## Framework for Great Schools

The Framework consists of six elements - Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, Supportive Environment, Effective School Leadership, Strong Family-Community Ties, and Trust-that drive Student Achievement. The School Quality Guide shares ratings and data on each of the Framework elements, based on information from Quality Reviews, the NYC School Survey, student attendance, and movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments. The School Quality Guide also shares ratings and data on Student Achievement based on a variety of quantitative measures of student growth and performance.


## State Accountability Status: Focus

This designation is determined by the New York State Department of Education. More information on New York State accountability can be found at: http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/tools/accountability/default.htm

## Note

In addition, an online version of the 2014-15 School Quality Guide, with additional features, can be found at http://schoolqualityreports.nyc

## Student Enrollment

| Grade | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - \mathbf { 2 0 1 3 }}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - \mathbf { 2 0 1 4 }}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - \mathbf { 2 0 1 5 }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kindergarten | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ |
| Grade 1 | 32 | 35 | 31 |
| Grade 2 | 32 | 32 | 33 |
| Grade 3 | 44 | 34 | 36 |
| Grade 4 | 60 | 42 | 30 |
| Grade 5 | 58 | 48 | 43 |
| Grade 6 | 77 | 64 | 62 |
| Grade 7 | 101 | 72 | 61 |
| Grade 8 | 91 | 91 | 70 |
| All students | $\mathbf{5 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 4}$ |

## Student Demographics

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - \mathbf { 2 0 1 4 }}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - \mathbf { 2 0 1 5 }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% English Language Learners | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| \% Free Lunch Eligible | $84 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $91 \%$ |
| \% Student with IEPs | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| \% Student with IEPs (less than 20\% time) | $12 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| \% HRA Eligible | - | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| \% Temporary Housing | - | $21 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| \% Asian | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| \% Black | $83 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
| \% Hispanic | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| \% White | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| \% Other | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |


| Student Achievement Rating | Student Achievement Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Approaching Target | $\mathbf{2 . 7 3}$ |


| Approaching Target |
| :--- |
| Student Achievement Metrics |
| State Test Results - ELA |
| $\quad$ Average Student Proficiency |
| $\quad$ Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 |
| Median Adjusted Growth Percentile |
| $\quad$ Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third |
| Early Grade Progress |
| State Test Results - Math |
| O Average Student Proficiency |
| - $\quad$ Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 |
| $\quad$ Median Adjusted Growth Percentile |
| $\quad$ Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third |
| - Early Grade Progress |
| Core Course Pass Rates |
| ELA |
| Math |
| Science |
| - Social Studies |
| - Percent of 8th Graders Earning HS Credit |
| - 9th Grade Adjusted Credit Accumulation of Former 8th Graders |


