
### **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: Local Assistance Plan

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://schoolqualityreports.nyc">http://schoolqualityreports.nyc</a>

**School Enrollment and Demographic Data** 

## **Student Enrollment**

Grade	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
Kindergarten	143	133	119
Grade 1	122	134	119
Grade 2	120	128	128
Grade 3	104	123	127
Grade 4	125	103	113
Grade 5	135	123	100
All students	784	777	739

# **Student Demographics**

	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
% English Language Learners	23%	21%	21%
% Free Lunch Eligible	72%	72%	72%
% Student with IEPs	17%	17%	18%
% Student with IEPs (less than 20% time)	8%	5%	7%
% HRA Eligible	-	61%	55%
% Temporary Housing	-	7%	8%
% Asian	3%	4%	4%
% Black	4%	4%	4%
% Hispanic	83%	82%	81%
% White	10%	9%	10%
% Other	0%	1%	1%

## **Student Achievement Scoring Appendix**

24Q068 P.S. 068 Cambridge

Student Achievement Rating	Student Achievement Score
Meeting Target	3.77

				2	014-15 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	318	2.43	2.06	2.29	2.44	2.60	2.86	2.93	9.09%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	318	24.2%	6.3%	16.5%	23.3%	30.9%	42.4%	3.12	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	188	70.0	48.1	55.3	61.6	66.0	76.5	4.38	9.09%
<ul> <li>Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third</li> </ul>	65	80.0	58.0	65.8	72.5	77.3	88.6	4.24	9.09%
Early Grade Progress	117	2.01	0.59	1.31	1.92	2.36	3.39	3.20	9.09%
State Test Results - Math									
Average Student Proficiency	320	2.59	2.04	2.39	2.62	2.89	3.26	2.87	9.09%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	320	31.3%	4.1%	19.9%	31.1%	43.8%	60.4%	3.02	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	194	78.5	40.1	50.9	60.2	66.7	82.2	4.76	9.09%
<ul> <li>Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third</li> </ul>	70	83.5	55.2	63.8	71.2	76.3	88.6	4.59	9.09%
Early Grade Progress	116	1.78	0.32	1.51	2.54	3.26	4.98	2.26	9.09%
MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	109	90.1%	75.2%	82.2%	87.2%	92.9%	100.0%	3.51	9.09%
								Weighted Average Score	3.53

						_						
							014-15 Target		_			
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 0.			
O Self-Contained	21	6.6%	32.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.9%	2.7%	4.6%	1.00	0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	29	9.1%	46.2%	3.4%	0.0%	3.7%	6.5%	9.3%	15.8%	1.92	0.030	0.007
SETSS	5	1.6%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	6.2%	8.9%	15.0%		0.030	0.000
Math - Percent at Level 3 or 4												
<ul> <li>Self-Contained</li> </ul>	21	6.6%	32.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	5.2%	7.4%	12.6%	1.00	0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	28	8.8%	44.9%	17.9%	0.0%	7.2%	12.9%	18.4%	31.2%	3.91	0.030	0.022
SETSS	5	1.6%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	11.7%	16.8%	28.4%		0.030	0.000
ELA - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
ELL	63	33.5%	71.6%	39.7%	12.7%	26.0%	36.3%	46.4%	69.9%	3.34	0.030	0.018
<ul> <li>Lowest Third Citywide</li> </ul>	71	37.8%	54.2%	56.3%	28.0%	38.8%	47.1%	55.4%	74.4%	4.05	0.030	0.023
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	32	17.0%	43.0%	62.5%	23.6%	36.2%	45.9%	55.6%	77.8%	4.31	0.030	0.025
• SC/ICT/SETSS	28	14.9%	31.5%	64.3%	22.0%	34.9%	44.8%	54.7%	77.4%	4.42	0.030	0.026
Math - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
• ELL	70	36.1%	74.1%	65.7%	7.8%	22.3%	33.5%	44.6%	70.2%	4.82	0.030	0.029
<ul> <li>Lowest Third Citywide</li> </ul>	73	37.6%	51.6%	65.8%	19.1%	32.5%	42.8%	53.1%	76.7%	4.54	0.030	0.027
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	26	13.4%	34.9%	53.8%	14.4%	29.5%	41.2%	52.8%	79.4%	4.04	0.030	0.023
• SC/ICT/SETSS	27	13.9%	29.4%	55.6%	15.4%	29.5%	40.4%	51.3%	76.2%	4.17	0.030	0.024
ELL Progress	144	20.4%	51.8%	50.7%	31.6%	44.8%	55.1%	65.2%	88.6%	2.57	0.030	0.012
										CtAG Add	ditional Points	0.24
									Overa	II Student Achie	vement Score	3.77

