
Summary of Section Ratings

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.



Section scores are on a scale from 1.00 - 4.99. The first digit corresponds to the section rating, and the additional digits show how close the school was to the next rating level.

State Accountability Status: Good Standing

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

School Enrollment and Demographic Data

Student Enrollment

Grade	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
Kindergarten	113	99	99
Grade 1	118	127	99
Grade 2	113	121	120
Grade 3	121	107	116
Grade 4	92	112	105
Grade 5	97	92	102
All students	672	676	659

Student Demographics

	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
% English Language Learners	14%	12%	14%
% Free Lunch Eligible	77%	77%	80%
% Student with IEPs	13%	14%	15%
% Student with IEPs (less than 20% time)	4%	3%	6%
% HRA Eligible	-	57%	51%
% Temporary Housing	-	10%	8%
% Asian	24%	25%	24%
% Black	38%	40%	37%
% Hispanic	29%	26%	27%
% White	4%	4%	5%
% Other	0%	6%	7%

Student Achievement Scoring Appendix

29Q035 P.S. 035 Nathaniel Woodhull

Student Achievement Rating	Student Achievement Score
Meeting Target	3.14

				2	2014-15 Target	s			
Student Achievement Metrics	n	2014-15 School Value	Bottom of Target Range	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target	Top of Target Range	Metric Score	Weight Pct
State Test Results - ELA									
Average Student Proficiency	304	2.44	2.15	2.41	2.56	2.73	2.97	2.20	9.09%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	304	24.3%	10.4%	22.0%	29.5%	38.1%	49.5%	2.31	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	190	67.5	48.4	55.3	61.3	65.5	75.8	4.19	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	69	67.0	56.6	64.4	71.1	75.9	87.2	2.39	9.09%
O Early Grade Progress	106	1.29	0.96	1.59	2.11	2.46	3.33	1.52	9.09%
State Test Results - Math									
Average Student Proficiency	310	2.71	2.16	2.52	2.75	3.00	3.35	2.83	9.09%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	310	37.4%	10.6%	26.6%	37.5%	49.9%	65.7%	2.99	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	192	67.5	43.1	52.8	61.1	66.8	80.7	4.05	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	64	73.5	51.5	61.1	69.5	75.4	89.3	3.68	9.09%
Early Grade Progress	111	2.21	0.63	1.72	2.65	3.30	4.84	2.53	9.09%
MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	87	93.2%	73.7%	81.1%	86.4%	92.4%	100.0%	4.11	9.09%
								Weighted Average Score	2.98

						2	2014-15 Targets					
Closing the Achievement Gap (CtAG) Metrics	n	2014-15 School Population %	Population % of Range	2014-15 School Value	Bottom of Target Range	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target	Top of Target Range	Metric Score	Extra Points Possible	Extra Points Earned
ELA - Percent at Level 3 or 4			_			-		-				
 Self-Contained 	17	5.6%	27.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.9%	2.7%	4.6%	1.00	0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	21	6.9%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	6.5%	9.3%	15.8%	1.00	0.030	0.000
SETSS	4	1.3%	12.4%		0.0%	3.5%	6.2%	8.9%	15.0%		0.030	0.000
Math - Percent at Level 3 or 4												
Self-Contained	17	5.5%	27.4%	5.9%	0.0%	2.9%	5.2%	7.4%	12.6%	3.32	0.030	0.017
Integrated Co-Teaching	21	6.8%	34.7%	4.8%	0.0%	7.2%	12.9%	18.4%	31.2%	1.67	0.030	0.005
SETSS	4	1.3%	12.5%		0.0%	6.6%	11.7%	16.8%	28.4%		0.030	0.000
ELA - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
O ELL	31	16.3%	34.8%	25.8%	12.7%	26.0%	36.3%	46.4%	69.9%	1.98	0.030	0.007
Lowest Third Citywide	70	36.8%	52.7%	42.9%	28.0%	38.8%	47.1%	55.4%	74.4%	2.49	0.030	0.011
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	21	11.1%	28.1%	47.6%	23.6%	36.2%	45.9%	55.6%	77.8%	3.18	0.030	0.016
SC/ICT/SETSS	29	15.3%	32.7%	44.8%	22.0%	34.9%	44.8%	54.7%	77.4%	3.00	0.030	0.015
Math - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
ELL	32	16.7%	34.3%	31.3%	7.8%	22.3%	33.5%	44.6%	70.2%	2.80	0.030	0.014
Lowest Third Citywide	75	39.1%	53.7%	54.7%	19.1%	32.5%	42.8%	53.1%	76.7%	4.07	0.030	0.023
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	23	12.0%	31.3%	47.8%	14.4%	29.5%	41.2%	52.8%	79.4%	3.57	0.030	0.019
SC/ICT/SETSS	29	15.1%	32.9%	41.4%	15.4%	29.5%	40.4%	51.3%	76.2%	3.09	0.030	0.016
ELL Progress	89	13.9%	35.3%	60.7%	31.6%	44.8%	55.1%	65.2%	88.6%	3.55	0.030	0.019
										CtAG Ad	ditional Points	0.16
									Overa	all Student Achie	evement Score	3.14

[•] Filled circle indicates a metric rating of Exceeding Target (and a metric score of 4.00 or higher).