| n | $\begin{aligned} & 2014-15 \\ & \text { School Value } \end{aligned}$ | Bottom of Target Range | 2014-15 Targets |  |  | Top of Target Range | Metric Score | Weight Pct |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approaching Target | Meeting Target | Exceeding Target |  |  |  |
| 272 | 2.27 | 1.91 | 2.12 | 2.29 | 2.42 | 2.72 | 2.88 | 8.20\% |
| 272 | 14.7\% | 0.0\% | 8.1\% | 14.8\% | 20.1\% | 32.1\% | 2.99 | 8.20\% |
| 233 | 65.0 | 52.3 | 58.7 | 64.1 | 68.3 | 77.2 | 3.21 | 8.20\% |
| 82 | 79.5 | 67.1 | 73.5 | 78.6 | 82.5 | 90.7 | 3.23 | 8.20\% |
| 30 | 0.40 | 0.08 | 0.84 | 1.50 | 2.02 | 3.10 | 1.42 | 8.20\% |
| 266 | 2.01 | 1.81 | 2.09 | 2.31 | 2.49 | 2.87 | 1.71 | 8.20\% |
| 266 | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 9.0\% | 16.5\% | 22.3\% | 36.7\% | 1.38 | 8.20\% |
| 232 | 58.0 | 47.3 | 54.7 | 61.0 | 66.0 | 76.5 | 2.52 | 8.20\% |
| 82 | 73.0 | 62.7 | 69.1 | 74.3 | 78.5 | 87.1 | 2.75 | 8.20\% |
| 28 | 0.76 | 0.03 | 1.01 | 1.86 | 2.52 | 3.96 | 1.74 | 8.20\% |
| 182 | 89.0\% | 62.1\% | 72.8\% | 81.6\% | 88.5\% | 100.0\% | 4.04 | 1.64\% |
| 182 | 88.5\% | 57.7\% | 69.6\% | 79.4\% | 87.2\% | 100.0\% | 4.10 | 1.64\% |
| 182 | 91.2\% | 57.0\% | 69.1\% | 79.1\% | 87.0\% | 100.0\% | 4.32 | 1.64\% |
| 182 | 93.4\% | 52.0\% | 65.7\% | 76.8\% | 85.5\% | 100.0\% | 4.54 | 1.64\% |
| 67 | 1.5\% | 0.0\% | 7.1\% | 13.0\% | 17.6\% | 29.1\% | 1.21 | 3.28\% |
| 88 | 87.0\% | 61.0\% | 71.0\% | 79.0\% | 86.0\% | 97.0\% | 4.09 | 8.20\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Weighte | 2.61 |


| Closing the Achievement Gap (CtAG) Metrics |  | 2014-15 School Population \% | Population \% of Range | 2014-15 <br> School Value | Bottom of Target Range | 2014-15 Targets |  |  | Top of Target Range | Metric Score | Extra Points Possible | Extra Points Earned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n |  |  |  |  | Approaching Target | Meeting Target | Exceeding Target |  |  |  |  |
| ELA - Percent at Level 3 or 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-Contained | 37 | 13.6\% | 76.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 1.0\% | 1.6\% | 2.6\% | 1.00 | 0.030 | 0.000 |
| Integrated Co-Teaching | 30 | 11.0\% | 61.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 5.0\% | 7.4\% | 12.4\% | 1.00 | 0.030 | 0.000 |
| SETSS | 12 | 4.4\% | 37.6\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 3.9\% | 6.3\% | 9.3\% | 15.6\% | 3.67 | 0.030 | 0.020 |
| Math - Percent at Level 3 or 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-Contained | 39 | 14.7\% | 83.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.1\% | 3.3\% | 4.9\% | 8.2\% | 1.00 | 0.030 | 0.000 |
| Integrated Co-Teaching | 27 | 10.2\% | 57.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.2\% | 8.3\% | 12.3\% | 20.6\% | 1.00 | 0.030 | 0.000 |
| SETSS | 12 | 4.5\% | 38.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.1\% | 9.6\% | 14.4\% | 24.0\% | 1.00 | 0.030 | 0.000 |
| ELA - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 17 | 7.3\% | 19.3\% | 52.9\% | 14.1\% | 28.3\% | 36.6\% | 47.7\% | 70.3\% |  | 0.030 | 0.000 |
| Lowest Third Citywide | 109 | 46.8\% | 73.0\% | 49.5\% | 33.6\% | 43.2\% | 48.8\% | 56.2\% | 71.4\% | 3.09 | 0.030 | 0.016 |
| Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide | 66 | 28.3\% | 78.8\% | 53.0\% | 29.1\% | 40.6\% | 47.4\% | 56.4\% | 74.7\% | 3.62 | 0.030 | 0.020 |
| SC/ICT/SETSS | 70 | 30.0\% | 83.7\% | 54.3\% | 30.2\% | 41.5\% | 48.2\% | 57.0\% | 75.0\% | 3.69 | 0.030 | 0.020 |
| Math - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 19 | 8.2\% | 20.8\% | 63.2\% | 13.4\% | 26.8\% | 34.7\% | 45.1\% | 66.4\% |  | 0.030 | 0.000 |
| Lowest Third Citywide | 158 | 68.1\% | 97.6\% | 39.9\% | 28.0\% | 39.6\% | 46.4\% | 55.5\% | 74.0\% | 2.04 | 0.030 | 0.008 |
| Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide | 84 | 36.2\% | 100.0\% | 46.4\% | 26.0\% | 38.8\% | 46.2\% | 56.1\% | 76.4\% | 3.02 | 0.030 | 0.015 |
| SC/ICT/SETSS | 71 | 30.6\% | 86.3\% | 53.5\% | 26.0\% | 36.6\% | 42.8\% | 51.1\% | 68.0\% | 4.14 | 0.030 | 0.024 |
| ELL Progress | 19 | 4.8\% | 16.7\% | 42.1\% | 24.5\% | 40.7\% | 50.2\% | 62.8\% | 88.5\% |  | 0.030 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CtAG | ional Points | 0.12 |


