
### **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: Priority**

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

#### Note

In addition, an online version of the 2014-15 School Quality Guide, with additional features, can be found at <a href="http://schoolgualityreports.nyc">http://schoolgualityreports.nyc</a>

# **School Enrollment and Demographic Data**

## **Student Enrollment**

Grade	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
Grade 6	84	85	94
Grade 7	82	84	88
Grade 8	83	82	85
All students	249	251	267

# **Student Demographics**

	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
% English Language Learners	16%	15%	16%
% Free Lunch Eligible	88%	88%	88%
% Student with IEPs	24%	24%	26%
% Student with IEPs (less than 20% time)	10%	10%	9%
% HRA Eligible	-	70%	67%
% Temporary Housing	-	22%	20%
% Asian	1%	1%	1%
% Black	31%	28%	26%
% Hispanic	67%	69%	71%
% White	0%	1%	1%
% Other	0%	2%	1%
Average Incoming ELA Proficiency	2.59	2.27	2.26
Average Incoming Math Proficiency	2.93	2.43	2.37

## **Student Achievement Scoring Appendix**

Student Achievement Rating	Student Achievement Score
Meeting Target	3.26

Student Achievement Metrics		2014-15	Bottom of	Approaching	Meeting	Exceeding	Top of		
	n	School Value	Target Range	Target	Target	Target	Target Range	Metric Score	Weight Pct
State Test Results - ELA									
Average Student Proficiency	251	2.23	1.94	2.14	2.24	2.36	2.61	2.90	9.80%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	251	11.6%	1.1%	7.2%	11.6%	16.5%	24.7%	3.00	9.80%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	236	65.0	48.4	54.1	62.3	67.8	77.6	3.49	9.80%
<ul> <li>Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third</li> </ul>	81	84.0	64.2	69.7	77.6	82.8	92.2	4.13	9.80%
State Test Results - Math									
Average Student Proficiency	258	2.17	1.79	2.08	2.28	2.50	2.83	2.45	9.80%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	258	9.3%	0.0%	8.2%	14.3%	21.1%	30.6%	2.18	9.80%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	239	65.0	41.0	48.9	60.3	67.9	81.4	3.62	9.80%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	90	79.0	59.7	65.6	74.1	79.8	89.8	3.86	9.80%
Core Course Pass Rates									
ELA	257	76.7%	59.4%	71.2%	79.7%	89.2%	100.0%	2.65	1.96%
Math	257	79.0%	61.5%	72.5%	80.6%	89.7%	100.0%	2.80	1.96%
Science	257	88.7%	64.5%	74.6%	82.1%	90.5%	100.0%	3.79	1.96%
Social Studies	257	76.3%	58.0%	70.1%	78.9%	88.8%	100.0%	2.70	1.96%
O Percent of 8th Graders Earning HS Credit	83	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	15.8%	23.4%	34.1%	1.00	3.92%
9th Grade Adjusted Credit Accumulation of Former 8th Graders	73	78.0%	61.0%	71.0%	79.0%	88.0%	98.0%	2.88	9.80%
								Weighted Average Score	3.07

							014-15 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					. 0 0	. 0	. 0	. 0	0.00			
O Self-Contained	27	10.8%	56.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	1.3%	2.2%	1.00	0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	32	12.7%	69.8%	3.1%	0.0%	1.6%	3.2%	5.1%	8.4%	2.94	0.030	0.015
SETSS	2	0.8%	8.6%		0.0%	2.6%	5.2%	8.2%	13.6%		0.030	0.000
Math - Percent at Level 3 or 4												
O Self-Contained	27	10.5%	55.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	1.4%	2.3%	3.8%	1.00	0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	31	12.0%	66.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	4.8%	7.6%	12.6%	1.00	0.030	0.000
SETSS	2	0.8%	8.7%		0.0%	3.3%	6.6%	10.4%	17.2%		0.030	0.000
ELA - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
ELL	54	22.9%	51.2%	42.6%	17.2%	27.0%	36.6%	47.8%	68.0%	3.54	0.030	0.019
Lowest Third Citywide	123	52.1%	66.9%	56.9%	31.5%	39.4%	47.2%	56.3%	72.7%	4.04	0.030	0.023
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	68	28.8%	64.4%	54.4%	29.6%	38.0%	46.2%	55.9%	73.2%	3.85	0.030	0.021
• SC/ICT/SETSS	61	25.8%	62.0%	63.9%	35.0%	42.9%	50.8%	60.0%	76.4%	4.24	0.030	0.024
Math - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
ELL	58	24.3%	50.1%	34.5%	12.4%	22.8%	33.0%	45.0%	66.4%	3.13	0.030	0.016
Lowest Third Citywide	133	55.6%	68.4%	43.6%	24.4%	34.1%	43.7%	54.9%	75.0%	2.99	0.030	0.015
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	67	28.0%	62.9%	46.3%	24.1%	34.0%	43.7%	55.1%	75.5%	3.23	0.030	0.017
• SC/ICT/SETSS	60	25.1%	61.2%	53.3%	25.8%	34.5%	43.0%	53.1%	71.0%	4.01	0.030	0.023
ELL Progress	42	15.8%	43.8%	38.1%	11.3%	22.8%	34.2%	47.5%	71.3%	3.29	0.030	0.017
										CtAG Add	ditional Points	0.19
									Over	rall Student Achie	vement Score	3.26

<sup>•</sup> Filled circle indicates a metric rating of Exceeding Target (and a metric score of 4.00 or higher).