[•] Empty circle indicates a metric rating of Not Meeting Target (and a metric score of 1.99 or lower).

2014-15 School Quality Reports

Framework Elements Scoring Appendix

P.S. 035 Nathaniel Woodhull

29Q035

Cousil process of Section Score: Sec		Metric Value	Metric Score	Weight Pct
Quality Review 1.2 Developing 2.00 22% Quality Review 2.2 Proficient 3.40 22% NVC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction 95% 3.76 34% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20 Ilaborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% NVC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 90% 3.88 50% NVC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 90% 3.64 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Section Rating: Meeting Target Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.15 2.09 5% EMS 0.15 2.09 5% 5% 5% Overall 0.15 2.09 5% 5% Section Rating: Me	orous Instruction			
Quality Review 2.2 Proficient 3.40 22% NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction 95% 3.76 34% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20 Illaborative Teachers Proficient 3.40 50% Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 90% 3.88 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Proficient 3.40 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Proficient 3.40 50% Proficient 3.40 50% Section Survey - Supportive Environment 90% 3.84 50% Proficient 4.99 3.0% MYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of Students with 90% - attendance 55% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments 2.24 30% 30%	Quality Review 1.1	Proficient	3.40	22%
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Section Score:	Quality Review 1.2	Developing	2.00	22%
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.40 50% NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 90% 3.88 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Section Score: 3.65 Section Score: 3.66	Quality Review 2.2	Proficient	3.40	22%
Ilaborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 90% 3.88 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Section Score: 3.65 Section Score: 3.65 Section Score: 3.66 Section Score: 3.67 Secti	NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction	95%	3.76	34%
Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 90% 3.88 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Section Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance FMS 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.15 2.09 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.20	
NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 90% 3.88 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Poportive Environment Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 75.6% 2.24 HS Overall 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.15 2.09 HS Overall 0.15 2.09 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Oong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 85% 3.16 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16	llaborative Teachers			
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.64 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 100%	Quality Review 4.2	Proficient	3.40	50%
Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.15 2.09 S% Overall 0.15 2.09 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04	·			
Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 75.6% 2.24 HS Overall 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS Overall 0.15 2.09 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 NOW Section Ratin	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.64	
Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 75.6% 2.24 HS Overall 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS Overall 0.15 2.09 S% Overall 0.15 2.09 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Overall 0.00% Overall 0	oportive Environment			
NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 96% 4.36 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.15 2.09 HS 0.15 2.09 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16	· -	Well Developed	4.99	30%
Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall 75.6% 2.24 Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.15 EMS Overall 0.15 Overall 0.15 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16	·	•		
Overall 75.6% 2.24 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.15 2.09 HS Overall 0.15 2.09 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 ective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 77% 3.04 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 85% 3.16 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 section Rating: Meeting Target 90% 3.80 100%	Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance			
Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS EMS Overall 0.15 2.09 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Formula Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16	HS			
environments EMS HS Overall O.15 2.09 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	Overall	75.6%	2.24	30%
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Score: 3.16 NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%				
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80 ective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Score: 3.16		0.15	2.09	
ective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	Overall	0.15	2.09	5%
NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 77% 3.04 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 85% 3.16 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 IST NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.80	
NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 77% 3.04 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 85% 3.16 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%				
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.04 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 85% 3.16 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	•	77%	3.04	100%
Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 85% 3.16 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 IST NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%				
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 85% 3.16 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 IST NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.04	
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16 UST NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	ong Family-Community Ties			
NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties	85%	3.16	100%
NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.16	
NYC School Survey - Trust 90% 3.80 100%				
		000/	2 00	100%
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.80	INTO SCHOOL SULVEY - ITUST	90%	5.80	100%
	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.80	