<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

P.S. 068 Cambridge

24Q068

		Metric Value	Metric Score	Weight Pct
Quality Review 1.1	gorous Instruction			
Quality Review 1.2	_	Proficient	3.40	22%
NYC School Survey - Rigorous instruction   86%   2.36   34%	·	Proficient	3.40	22%
Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.72    Comparison of	Quality Review 2.2	Developing	2.00	22%
Oullaborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 84% 2.80 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.12  Ipportive Environment Quality Review 3.4 Proficient 3.40 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 91% 3.52 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 79.6% 2.96 MS 2.96 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 2.88  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16	NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction	86%	2.36	34%
Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 84% 2.80 50% 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.12    Image: Representation of the proficient and the proficient survey - Collaborative Teachers	Section Rating: Approaching Target	Section Score:	2.72	
Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 84% 2.80 50% 50% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.12    Image: Comparison of Survey - Collaborative Teachers	ollahorative Teachers			
NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 84% 2.80 50%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.12  Ipportive Environment Quality Review 3.4 Proficient 3.40 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 91% 3.52 35% Percentage of Students with 90%+ attendance EMS 79.6% 2.96 HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 75% 2.88 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  FOOL Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  FOOL Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  FOOL Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16		Proficient	3.40	50%
Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.12  Ipportive Environment Quality Review 3.4 Proficient 3.40 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 91% 3.52 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 79.6% 2.96 HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  TONG Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 78% 2.16 100% Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16	·			
Apportive Environment  Quality Review 3.4 Proficient 3.40 30%  NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 91% 3.52 35%  Percentage of Students with 90%+ attendance  EMS HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS Overall 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  TOUS Chool Survey - Effective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%	The Sensor Survey Conditional Federicis	0.170	2.00	3070
Quality Review 3.4 Proficient 3.40 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 91% 3.52 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 79.6% 2.96 HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.14 2.00 5% Overall 0.14 2.00 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.12	
Quality Review 3.4 Proficient 3.40 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 91% 3.52 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 79.6% 2.96 HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30% Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.14 2.00 5% Overall 0.14 2.00 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24				
NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 91% 3.52 35%  Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance  EMS HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.56 100%	pportive Environment			
Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance  EMS HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS Overall 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%	·	Proficient	3.40	30%
EMS 79.6% 2.96 HS Overall 79.6% 2.96 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 75% 2.88 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  Frong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16	NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment	91%	3.52	35%
Overall 79.6% 2.96 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS 0.14 2.00 5%  HS 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 2.88 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  FOR Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16				
Overall 79.6% 2.96 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS EMS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 75% 2.88 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  rong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16		79.6%	2.96	
Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  rrong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  rust NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%				
environments  EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 75% 2.88 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  rong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  ust NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%		79.6%	2.96	30%
EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Tong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  Ust NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%				
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Trust NYC School Survey - Trust NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%				
Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.24  Ffective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 75% 2.88 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  Frong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  Fust NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%		0.14	2.00	
Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.24  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership  Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.88  Frong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.16  Section Score: 2.16  Fust NYC School Survey - Trust  89% 3.56 100%		0.14	2.00	F0/
Fective School Leadership  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership  Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.88  Frong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties  Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.16  Fust  NYC School Survey - Trust  89%  3.56  100%	Overall	0.14	2.00	5%
fective School Leadership  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership  Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.88  rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties  Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.16  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust  89%  3.56  100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.24	
NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 75% 2.88 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.88  Trong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%				
Section Rating: Approaching Target  Frong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties  Section Rating: Approaching Target  Section Score: 2.16  Ust  NYC School Survey - Trust  89%  3.56  100%	fective School Leadership			
rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%	NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership	75%	2.88	100%
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%	Section Rating: Approaching Target	Section Score:	2.88	
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  Fust  NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%				
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 78% 2.16 100%  Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.16  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%	rong Family-Community Ties			
rust  NYC School Survey - Trust  89% 3.56 100%		78%	2.16	100%
rust  NYC School Survey - Trust  89% 3.56 100%				
NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%	Section Rating: Approaching Target	Section Score:	2.16	
NYC School Survey - Trust 89% 3.56 100%	<u> </u>			
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56		89%	3.56	100%
Section nating. Wiceting range: Section Store. 3.30	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score	3 56	
	Section Ruting. Meeting raiget	Jection Jone.	3.30	

