMS until 09/03)***	Area:	***Elem/Mid-ELA***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 142, PI=124	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 156, PI=124	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 85, PI=58	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 125, PI=115	No	Good Standing⮝
2012-2013	White made Safe Harbor target of 75, PI=94	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
2013-2014	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 82, PI=77	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 102, PI=77	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 31, PI=10	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 66, PI=61	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 89, PI=75	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 106, PI=75	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 44, PI=8	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 75, PI=59	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 57, PI=16	No	TBD
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 83, PI=70	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OFA (OMS until 09/03)***	Area:	***Elem/Mid-Math***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 156, PI=144	No	Good Standing
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 166, PI=144	No	Good Standing
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 106, PI=81	No	Good Standing
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 142, PI=136	No	Good Standing
2012-2013	WH made Safe Harbor target of 77, PI=78	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
2013-2014	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 79, PI=65	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 98, PI=65	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 63, PI=51	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 86, PI=91	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 102, PI=91	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 45, PI=24	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 71, PI=78	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 93, PI=89	No	TBD
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 107, PI=89	No	TBD
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 57, PI=25	No	TBD
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 81, PI=70	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OFA***	Area:	***Sec-ELA***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	WH did not meet E-AMO of 164, PI=152	No	Good Standing
2012-2013	WH did not meet E-AMO of 166, PI=150	No	Good Standing⮝
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 153, PI=150	No	Good Standing⮝
2013-2014		Yes	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 171, PI=168	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	WH did not meet E-AMO of 172, PI=166	No	TBD

Building:	***OFA***	Area:	***Sec-Math***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	WH did not meet E-AMO of 144, PI=139	No	Good Standing
2012-2013		Yes	Good Standing⮝
2013-2014		Yes	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 156, PI=151	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	WH did not meet E-AMO of 159, PI=153	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OFA***	Area:	***Science 8***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2013		Yes	Good Standing
2013-2014	WH did not meet E-AMO of 183, PI=175	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 176, PI=172	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 184, PI=176	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016		Yes	Good Standing⮝

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OFA***	Area:	***Graduation Rate***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	*4-year cohort:* (1)"All Students" rate of 74% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 77%, (2)WH rate of 74% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 77% and (3) ED rate of 56% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 64%	No	Good Standing
	5-year cohort: (1) "All Students" rate of 5% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 74%, (2) WH rate of 5% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 75% and (3) ED rate of 2% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 61%	No	
2012-2013	*4-year cohort:* 1) "All Students" rate of 72% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 75%, (2) WH rate of 73% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 75% and (3) SWD rate of 41% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 75%		Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort:	Yes	

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***OFA***	Area:	***Graduation Rate***
2013-2014	*4-year cohort:*	Yes	Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort: 1) "All Students" rate of 74% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80%, (2) WH rate of 74% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% (3) SWD rate of 41% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% and (4) ED rate of 63% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 67%.	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	*4-year cohort:* (1) WH rate of 79% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% (2) ED rate of 68% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 69%.	No	Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	*4-year cohort:*	Yes	Good Standing⮝
	5-year cohort: (1) WH rate of 79% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% (2) ED rate of 70% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 74%.	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***JFK***	Area:	***ELA***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 86, PI=60	No	Good Standing⮝
2012-2013	WH did not meet E-AMO of 99, PI=88	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD made Safe Harbor target of 20, PI=21	Yes (SH)	
2013-2014	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 83, PI=82	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 103, PI=83	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 63, PI=14	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 67, PI=66	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 91, PI=79	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 108, PI=80	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 49, PI=23	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 76, PI=68	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 61, PI=24	No	TBD
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 85, PI=76	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***JFK***	Area:	***Math***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 158, PI=146	No	Good Standing⮝
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 168, PI=146	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 107, PI=65	No	Good Standing⮝
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 143, PI=134	No	Good Standing⮝
2012-2013	WH made Safe Harbor target of 79, PI=79	Yes (SH)	Good Standing⮝
2013-2014	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 37, PI=36	No	Good Standing⮝
2014-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 103, PI=99	No	Good Standing⮝
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 50, PI=37	No	Good Standing⮝
2015-2016	WH did not meet E-AMO of 109, PI=103	No	TBD
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 62, PI=37	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Building:	***JFK***	Area:	***Science 4***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2016		Yes	Good Standing

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***Madill***	Area:	***ELA***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012		Yes	Good Standing⮙
2012-2013	WH did not meet E-AMO of 97, PI=92	No	Good Standing⮙
2013-2014	WH did not meet E-AMO of 100, PI=98	No	Good Standing⮙
2014-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 104, PI=95	No	Good Standing⮙
	ED did not meet E-AMO of 72, PI=61	No	Good Standing⮙
2015-2016	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Building:	***Madill***	Area:	***Math***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 156, PI=149	No	Good Standing⮙
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 165, PI=150	No	Good Standing⮙
2012-2013	WH did not meet E-AMO of 91, PI=82	No	Good Standing⮙
2013-2014		Yes	Good Standing⮙
2014-2015		Yes	Good Standing⮙
2015-2016	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮙Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).

Ogdensburg City School District

History of AYP/Improvement Status

Building:	***Madill***	Area:	***Science 4***
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2016		Yes	Good Standing⮝

Legend:

AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, **PI**=Performance Index, **ED**=economically disadvantaged, **AMO**=annual measureable objective, **E-AMO**=effective annual measureable objective, **SWD**=students with disabilities, **WH**=white, **SH**=safe harbor, **SINI**=school in need of improvement, **DINI**=district in need of improvement, **Basic**=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, **Focused**=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

⮝Based upon a revised accountability system that includes: (1) a growth model that measures whether a student who scores a "1" or a "2" is on track to proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).