<sup>•</sup> 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

Fannie Lou Hamer Middle School

Quality Review 1.1 Quality Review 1.2 Quality Review 2.2	Proficient Proficient Proficient	3.40 3.40	22%
Quality Review 1.1 Quality Review 1.2	Proficient		22%
·		3.40	
Quality Review 2.2	Proficient	J. <del>4</del> U	22%
		3.40	22%
NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction	89%	3.60	34%
Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.48	
llaborative Teachers			
Quality Review 4.2	Proficient	3.40	50%
NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers	94%	4.20	50%
Tre School Survey - Collaborative Teachers	J470	4.20	3070
Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.80	
pportive Environment			
Quality Review 3.4	Proficient	3.40	30%
NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment	86%	3.40	35%
Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance			
EMS	80.1%	3.76	
HS			
Overall	80.1%	3.76	30%
Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive			
environments			
EMS	0.23	2.35	
HS			
Overall	0.23	2.35	5%
Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.44	
ective School Leadership			
NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership	93%	4.24	100%
Section Rating: Exceeding Target	Section Score:	4.24	
ong Family-Community Ties			
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties	80%	3.48	100%
Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.48	
NYC School Survey - Trust	94%	4.12	100%
NYC School Survey - Trust	J470	4.12	100%
Section Rating: Exceeding Target	Section Score:	4.12	



Fannie Lou Hamer Middle School

				City Range			
		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Rigorous Instruction			•	, ,		•	
Common Core shifts in literacy	Teachers	97	79.4	91.4	100.0	0.83	4.32
Common Core shifts in math	Teachers	77	68.9	87.1	100.0	0.26	2.04
Course clarity	Students	95	81.3	89.7	98.1	0.80	4.20
Quality of student discussion	Teachers	85	53.2	78.4	100.0	0.69	3.76
ection Results:		89%					3.60
ollaborative Teachers							
Cultural awareness:							
Cultural awareness	Teachers	95	84.5	94.1	100.0	0.75	
Cultural awareness	Parents	97	87.1	93.3	99.5	0.82	
Cultural awareness	Students	91	70.6	84.2	97.8	0.74	
Cultural awareness	Combined	94	70.0	02	37.0	0.77	4.08
Inclusive classroom instruction	Teachers	92	81.7	93.3	100.0	0.58	3.32
Quality of professional development	Teachers	86	54.0	77.4	100.0	0.70	3.80
School commitment	Teachers	90	59.7	84.3	100.0	0.75	4.00
<ul> <li>Innovation</li> </ul>	Teachers	97	65.8	85.2	100.0	0.91	4.64
Reflective dialogue	Teachers	95	86.6	95.8	100.0	0.75	4.00
Peer collaboration	Teachers	96	76.7	91.9	100.0	0.84	4.36
Focus on student learning	Teachers	98	68.4	88.4	100.0	0.94	4.76
Collective responsibility	Teachers	99	57.5	82.3	100.0	0.97	4.88
ection Results:		94%					4.20
upportive Environment Safety:							
Safety	Teachers						
Safety	Students	77	67.5	82.9	98.3	0.30	
Safety	Combined	77				0.30	2.20
Classroom behavior:							
Classroom behavior	Teachers						
Classroom behavior	Students	76	63.4	79.2	95.0	0.41	
Classroom behavior	Combined	76				0.41	2.64
Social-emotional measure	Teachers	99	84.7	95.3	100.0	0.94	4.76
Peer interactions	Students	82	67.5	80.7	93.9	0.56	3.24
Next-level guidance	Students	91	76.9	88.3	99.7	0.62	3.48
Press toward academic achievement:							
Press toward academic achievement	Teachers		00.6	00.0	0.7.0	0.00	
Press toward academic achievement	Students	90	80.6	88.2	95.8	0.63	
Press toward academic achievement	Combined	90		a		0.63	3.52
Personal attention and support	Students	91	74.1	85.5	96.9	0.73	3.92
Peer support for academic work:							
Peer support for academic work	Teachers	00	76.0	00.6	400.0	0.04	
Peer support for academic work	Parents	98	76.8	88.6	100.0	0.91	
Peer support for academic work	Students	62	48.0	66.6	85.2	0.38	2.50
Peer support for academic work	Combined	80				0.64	3.56
ection Results:		86%					3.40