Framework Elements - Survey Scoring Appendix

P.S. 068 Cambridge

		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Range City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Rigorous Instruction			•	, ,		•	
Common Core shifts in literacy	Teachers	89	86.4	94.8	100.0	0.25	2.00
Common Core shifts in math	Teachers	90	83.3	93.1	100.0	0.50	3.00
Course clarity	Students		84.3	92.7	100.0		
Quality of student discussion	Teachers	78	68.7	85.3	100.0	0.28	2.12
Section Results:		86%					2.36
Collaborative Teachers							
Cultural awareness:							
Cultural awareness	Teachers	90	85.4	95.0	100.0	0.50	
Cultural awareness	Parents	96	90.5	94.9	99.3	0.75	
Cultural awareness	Students	30	68.6	87.4	100.0	0.75	
Cultural awareness	Combined	93	00.0	07.4	100.0	0.63	3.52
Inclusive classroom instruction	Teachers	94	84.2	94.6	100.0	0.59	3.36
Quality of professional development	Teachers	69	51.4	77.4	100.0	0.36	2.44
School commitment	Teachers	76	59.9	85.3	100.0	0.41	2.44
Innovation	Teachers	81	70.3	86.7	100.0	0.35	2.40
Reflective dialogue	Teachers	94	87.9	95.9	100.0	0.50	3.00
Peer collaboration	Teachers	88	77.6	92.2	100.0	0.46	2.84
Focus on student learning	Teachers	81	68.2	89.0	100.0	0.40	2.60
Collective responsibility	Teachers	77	65.7	84.7	100.0	0.32	2.28
ection Results:	reactiers	84%	05.7	04.7	100.0	0.32	2.20
upportive Environment Safety:							
Safety	Teachers	93	80.0	94.6	100.0	0.65	
Safety	Students		74.5	88.5	100.0		
Safety	Combined	93				0.65	3.60
Classroom behavior:							
Classroom behavior	Teachers	83	66.9	85.5	100.0	0.49	
Classroom behavior	Students		67.3	84.3	100.0		
Classroom behavior	Combined	83				0.49	2.96
Social-emotional measure	Teachers	96	89.0	96.6	100.0	0.75	4.00
Peer interactions	Students		68.2	84.8	100.0		
Next-level guidance	Students						
Press toward academic achievement:							
Press toward academic achievement	Teachers	90	75.0	88.8	100.0	0.59	
Press toward academic achievement	Students		85.3	91.9	98.5		
Press toward academic achievement	Combined	90				0.59	3.36
Personal attention and support	Students		77.8	89.6	100.0		
Peer support for academic work:							
Peer support for academic work	Teachers	90	76.5	91.5	100.0	0.55	
Peer support for academic work	Parents	96	88.4	94.8	100.0	0.75	
Peer support for academic work	Students		50.4	73.8	97.2		
Peer support for academic work	Combined	93				0.65	3.60
Section Results:		91%					3.52