Framework Elements - Survey Scoring Appendix

					City Range			
			Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Rigor	ous Instruction		,	J	, 0	, ,	· ·	
_	ommon Core shifts in literacy	Teachers	93	86.4	94.8	100.0	0.50	3.00
	ommon Core shifts in math	Teachers	96	83.3	93.1	100.0	0.75	4.00
С	ourse clarity	Students		84.3	92.7	100.0		
	uality of student discussion	Teachers	95	68.7	85.3	100.0	0.83	4.32
	n Results:		95%					3.76
Collal	porative Teachers							
С	ultural awareness:							
	Cultural awareness	Teachers	97	85.4	95.0	100.0	0.82	
	Cultural awareness	Parents	96	90.5	94.9	99.3	0.75	
	Cultural awareness	Students		68.6	87.4	100.0		
•	Cultural awareness	Combined	97				0.78	4.12
	iclusive classroom instruction	Teachers	98	84.2	94.6	100.0	0.87	4.48
	uality of professional development	Teachers	55	51.4	77.4	100.0	0.07	1.28
	chool commitment	Teachers	88	59.9	85.3	100.0	0.70	3.80
	novation	Teachers	94	70.3	86.7	100.0	0.81	4.24
• R	eflective dialogue	Teachers	100	87.9	95.9	100.0	1.00	4.99
	eer collaboration	Teachers	97	77.6	92.2	100.0	0.86	4.44
	ocus on student learning	Teachers	87	68.2	89.0	100.0	0.58	3.32
	ollective responsibility	Teachers	94	65.7	84.7	100.0	0.81	4.24
	n Results:		90%					3.88
			3676					
Suppo	ortive Environment afety:	Tarahan		00.0	04.5	400.0	0.00	
Suppo	ortive Environment afety: Safety	Teachers	98	80.0	94.6	100.0	0.90	
Suppo	ortive Environment afety: Safety Safety	Students	98	80.0 74.5	94.6 88.5	100.0 100.0		
Suppo Sa	ortive Environment afety: Safety Safety Safety						0.90	4.60
Suppo Sa	ortive Environment afety: Safety Safety Safety Safety Safety lassroom behavior:	Students Combined	98 98	74.5	88.5	100.0	0.90	
Suppo Sa	ortive Environment afety: Safety Safety Safety Safety Iassroom behavior: Classroom behavior	Students Combined Teachers	98	74.5 66.9	88.5 85.5	100.0		
Suppo Sa	Safety Safety Safety Safety Sassroom behavior: Classroom behavior	Students Combined Teachers Students	98 98 91	74.5	88.5	100.0	0.90 0.73	4.60
Suppo Sa C	Safety Safety Safety Sassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined	98 98 91	74.5 66.9 67.3	88.5 85.5 84.3	100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73	4.60 3.92
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Sassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior cocial-emotional measure	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers	98 98 91	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6	100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73	4.60
Suppo Sá Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Safety Ilassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior ocial-emotional measure eer interactions	Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students	98 98 91	74.5 66.9 67.3	88.5 85.5 84.3	100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73	4.60 3.92
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Sassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior cocial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers	98 98 91	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6	100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73	4.60 3.92
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Ilassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior erial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement:	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students	98 98 91 91 100	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00	4.60 3.92
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Ilassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior classroom behavior ecial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement: Press toward academic achievement	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Students Teachers	98 98 91	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73	4.60 3.92
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Itassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior classroom behavior extilementional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Teachers Students	98 98 91 91 100	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00	4.60 3.92 4.99
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Sassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior coial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement	Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Teachers Students Combined	98 98 91 91 100	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00	4.60 3.92 4.99
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Iassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior cocial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement ersonal attention and support	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Teachers Students	98 98 91 91 100	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00	4.60 3.92 4.99
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Itassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior cocial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement ersonal attention and support eer support for academic work:	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Teachers Students Combined Students	98 98 91 91 100 95	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00 0.79	4.60 3.92 4.99
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Safety Ilassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior coial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement ersonal attention and support eer support for academic work	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Teachers Students Combined Students Combined Students	98 98 91 91 100 95 95	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3 77.8	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00 0.79	4.60 3.92 4.99
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Iassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior coial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement ersonal attention and support eer support for academic work Peer support for academic work	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Teachers Students Combined Students Combined Students Teachers Parents	98 98 91 91 100 95	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3 77.8	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9 89.6	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5 100.0 100.0 100.0	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00 0.79	4.60 3.92
Suppo Sa Cl	Safety Safety Safety Safety Safety Ilassroom behavior: Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior Classroom behavior coial-emotional measure eer interactions ext-level guidance ress toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achievement ersonal attention and support eer support for academic work	Students Combined Teachers Students Combined Teachers Students Students Teachers Students Combined Students Combined Students	98 98 91 91 100 95 95	74.5 66.9 67.3 89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3 77.8	88.5 85.5 84.3 96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5	0.90 0.73 0.73 1.00 0.79	4.60 3.92 4.99