12X286 Fannie Lou Hamer Middle School

		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Effective School Leadership							
Inclusive principal leadership	Parents	94	82.1	90.7	99.3	0.67	3.68
Teacher influence	Teachers	83	34.5	67.1	99.7	0.75	4.00
Program coherence	Teachers	98	60.8	85.2	100.0	0.96	4.84
Principal instructional leadership	Teachers	95	67.2	88.0	100.0	0.86	4.44
Section Results:		93%					4.24
Strong Family Community Ties							
Teacher outreach to parents:							
Teacher outreach to parents	Teachers	95	79.9	92.5	100.0	0.75	
Teacher outreach to parents	Parents	96	81.6	90.6	99.6	0.79	
<ul> <li>Teacher outreach to parents</li> </ul>	Combined	95				0.77	4.08
Parent involvement in the schools	Parents	65	47.1	66.3	85.5	0.46	2.84
Section Results:		80%					3.48
Trust							
Parent-teacher trust	Parents	97	88.9	94.3	99.7	0.79	4.16
Parent-principal trust	Parents	96	88.6	94.8	100.0	0.75	4.00
Student-teacher trust	Students	86	69.2	82.0	94.8	0.67	3.68
Teacher-principal trust	Teachers	93	63.2	87.4	100.0	0.82	4.28
Teacher-teacher trust	Teachers	97	74.2	90.6	100.0	0.88	4.52
Section Results:		94%					4.12

12X286

**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 Targe		
State Test Results - ELA*							
Average Student Proficiency	2.23	2.12 or lower	2.13 to 2.19	2.20 to 2.25	2.26 or higher		
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	1.88	1.81 or lower	1.82 to 1.90	1.91 to 1.99	2.00 or higher		
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	11.6%	6.0% or lower	6.1% to 9.9%	10.0% to 14.9%	15.0% or highe		
State Test Results - Math*							
Average Student Proficiency	2.17	2.04 or lower	2.05 to 2.17	2.18 to 2.27	2.28 or higher		
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	1.82	1.79 or lower	1.80 to 1.89	1.90 to 1.99	2.00 or higher		
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	9.3%	6.7% or lower	6.8% to 10.5%	10.6% to 14.9%	15.0% or highe		
Core Course Pass Rates							
ELA	76.7%	78.0% or lower	78.1% to 83.2%	83.3% to 87.4%	87.5% or highe		
Math	79.0%	78.9% or lower	79.0% to 83.9%	84.0% to 87.9%	88.0% or highe		
Science	88.7%	80.9% or lower	81.0% to 85.3%	85.4% to 89.0%	89.1% or highe		
Social Studies	76.3%	76.8% or lower	76.9% to 82.2%	82.3% to 86.6%	86.7% or highe		
Percent of 8th Graders Earning HS Credit	0.0%	8.0% or lower	8.1% to 12.6%	12.7% to 16.4%	16.5% or highe		
9th Grade Adjusted Credit Accumulation of Former 8th Graders	78.0%	75.9% or lower	76.0% to 79.9%	80.0% to 83.9%	84.0% or highe		
Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics*	2014-15	2015-16 Targets					
_	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Targe		
ELA - Average Proficiency Rating							
Self-Contained	1.80	1.74 or lower	1.75 to 1.81	1.82 to 1.89	1.90 or higher		
Integrated Co-Teaching	1.96	1.88 or lower	1.89 to 1.96	1.97 to 2.02	2.03 or higher		
SETSS		1.93 or lower	1.94 to 2.04	2.05 to 2.14	2.15 or higher		
ELL	2.05	1.93 or lower	1.94 to 2.04	2.05 to 2.14	2.15 or higher		
Lowest Third Citywide	1.95	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	1.90	1.85 or lower	1.86 to 1.90	1.91 to 1.99	2.00 or higher		
Math - Average Proficiency Rating							
Self-Contained	1.71	1.69 or lower	1.70 to 1.79	1.80 to 1.89	1.90 or higher		
Integrated Co-Teaching	1.91	1.80 or lower	1.81 to 1.92	1.93 to 2.02	2.03 or highe		
SETSS		1.83 or lower	1.84 to 1.98	1.99 to 2.11	2.12 or higher		
ELL	1.99	1.89 or lower	1.90 to 2.05	2.06 to 2.18	2.19 or higher		
Lowest Third Citywide	1.87	1.80 or lower	1.81 to 1.89	1.90 to 1.99	2.00 or highe		
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	1.85	1.79 or lower	1.80 to 1.89	1.90 to 1.99	2.00 or higher		
ELL Progress	38.1%	30.3% or lower	30.4% to 40.2%	40.3% to 48.2%	48.3% or highe		

<sup>\*</sup>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	2014-15 2015-16 Targets						
	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target			
Percentage of Students with 90%+ Attendance	80.1%	63.8% or lower	63.9% to 69.6%	69.7% to 74.4%	74.5% or higher			
Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments	0.23	0.20 or lower	0.21 to 0.32	0.33 to 0.41	0.42 or higher			

<sup>\*</sup> 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.