|  | Metric Value | Metric Score | Weight Pct |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rigorous Instruction |  |  |  |
| Quality Review 1.1 | Proficient | 3.40 | 22\% |
| Quality Review 1.2 | Developing | 2.00 | 22\% |
| Quality Review 2.2 | Proficient | 3.40 | 22\% |
| NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction | 87\% | 2.52 | 34\% |
| Section Rating: Approaching Target | Section Score: | 2.80 |  |
| Collaborative Teachers |  |  |  |
| Quality Review 4.2 | Proficient | 3.40 | 50\% |
| NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers | 86\% | 3.08 | 50\% |
| Section Rating: Meeting Target | Section Score: | 3.24 |  |
| Supportive Environment |  |  |  |
| Quality Review 3.4 | Proficient | 3.40 | 30\% |
| NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment | 86\% | 3.16 | 35\% |
| Percentage of students with 90\%+ attendance |  |  |  |
| EMS | 56.0\% | 1.84 |  |
| HS |  |  |  |
| Overall | 56.0\% | 1.84 | 30\% |
| Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments |  |  |  |
| EMS | 0.28 | 2.73 |  |
| HS |  |  |  |
| Overall | 0.28 | 2.73 | 5\% |
| Section Rating: Approaching Target | Section Score: | 2.80 |  |
| Effective School Leadership |  |  |  |
| NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership | 77\% | 2.84 | 100\% |
| Section Rating: Approaching Target | Section Score: | 2.84 |  |
| Strong Family-Community Ties |  |  |  |
| NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties | 83\% | 2.88 | 100\% |
| Section Rating: Approaching Target | Section Score: | 2.88 |  |
| Trust |  |  |  |
| NYC School Survey - Trust | 86\% | 2.72 | 100\% |
| Section Rating: Approaching Target | Section Score: | 2.72 |  |


