
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: N/A

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	80	79	87
Grade 1	87	84	85
Grade 2	90	84	85
Grade 3	85	82	84
Grade 4	83	86	83
Grade 5	-	82	88
Grade 6	-	-	90
All students	425	497	602

Student Demographics

	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
% English Language Learners	13%	11%	11%
% Free Lunch Eligible	51%	51%	47%
% Student with IEPs	17%	19%	18%
% Student with IEPs (less than 20% time)	0%	0%	0%
% HRA Eligible	-	39%	35%
% Temporary Housing	-	3%	4%
% Asian	14%	14%	16%
% Black	16%	15%	13%
% Hispanic	34%	35%	35%
% White	34%	32%	32%
% Other	2%	4%	4%

84Q321 Growing Up Green Charter School

Student Achievement Scoring Appendix

Student Achievement Rating	Student Achievement Score
Meeting Target	3.41

				2	2014-15 Target	s			
Student Achievement Metrics		2014-15	Bottom of	Approaching	Meeting	Exceeding	Top of		
Student Achievement Wethes	n	School Value	Target Range	Target	Target	Target	Target Range	Metric Score	Weight Pct
State Test Results - ELA									
Average Student Proficiency	340	2.67	2.26	2.54	2.69	2.87	3.11	2.87	9.09%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	340	32.1%	14.9%	27.9%	36.5%	46.2%	58.1%	2.49	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	241	63.0	48.2	55.9	62.6	67.3	78.5	3.09	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	83	66.0	57.7	65.0	71.4	75.8	86.6	2.16	9.09%
Early Grade Progress	84	2.23	1.11	1.70	2.14	2.45	3.23	3.29	9.09%
State Test Results - Math									
Average Student Proficiency	340	2.99	2.28	2.65	2.88	3.14	3.47	3.42	9.09%
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	340	50.6%	15.9%	32.6%	43.8%	56.5%	72.3%	3.54	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	242	63.0	41.6	52.5	61.9	68.4	84.0	3.17	9.09%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	86	70.0	50.7	60.3	68.7	74.5	88.5	3.22	9.09%
Early Grade Progress	84	2.58	0.95	1.85	2.54	3.03	4.26	3.08	9.09%
MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	73	100.0%	75.3%	82.2%	87.2%	92.9%	100.0%	4.99	9.09%
								Weighted Average Score	3.21

						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	2	0.6%	3.0%		0.0%	1.1%	1.9%	2.7%	4.6%		0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	26	7.6%	38.6%	3.8%	0.0%	3.7%	6.5%	9.3%	15.8%	2.04	0.030	0.008
• SETSS	39	11.5%	100.0%	17.9%	0.0%	3.5%	6.2%	8.9%	15.0%	4.99	0.030	0.030
Math - Percent at Level 3 or 4												
Self-Contained	2	0.6%	3.0%		0.0%	2.9%	5.2%	7.4%	12.6%		0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	26	7.6%	38.8%	15.4%	0.0%	7.2%	12.9%	18.4%	31.2%	3.45	0.030	0.018
• SETSS	39	11.5%	100.0%	20.5%	0.0%	6.6%	11.7%	16.8%	28.4%	4.32	0.030	0.025
ELA - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
ELL	32	13.3%	28.4%	31.3%	12.7%	26.0%	36.3%	46.4%	69.9%	2.51	0.030	0.011
Lowest Third Citywide	64	26.6%	37.4%	46.9%	28.0%	38.8%	47.1%	55.4%	74.4%	2.98	0.030	0.015
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	23	9.5%	24.1%	60.9%	23.6%	36.2%	45.9%	55.6%	77.8%		0.030	0.000
SC/ICT/SETSS	47	19.5%	44.7%	53.2%	22.0%	34.9%	44.8%	54.7%	77.4%	3.85	0.030	0.021
Math - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
• ELL	32	13.2%	27.1%	50.0%	7.8%	22.3%	33.5%	44.6%	70.2%	4.21	0.030	0.024
Lowest Third Citywide	51	21.1%	29.0%	43.1%	19.1%	32.5%	42.8%	53.1%	76.7%	3.03	0.030	0.015
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	23	9.5%	24.7%	34.8%	14.4%	29.5%	41.2%	52.8%	79.4%		0.030	0.000
SC/ICT/SETSS	47	19.4%	45.2%	38.3%	15.4%	29.5%	40.4%	51.3%	76.2%	2.81	0.030	0.014
ELL Progress	67	11.1%	28.2%	56.7%	31.6%	44.8%	55.1%	65.2%	88.6%	3.16	0.030	0.016
										CtAG Add	ditional Points	0.20
									Overa	all Student Achie	vement Score	3.41