Framework Elements - Survey Scoring Appendix

			City Range				
		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Effective School Leadership							
Inclusive principal leadership	Parents	92	79.3	90.9	100.0	0.63	3.52
Teacher influence	Teachers	47	28.8	60.8	92.8	0.28	2.12
Program coherence	Teachers	78	60.0	85.2	100.0	0.44	2.76
Principal instructional leadership	Teachers	82	61.6	87.0	100.0	0.54	3.16
Section Results:		75%					2.88
Strong Family Community Ties							
Teacher outreach to parents:							
Teacher outreach to parents	Teachers	88	84.5	94.5	100.0	0.25	
Teacher outreach to parents	Parents	95	86.0	92.6	99.2	0.75	
Teacher outreach to parents	Combined	91				0.50	3.00
<ul> <li>Parent involvement in the schools</li> </ul>	Parents	64	62.4	76.6	90.8	0.07	1.28
Section Results:		78%					2.16
Trust							
Parent-teacher trust	Parents	96	90.9	95.3	99.7	0.75	4.00
Parent-principal trust	Parents	96	82.7	93.3	100.0	0.79	4.16
Student-teacher trust	Students		64.6	85.2	100.0		
Teacher-principal trust	Teachers	78	56.4	85.0	100.0	0.50	3.00
Teacher-teacher trust	Teachers	87	74.1	90.5	100.0	0.50	3.00
Section Results:		89%					3.56

Targets for 2015-16 P.S. 068 Cambridge

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	2.43	2.33 or lower	2.34 to 2.44	2.45 to 2.51	2.52 or higher			
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	2.03	1.87 or lower	1.88 to 2.00	2.01 to 2.09	2.10 or higher			
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	24.2%	19.1% or lower	19.2% to 24.6%	24.7% to 28.8%	28.9% or highe			
State Test Results - Math*								
Average Student Proficiency	2.59	2.49 or lower	2.50 to 2.64	2.65 to 2.76	2.77 or higher			
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	2.06	1.88 or lower	1.89 to 2.05	2.06 to 2.18	2.19 or higher			
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	31.3%	25.9% or lower	26.0% to 33.1%	33.2% to 38.6%	38.7% or highe			
MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	90.1%	87.2% or lower	87.3% to 90.5%	90.6% to 92.9%	93.0% or highe			
Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics*	2014-15		2015-16	Targets				
	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target			
ELA - Average Proficiency Rating								
Self-Contained	1.76	1.72 or lower	1.73 to 1.81	1.82 to 1.89	1.90 or higher			
Integrated Co-Teaching	1.94	1.96 or lower	1.97 to 2.07	2.08 to 2.15	2.16 or higher			
SETSS	1.94	1.93 or lower	1.94 to 2.05	2.06 to 2.15	2.16 or higher			
ELL	2.22	2.09 or lower	2.10 to 2.23	2.24 to 2.33	2.34 or higher			
Lowest Third Citywide	2.04	1.88 or lower	1.89 to 1.95	1.96 to 2.00	2.01 or higher			
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	2.00	1.82 or lower	1.83 to 1.89	1.90 to 1.99	2.00 or higher			
Math - Average Proficiency Rating								
Self-Contained	1.87	1.86 or lower	1.87 to 2.00	2.01 to 2.11	2.12 or higher			
Integrated Co-Teaching	2.24	2.13 or lower	2.14 to 2.30	2.31 to 2.43	2.44 or higher			
SETSS	1.87	2.06 or lower	2.07 to 2.24	2.25 to 2.37	2.38 or higher			
ELL	2.36	2.32 or lower	2.33 to 2.51	2.52 to 2.66	2.67 or higher			
Lowest Third Citywide	2.07	1.89 or lower	1.90 to 1.97	1.98 to 2.03	2.04 or higher			
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	2.01	1.86 or lower	1.87 to 1.95	1.96 to 2.01	2.02 or higher			
ELL Progress	50.7%	46.1% or lower	46.2% to 56.0%	56.1% to 63.6%	63.7% 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	2015-16 Targets						
	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target			
Percentage of Students with 90%+ Attendance	79.6%	75.6% or lower	75.7% to 81.8%	81.9% to 86.5%	86.6% or higher			
Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments	0.14	0.14 or lower	0.15 to 0.23	0.24 to 0.29	0.30 or higher			