### 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:

Supportintendent

Attachment KKK/sac



Building:	Ogdensburg City School District (cf. District Report Card)	Area:	ELA
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 91, PI=67	No	Good Standing ▲
2011-2012	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 ▲
	Elem/Mid Wh did not meet E-AMO of 101, PI=90	No	Good Standing ▲
2012-2013	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 ▲
	Elm/Mid "All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 85, PI = 84	No	Good Standing ▲
2013-2017	Elem/Mid Wh did not meet E-AMO of 101, PI=84	No	Good Standing ▲
+T07-C103	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	ON	Good Standing ▲
	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 ∧
2014-2015	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 51, PI=23	ON	Good Standing ▲
	Elem/Mid ED did not meet E-AMO of 79, PI=64	ON	Good Standing ▲
	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 171, PI=166	No	Good Standing ▲
	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 64, PI=32	No	TBD
2015-2016	Sec WH did not meet E-AMO of 172, PI=164	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	N <sub>o</sub>	DBT

### Legend

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

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevOB/OH11, Rev11/14/11, Rev O4/29/12, Rev O5/07/13, Rev 5/30/13, Rev 6/12/13 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. 09/05/14, 06/04/15, 05/03/16, 12/06/16, 01/10/17

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI).



Building:	Ogdensburg City School District (cf. District Report Card)	Area:	Math
Testing Year	lssue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
	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 ▲
2011-2012	Elem/Mid "All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 160, PI=145	No	Good Standing A
	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 △
2013-2017	Elem/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 101, PI=88	No	Good Standing △
LT02 CT03	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 40, PI=39	No	Good Standing A
	Elem/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 105, PI=100	Yes (SH)	Good Standing ▲
2014-2015	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 ▲
	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
2015-2016	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

### <u>-egend</u>

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). 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, A 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 Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevO8/O411, Rev11/14/11, Rev O4/29/12, Rev O5/07/13, Rev 5/30/13, Rev 6/12/13 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. 09/05/14, 06/04/15, 05/03/16, 12/06/16, 01/10/17



Building:	Ogdensburg City School District (cf. District Report Card)	Area:	Science
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2012	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 ▲
2017-2015	Elm/Mid White did not meet E-AMO of 186, PI=179	No	Good Standing ▲
CT02-4T07	Elem/Mid SWD did not meet E-AMO of 152, PI=129	No	Good Standing ▲
2015-2016		Yes	Good Standing ▲

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. A 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

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevO&/O4ll, Revll/J4/ll, Rev O4/29/l2, Rev O5/07/l3, Rev 5/30/l3, Rev 6/12/l3 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/l4 K. Kendall, Rev. O9/O5/l4, O6/O4/l5, O5/O3/l6, 12/O6/l6, O1/10/l7



Building: OCSD	OCSD	Area:	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
	4-year cohort: ED rate of 55% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 60%	No	Good Standing
2011-2012	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%	N <sub>O</sub>	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%	N <sub>O</sub>	Good Standing.▲
	5-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing ▲

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual ABased 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 Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevO&/O411, Rev11/14/11, Rev O4/29/12, Rev O5/07/13, Rev 5/30/13, Rev 6/12/13 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. 09/05/14, 06/04/15, 05/03/16, 12/06/16, 01/10/17



Building: OCSD	OCSD	Area:	Graduation Rate
	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)	No	Good Standing ▲
	SWD rate of 41% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor		
2013-2014	progress target of 80% and (4) ED rate of 63% did not meet		
	state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 67%.		
	4-year cohort: (1) WH rate of 79% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor		
2014-2015	progress target of 80% (2) ED rate of 68% did not meet state	NO	Good Standing
CT07-4T07	standard of 80%, nor progress target of 69%.		
75	5-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing ▲
	4-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing ▲
2015-2016	5-year cohort: (1) WH rate of 79% did not meet state standard of 80%, nor	2	
	standard of 80%, nor progress target of 74%.		

### Legend

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

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). ABased 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



Building:	Building: OFA (OMS until 09/03)	Area:	Elem/Mid-ELA
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 142, PI=124	No	Good Standing ▲
2011 2012	WH did not meet E-AMO of 156, PI=124	No	Good Standing ▲
7107-1107	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 ▲
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 82, PI=77	No	Good Standing ▲
2013-2017	WH did not meet E-AMO of 102, PI=77	No	Good Standing △
2010 2017	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 ▲
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 89, PI=75	No	Good Standing ▲
2014-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 106, PI=75	No	Good Standing ▲
CT07 +107	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 ▲
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 57, PI=16	No	TBD
2015-2016	ED did not meet E-AMO of 83, PI=70	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. ABased 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

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevO&/O4ll, Revll/l4/ll, Rev O4/29/l2, Rev O5/O7/l3, Rev 5/30/l3, Rev 6/12/l3 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/l4 K. Kendall, Rev. O9/O5/l4, O6/O4/l5, O5/O3/l6, 12/O6/l6, Ol/lO/l7



Building:	Building: OFA (oMs until 09/03)	Area:	Elem/Mid-Math
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 156, PI=144	No	Good Standing
2011 2012	WH did not meet E-AMO of 166, PI=144	No	Good Standing
717-7017	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 ▲
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 79, PI=65	No	Good Standing ▲
2013-2014	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 ▲
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 86, PI=91	Yes (SH)	Good Standing ▲
2014-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 102, PI=91	Yes (SH)	Good Standing ▲
CT07_4T03	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 ▲
) (4)	"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
2015-2016	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