[•] 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

Growing Up Green Charter School

84Q321

Quality Review 1.1 Quality Review 2.2 NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score:* Quality Review 2.2 Section Score:* Quality Review 4.2		Metric Value	Metric Score	Weight Pct
Quality Review 1.2 Quality Review 2.2 NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction 81% 1.84 100% Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.32 aborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.19 portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.27 3.20 HS Overall 0.27 3.20 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04	orous Instruction			
Quality Review 2.2 NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction 81% 1.84 1.00% Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score:* 2.32 aborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.19 portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall Movement Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 In Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04	Quality Review 1.1			
NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction 81% 1.84 100% Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score: 2.32 aborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.19 portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS Overall 0.27 3.20 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04	Quality Review 1.2			
Section Rating: Approaching Target Section Score:* 2.32 aborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.19 portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%	Quality Review 2.2			
Aborative Teachers Quality Review 4.2 NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.19 Portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall DOVERALL EMS Overall Overall Overall Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%	NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction	81%	1.84	100%
Quality Review 4.2 NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.19 Portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments 89% 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.20 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Citive School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 83% 3.56 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 90% 4.04 100% Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Score: 4.04	Section Rating: Approaching Target	Section Score:*	2.32	
NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.19 Portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04	aborative Teachers			
NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.88 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.19 Portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04	Quality Review 4.2			
portive Environment Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EN/S HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04	NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers	85%	2.88	100%
Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 93% 4.00 100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:*	3.19	
Quality Review 3.4 NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 93% 4.00 100%	noutive Envisorment			
NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 89% 3.20 95% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Se				
Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS HS Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 HS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: Sect	·	89%	3.20	95%
Overall Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS	Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS			
Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS				
environments EMS HS Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Ctive School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04				
EMS HS Overall O.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Citive School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04				
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 90% 4.04 100% Section Rating: Exceeding Target 93% 4.00 100%		0.27	3 20	
Overall 0.27 3.20 5% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score:* 3.50 Ctive School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 83% 3.56 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Ing Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 90% 4.04 100% Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Rating: Exceeding Target 93% 4.00 100%		0.27	3.20	
Ctive School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Ing Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Score: 4.04 Section Score: 4.04		0.27	3.20	5%
Active School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 Section Score: 4.04 Section Score: 4.04	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:*	3.50	
NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 83% 3.56 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 90% 4.04 100% Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 St NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%				
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.56 Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 90% 4.04 100% Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 St NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%		939/	2.55	4000/
Ong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 St NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%	NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership	83%	3.56	100%
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 90% 4.04 100% Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 St NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.56	
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 90% 4.04 100% Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.04 St NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%	ong Family-Community Ties			
st NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%		90%	4.04	100%
NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%	Section Rating: Exceeding Target	Section Score:	4.04	
NYC School Survey - Trust 93% 4.00 100%				
		020/	4.00	4000/
Section Rating: Exceeding Target Section Score: 4.00	NYC School Survey - Trust	93%	4.00	100%
	Section Rating: Exceeding Target	Section Score:	4.00	

^{*} These scores have been rescaled so that schools without Quality Review ratings are measured on a comparable scale to schools with Quality Review ratings.