P.S. 035 Nathaniel Woodhull

				City Range			
		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Effective School Leadership							
 Inclusive principal leadership 	Parents	95	79.3	90.9	100.0	0.77	4.08
Teacher influence	Teachers	60	28.8	60.8	92.8	0.49	2.96
Program coherence	Teachers	77	60.0	85.2	100.0	0.43	2.72
Principal instructional leadership	Teachers	76	61.6	87.0	100.0	0.36	2.44
Section Results:		77%					3.04
Strong Family Community Ties							
Teacher outreach to parents:							
Teacher outreach to parents	Teachers	96	84.5	94.5	100.0	0.75	
Teacher outreach to parents	Parents	94	86.0	92.6	99.2	0.60	
Teacher outreach to parents	Combined	95				0.67	3.68
Parent involvement in the schools	Parents	74	62.4	76.6	90.8	0.40	2.60
Section Results:		85%					3.16
Trust							
 Parent-teacher trust 	Parents	96	90.9	95.3	99.7	0.75	4.00
 Parent-principal trust 	Parents	95	82.7	93.3	100.0	0.75	4.00
Student-teacher trust	Students		64.6	85.2	100.0		
Teacher-principal trust	Teachers	70	56.4	85.0	100.0	0.32	2.28
Teacher-teacher trust	Teachers	99	74.1	90.5	100.0	0.98	4.92
Section Results:		90%					3.80

Targets for 2015-16

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	2015-16 Targets						
	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target			
State Test Results - ELA*								
Average Student Proficiency	2.44	2.42 or lower	2.43 to 2.53	2.54 to 2.61	2.62 or higher			
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	1.94	1.97 or lower	1.98 to 2.10	2.11 to 2.19	2.20 or higher			
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	24.3%	22.5% or lower	22.6% to 28.0%	28.1% to 32.2%	32.3% or higher			
State Test Results - Math*								
Average Student Proficiency	2.71	2.63 or lower	2.64 to 2.78	2.79 to 2.90	2.91 or higher			
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	2.06	2.06 or lower	2.07 to 2.23	2.24 to 2.35	2.36 or higher			
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	37.4%	32.8% or lower	32.9% to 40.1%	40.2% to 45.6%	45.7% or higher			
MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	93.2%	87.1% or lower	87.2% to 90.4%	90.5% to 92.8%	92.9% or higher			
Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics*	2014-15		2015-16	Targets	gets			
	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target			
ELA - Average Proficiency Rating								
Self-Contained	1.75	1.73 or lower	1.74 to 1.82	1.83 to 1.89	1.90 or higher			
Integrated Co-Teaching	1.86	1.93 or lower	1.94 to 2.04	2.05 to 2.12	2.13 or higher			
SETSS		1.97 or lower	1.98 to 2.09	2.10 to 2.18	2.19 or higher			
ELL	2.12	2.14 or lower	2.15 to 2.27	2.28 to 2.38	2.39 or higher			
Lowest Third Citywide	1.95	1.95 or lower	1.96 to 2.02	2.03 to 2.07	2.08 or higher			
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	1.91	1.92 or lower	1.93 to 1.99	2.00 to 2.05	2.06 or higher			
Math - Average Proficiency Rating								
Self-Contained	1.90	1.93 or lower	1.94 to 2.07	2.08 to 2.18	2.19 or higher			
Integrated Co-Teaching	2.21	2.16 or lower	2.17 to 2.33	2.34 to 2.46	2.47 or higher			
SETSS		2.14 or lower	2.15 to 2.32	2.33 to 2.45	2.46 or higher			
ELL	2.30	2.34 or lower	2.35 to 2.54	2.55 to 2.69	2.70 or higher			
Lowest Third Citywide	2.13	1.99 or lower	2.00 to 2.07	2.08 to 2.13	2.14 or higher			
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	2.03	1.90 or lower	1.91 to 1.98	1.99 to 2.05	2.06 or higher			
ELL Progress	60.7%	46.7% or lower	46.8% to 56.6%	56.7% to 64.2%	64.3% or highe			

^{*}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 <u>and</u> 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	2015-16 Targets						
	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target			
Percentage of Students with 90%+ Attendance	75.6%	73.2% or lower	73.3% to 80.0%	80.1% to 85.2%	85.3% or higher			
Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments	0.15	0.14 or lower	0.15 to 0.23	0.24 to 0.29	0.30 or higher			