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. ABased 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

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevOB/O4ll, Revll/14/ll, Rev O4/29/l2, Rev O5/07/l3, Rev 5/30/l3, Rev 6/12/l3 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. 09/05/14, 06/04/15, 05/03/16, 12/06/16, 01/10/17



Building: OFA	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 ▲
CT02-2102	"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	2015-2016 WH did not moot 5 AMO of 172 BI-166		

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

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. ABased 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

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevO&/O4ll, Revll/14/11, Rev O4/29/12, Rev O5/07/13, Rev 5/30/13, Rev 6/12/13 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. O9/O5/14, O6/O4/15, O5/O3/16, 12/O6/16, O1/10/17



Building: <b>OFA</b>	OFA	Area:	Science 8
Testing Year	lssue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
2011-2013		Yes	Good Standing
2013-2014	2013-2014 WH did not meet E-AMO of 183, PI=175	No	Good Standing ▲
2017 2015	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 176, PI=172	No	Good Standing ▲
CT07-4T07	WH did not meet E-AMO of 184, PI=176	No	Good Standing ▲
2015-2016		Yes	Good Standing ▲

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). 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. ABased 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



Building: OFA	OFA	Area:	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
Testing Year	lssue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
	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%	N <sub>O</sub>	
7017	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%	N <sub>o</sub>	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%		Good Standing.^
	5-year cohort:	Yes	

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, ABased 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



Building: OFA	OFA	Area:	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
	4-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing ▲
	5-year cohort:		-10 X10 H-10 H-10 H-10 H-10 H-10 H-10 H-10 H-
	1) "All Students" rate of 74% did not meet state standard of		
2013-2014	80%, nor progress target of 80%, (2) WH rate of 74% did not		
	meet state standard of 80%, nor progress target of 80% (3)	No	Good Standing ▲
	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%.		
	4-year cohort:		# 510   1   1   2   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1
	progress target of 80% (2) ED rate of 68% did not meet state	No	Good Standing ▲
CT07-4T07	standard of 80%, nor progress target of 69%.		
	5-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing ▲
	4-year cohort:	Yes	Good Standing ▲
2015-2016	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%.	Z	BD

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual ABased 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

Prepared 22Jul10 by D. Valois, RevO8/0411, Rev11/14/11, Rev 04/29/12, Rev 05/07/13, Rev 5/30/13, Rev 6/12/13 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. 09/05/14, 06/04/15, 05/03/16, 12/06/16, 01/10/17



Building: JFK	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 ▲
ברחר ברחנ	WH did not meet E-AMO of 99, PI=88	No	:
2012-2013	SWD made Safe Harbor target of 20, PI=21	Yes (SH)	Good Standing
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 83, PI=82	No	Good Standing ▲
2012-2017	WH did not meet E-AMO of 103, PI=83	No	Good Standing ▲
+T07-CT0	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 ▲
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 91, PI=79	No	Good Standing △
2014-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 108, PI=80	No	Good Standing ▲
CT07-4T0	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 ▲
	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 61, PI=24	No	TBD
2015-2016	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, proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). Basic-identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused-not identified in an ""All Students"" group. ABased 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



Building: JFK	JFK	Area:	Math
Testing Year	Issue	Made AYP?	Accountability status for next year
	"All Students" did not meet E-AMO of 158, PI=146	No	Good Standing ▲
2011 2012	WH did not meet E-AMO of 168, PI=146	No	Good Standing ▲
7107-1107	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 ▲
CT02,4T02	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 50, PI=37	No	Good Standing ▲
	WH did not meet E-AMO of 109, PI=103	No	TBD
2015-2016	SWD did not meet E-AMO of 62, PI=37	No	TBD
	ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

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

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. ABased 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

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevO&/O4ll, Rev11/14/11, Rev O4/29/12, Rev O5/07/13, Rev 5/30/13, Rev 6/12/13 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. 09/05/14, O6/04/15, O5/03/16, 12/06/16, O1/10/17



Building:	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 ▲
2017-2015	WH did not meet E-AMO of 104, PI=95	No	Good Standing ▲
CT07-4T07	ED did not meet E-AMO of 72, PI=61	No	Good Standing ▲
2015-2016	2015-2016 ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

Building:	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 ▲
2107 1107	WH did not meet E-AMO of 165, PI=150	No	Good Standing ▲
2012-2013	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	2015-2016 ALL Subgroups did not meet 95% Tested	No	TBD

### Legend

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual ABased 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 Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group.

Prepared 22JullO by D. Valois, RevO8/O411, Rev11/14/11, Rev O4/29/12, Rev O5/07/13, Rev 5/30/13, Rev 6/12/13 K.Kendall/D. Valois, Rev 4/23/14 K. Kendall, Rev. 09/05/14, 06/04/15, 05/03/16, 12/06/16, 01/10/17



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

### egend:

proficiency (significant growth from previous testing year) and (2) a revised calculation of the Performance Index (PI). AYP=Adequate Yearly Progress, PI=Performance Index, ED=economically disadvantaged, AMO=annual measureable objective, E-AMO=effective annual Basic=identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure, Focused=not identified in an ""All Students"" group. measureable objective, SWD=students with disabilities, WH=white, SH=safe harbor, SINI=school in need of improvement, DINI=district in need of improvement, ABased 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