Growing Up Green Charter School

	City Range						
		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
igorous Instruction							
 Common Core shifts in literacy 	Teachers	73	86.4	94.8	100.0	0.00	1.00
 Common Core shifts in math 	Teachers	82	83.3	93.1	100.0	0.00	1.00
Course clarity	Students	93	84.3	92.7	100.0	0.57	3.28
Quality of student discussion	Teachers	77	68.7	85.3	100.0	0.28	2.12
ection Results:		81%					1.84
Collaborative Teachers							
Cultural awareness:							
Cultural awareness	Teachers	83	85.4	95.0	100.0	0.00	
Cultural awareness	Parents	97	90.5	94.9	99.3	0.76	
Cultural awareness	Students	93	68.6	87.4	100.0	0.77	
Cultural awareness	Combined	91				0.51	3.04
Inclusive classroom instruction	Teachers	87	84.2	94.6	100.0	0.25	2.00
Quality of professional development	Teachers	66	51.4	77.4	100.0	0.30	2.20
School commitment	Teachers	89	59.9	85.3	100.0	0.73	3.92
Innovation	Teachers	83	70.3	86.7	100.0	0.42	2.68
Reflective dialogue	Teachers	85	87.9	95.9	100.0	0.25	2.00
Peer collaboration	Teachers	88	77.6	92.2	100.0	0.48	2.92
Focus on student learning	Teachers	92	68.2	89.0	100.0	0.74	3.96
Collective responsibility	Teachers	86	65.7	84.7	100.0	0.59	3.36
ection Results:		85%					2.88
upportive Environment Safety:							
Safety	Teachers	99	80.0	94.6	100.0	0.95	
Safety	Students	88	74.5	88.5	100.0	0.51	
Safety	Combined	93				0.73	3.92
Classroom behavior:							
Classroom behavior	Teachers	82	66.9	85.5	100.0	0.44	
Classroom behavior	Students	92	67.3	84.3	100.0	0.74	
Classroom behavior	Combined	87				0.59	3.36
Social-emotional measure	Teachers	94	89.0	96.6	100.0	0.50	3.00
Peer interactions	Students	83	68.2	84.8	100.0	0.48	2.92
Next-level guidance	Students						
Press toward academic achievement:							
Press toward academic achievement	Teachers	78	75.0	88.8	100.0	0.11	
Press toward academic achievement	Students	91	85.3	91.9	98.5	0.50	
Press toward academic achievement	Combined	85				0.31	2.24
Personal attention and support	Students	92	77.8	89.6	100.0	0.63	3.52
Peer support for academic work:							
Peer support for academic work	Teachers	90	76.5	91.5	100.0	0.57	
Peer support for academic work	Parents	97	88.4	94.8	100.0	0.77	
Peer support for academic work	Students	78	50.4	73.8	97.2	0.60	
Peer support for academic work	Combined	88				0.64	3.56
ection Results:		89%					3.20

84Q321

Framework Elements - Survey Scoring Appendix

			City Range				
		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Effective Cabaal Landowskin							
Effective School Leadership		0.5	70.0	00.0	100.0	0.75	4.00
Inclusive principal leadership	Parents	95	79.3	90.9	100.0	0.75	4.00
Teacher influence	Teachers	69	28.8	60.8	92.8	0.63	3.52
Program coherence	Teachers	87	60.0	85.2	100.0	0.67	3.68
Principal instructional leadership	Teachers	81	61.6	87.0	100.0	0.51	3.04
Section Results:		83%					3.56
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	96	86.0	92.6	99.2	0.77	
 Teacher outreach to parents 	Combined	96				0.76	4.04
 Parent involvement in the schools 	Parents	84	62.4	76.6	90.8	0.76	4.04
Section Results:		90%					4.04
Turnet							
Trust	_						
Parent-teacher trust	Parents	97	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	85	64.6	85.2	100.0	0.57	3.28
 Teacher-principal trust 	Teachers	90	56.4	85.0	100.0	0.78	4.12
Teacher-teacher trust	Teachers	98	74.1	90.5	100.0	0.91	4.64
Section Results:		93%					4.00

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.