|  |  | Survey \% Positive | City Range |  |  | Percent of Range | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Bottom of Range | City Avg | Top of Range |  |  |
| Rigorous Instruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Common Core shifts in literacy | Teachers | 89 | 86.5 | 94.1 | 100.0 | 0.25 | 2.00 |
| - Common Core shifts in math | Teachers | 82 | 81.3 | 91.9 | 100.0 | 0.03 | 1.12 |
| Course clarity | Students | 94 | 82.2 | 90.6 | 99.0 | 0.69 | 3.76 |
| Quality of student discussion | Teachers | 84 | 64.9 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.54 | 3.16 |
| Section Results: |  | 87\% |  |  |  |  | 2.52 |
| Collaborative Teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cultural awareness: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cultural awareness | Teachers | 95 | 86.2 | 94.8 | 100.0 | 0.75 |  |
| Cultural awareness | Parents | 91 | 89.5 | 94.1 | 98.7 | 0.50 |  |
| Cultural awareness | Students | 81 | 69.6 | 84.0 | 98.4 | 0.40 |  |
| Cultural awareness | Combined | 89 |  |  |  | 0.55 | 3.20 |
| Inclusive classroom instruction | Teachers | 93 | 84.7 | 94.1 | 100.0 | 0.56 | 3.24 |
| - Quality of professional development | Teachers | 88 | 52.2 | 76.8 | 100.0 | 0.75 | 4.00 |
| School commitment | Teachers | 80 | 60.2 | 84.6 | 100.0 | 0.51 | 3.04 |
| Innovation | Teachers | 83 | 66.7 | 84.9 | 100.0 | 0.50 | 3.00 |
| Reflective dialogue | Teachers | 89 | 87.4 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 0.25 | 2.00 |
| Peer collaboration | Teachers | 91 | 79.2 | 92.0 | 100.0 | 0.54 | 3.16 |
| Focus on student learning | Teachers | 82 | 67.5 | 88.5 | 100.0 | 0.45 | 2.80 |
| Collective responsibility | Teachers | 81 | 59.6 | 82.2 | 100.0 | 0.53 | 3.12 |
| Section Results: |  | 86\% |  |  |  |  | 3.08 |
| Supportive Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safety: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safety | Teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safety | Students | 79 | 72.2 | 86.2 | 100.0 | 0.25 |  |
| Safety | Combined | 79 |  |  |  | 0.25 | 2.00 |
| Classroom behavior: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Classroom behavior | Teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Classroom behavior | Students | 85 | 64.2 | 80.8 | 97.4 | 0.61 |  |
| Classroom behavior | Combined | 85 |  |  |  | 0.61 | 3.44 |
| - Social-emotional measure | Teachers | 95 | 88.0 | 96.2 | 100.0 | 0.75 | 4.00 |
| Peer interactions | Students | 78 | 67.8 | 82.0 | 96.2 | 0.36 | 2.44 |
| - Next-level guidance | Students | 95 | 77.9 | 89.3 | 100.0 | 0.77 | 4.08 |
| Press toward academic achievement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Press toward academic achievement | Teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Press toward academic achievement | Students | 91 | 82.4 | 89.4 | 96.4 | 0.61 |  |
| Press toward academic achievement | Combined | 91 |  |  |  | 0.61 | 3.44 |
| Personal attention and support | Students | 87 | 75.7 | 86.3 | 96.9 | 0.54 | 3.16 |
| Peer support for academic work: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peer support for academic work | Teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peer support for academic work | Parents | 86 | 84.4 | 92.8 | 100.0 | 0.25 |  |
| Peer support for academic work | Students | 73 | 45.8 | 67.0 | 88.2 | 0.65 |  |
| Peer support for academic work | Combined | 80 |  |  |  | 0.45 | 2.80 |
| Section Results: |  | 86\% |  |  |  |  | 3.16 |


|  |  | Survey \% Positive | City Range |  |  | Percent of Range | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Bottom of Range | City Avg | Top of Range |  |  |
| Effective School Leadership |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inclusive principal leadership | Parents | 85 | 79.5 | 89.7 | 99.9 | 0.28 | 2.12 |
| Teacher influence | Teachers | 54 | 30.2 | 60.2 | 90.2 | 0.40 | 2.60 |
| Program coherence | Teachers | 83 | 61.1 | 85.1 | 100.0 | 0.57 | 3.28 |
| Principal instructional leadership | Teachers | 86 | 63.6 | 87.0 | 100.0 | 0.60 | 3.40 |
| Section Results: |  | 77\% |  |  |  |  | 2.84 |
| Strong Family Community Ties |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher outreach to parents: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher outreach to parents | Teachers | 94 | 84.4 | 93.8 | 100.0 | 0.58 |  |
| Teacher outreach to parents | Parents | 89 | 83.7 | 91.1 | 98.5 | 0.33 |  |
| Teacher outreach to parents | Combined | 91 |  |  |  | 0.46 | 2.84 |
| Parent involvement in the schools | Parents | 74 | 59.7 | 74.7 | 89.7 | 0.47 | 2.88 |
| Section Results: |  | 83\% |  |  |  |  | 2.88 |
| Trust |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parent-teacher trust | Parents | 93 | 90.0 | 94.6 | 99.2 | 0.50 | 3.00 |
| Parent-principal trust | Parents | 89 | 83.1 | 92.7 | 100.0 | 0.32 | 2.28 |
| Student-teacher trust | Students | 79 | 67.7 | 81.9 | 96.1 | 0.41 | 2.64 |
| Teacher-principal trust | Teachers | 82 | 62.0 | 86.8 | 100.0 | 0.52 | 3.08 |
| Teacher-teacher trust | Teachers | 86 | 77.3 | 91.1 | 100.0 | 0.39 | 2.56 |
| Section Results: |  | 86\% |  |  |  |  | 2.72 |

These tables show the values needed in 2015-16 for the school to achieve a rating of Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, Approaching Target, or Not Meeting Target on each metric.

| Student Achievement Metrics |  |  | 2014-15 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics* | 2014-15 <br> School Value | 2015-16 Targets |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Not Meeting Target | Approaching Target | Meeting Target | Exceeding Target |
| ELA - Average Proficiency Rating |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-Contained | 1.73 | 1.78 or lower | 1.79 to 1.85 | 1.86 to 1.90 | 1.91 or higher |
| Integrated Co-Teaching | 1.92 | 1.93 or lower | 1.94 to 2.02 | 2.03 to 2.08 | 2.09 or higher |
| SETSS | 2.11 | 1.93 or lower | 1.94 to 2.05 | 2.06 to 2.13 | 2.14 or higher |
| ELL | 2.21 | 1.95 or lower | 1.96 to 2.07 | 2.08 to 2.16 | 2.17 or higher |
| Lowest Third Citywide | 1.91 | 1.89 or lower | 1.90 to 1.94 | 1.95 to 1.99 | 2.00 or higher |
| Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide | 1.87 | 1.85 or lower | 1.86 to 1.91 | 1.92 to 1.99 | 2.00 or higher |
| Math - Average Proficiency Rating |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-Contained | 1.67 | 1.69 or lower | 1.70 to 1.81 | 1.82 to 1.89 | 1.90 or higher |
| Integrated Co-Teaching | 1.84 | 1.84 or lower | 1.85 to 1.97 | 1.98 to 2.06 | 2.07 or higher |
| SETSS | 1.96 | 1.84 or lower | 1.85 to 2.00 | 2.01 to 2.13 | 2.14 or higher |
| ELL | 2.21 | 1.93 or lower | 1.94 to 2.11 | 2.12 to 2.24 | 2.25 or higher |
| Lowest Third Citywide | 1.84 | 1.81 or lower | 1.82 to 1.89 | 1.90 to 1.99 | 2.00 or higher |
| Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide | 1.82 | 1.79 or lower | 1.80 to 1.89 | 1.90 to 1.99 | 2.00 or higher |
| ELL Progress | 42.1\% | 41.2\% or lower | 41.3\% to 50.0\% | 50.1\% to 56.5\% | 56.6\% or higher |

*To earn additional points from the Closing the Achievement Gap section on the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, the school must meet the targets below and have a population percentage (of the relevant high-need group) that is not more than one standard deviation below the citywide average.

| Supportive Environment Metrics | 2014-15 <br> School Value | 2015-16 Targets |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Not Meeting Target | Approaching Target | Meeting Target | Exceeding Target |
| Percentage of Students with $90 \%+$ Attendance | 56.0\% | 55.9\% or lower | 56.0\% to 64.2\% | 64.3\% to 70.3\% | 70.4\% or higher |
| Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments | 0.28 | 0.23 or lower | 0.24 to 0.34 | 0.35 to 0.42 | 0.43 or higher |

* If the participation in state tests is low, the targets may be adjusted to reflect the students at the school that actually take the tests.