State Test Results - ELA*	eeding Target 82 or higher 24 or higher 1% or higher 07 or higher 35 or higher 3% or higher							
Average Student Proficiency	24 or higher 1% or higher 07 or higher 35 or higher 3% or higher							
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third 2.05 2.02 or lower 2.03 to 2.14 2.15 to 2.23 2. Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 32.1% 32.1% 32.4% or lower 32.5% to 37.9% 38.0% to 42.0% 42 32.1% 32.4% or lower 32.5% to 37.9% 38.0% to 42.0% 42 32.4% or lower 32.5% to 37.9% 38.0% to 42.0% 42 32.4% or lower 32.5% to 37.9% 38.0% to 42.0% 42 32.4% or lower 42.80 to 2.95 2.96 to 3.06 3. Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third 2.26 2.04 or lower 2.05 to 2.21 2.22 to 2.34 2. Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 50.6% 40.5% or lower 40.6% to 47.7% 47.8% to 53.2% 53 40.5% or lower 40.6% to 47.7% 53 40.5% 53 40.5% 53 40.5% or lower 40.6% to 47.7% 53 40.5% 53 40.5% 53 40.5% 53 40.5	24 or higher 1% or higher 07 or higher 35 or higher 3% or higher							
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 32.1% 32.4% or lower 32.5% to 37.9% 38.0% to 42.0% 42.2%	1% or higher 07 or higher 35 or higher 3% or higher							
State Test Results - Math* Average Student Proficiency	07 or higher 35 or higher 3% or higher							
Average Student Proficiency Average Student Proficiency Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third 2.26 2.04 or lower 2.05 to 2.21 2.22 to 2.34 2. Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 50.6% 40.5% or lower 40.6% to 47.7% 47.8% to 53.2% 53 MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students 100.0% 87.4% or lower 87.5% to 90.6% 90.7% to 93.0% 93 Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics* 2014-15 School Value Not Meeting Target Approaching Target Meeting Target ELA - Average Proficiency Rating Self-Contained 1.70 or lower 1.71 to 1.79 1.80 to 1.89 1. Integrated Co-Teaching 2.08 2.02 or lower 2.03 to 2.13 2.14 to 2.21 2. SETSS 2.36 2.05 or lower 2.06 to 2.17 2.18 to 2.26 2. ELL Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.95 to lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.03 to 2.07 2.	35 or higher 3% or higher							
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third 2.26 2.04 or lower 4.05 to 2.21 2.22 to 2.34 2. Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 50.6% 40.5% or lower 40.6% to 47.7% 47.8% to 53.2% 53 MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students 100.0% 87.4% or lower 87.5% to 90.6% 90.7% to 93.0% 93 Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics* 2014-15 2015-16 Targets School Value Not Meeting Target Approaching Target Meeting Target Exception Exception Self-Contained 1.70 or lower 1.71 to 1.79 1.80 to 1.89 1. Integrated Co-Teaching 2.08 2.02 or lower 2.03 to 2.13 2.14 to 2.21 2. SETSS 2.36 2.05 or lower 2.06 to 2.17 2.18 to 2.26 2. ELL 2.34 2.30 or lower 2.31 to 2.44 2.45 to 2.54 2. Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.07 2.	35 or higher 3% or higher							
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 50.6% 40.5% or lower 40.6% to 47.7% 47.8% to 53.2% 53	3% or higher							
MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students 100.0% 87.4% or lower 87.5% to 90.6% 90.7% to 93.0% 93.0% 93.0%	· ·							
Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics* 2014-15 School Value Not Meeting Target Approaching Target Meeting Target Exception	1% or higher							
School Value Not Meeting Target Approaching Target Meeting Target Exception Self-Contained 1.70 or lower 1.71 to 1.79 1.80 to 1.89 1.71 to 2.79 1.80 to 2.19 1.71 to 2.21 2.72 to 2.72 2.73 to 2.13 2.14 to 2.21 2.72 to 2.18 to 2.26 2.73 to 2.17 2.18 to 2.26 2.73 to 2.24 2.25 to 2.54 2.73 to 2.24 2.25 to 2.27	1/0 OI IIIBIICI							
ELA - Average Proficiency Rating Self-Contained 1.70 or lower 1.71 to 1.79 1.80 to 1.89 1.71 to 1.79 Integrated Co-Teaching 2.08 2.02 or lower 2.03 to 2.13 2.14 to 2.21 2.71 SETSS 2.36 2.05 or lower 2.06 to 2.17 2.18 to 2.26 2.71 ELL 2.34 2.30 or lower 2.31 to 2.44 2.45 to 2.54 2.71 Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.07 2.03 to 2.07								
Self-Contained 1.70 or lower 1.71 to 1.79 1.80 to 1.89 1. Integrated Co-Teaching 2.08 2.02 or lower 2.03 to 2.13 2.14 to 2.21 2. SETSS 2.36 2.05 or lower 2.06 to 2.17 2.18 to 2.26 2. ELL 2.34 2.30 or lower 2.31 to 2.44 2.45 to 2.54 2. Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.07 2.	eeding Target							
Integrated Co-Teaching 2.08 2.02 or lower 2.03 to 2.13 2.14 to 2.21 2.5 SETSS 2.36 2.05 or lower 2.06 to 2.17 2.18 to 2.26 2.5 ELL 2.34 2.30 or lower 2.31 to 2.44 2.45 to 2.54 2.5 Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.07 2.03								
SETSS 2.36 2.05 or lower 2.06 to 2.17 2.18 to 2.26 2. ELL 2.34 2.30 or lower 2.31 to 2.44 2.45 to 2.54 2. Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.07 2.	90 or higher							
ELL 2.34 2.30 or lower 2.31 to 2.44 2.45 to 2.54 2. Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.07 2.	22 or higher							
Lowest Third Citywide 2.04 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.02 2.03 to 2.07 2.	27 or higher							
,	55 or higher							
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide 2.05 1.91 or lower 1.92 to 1.99 2.00 to 2.04 2.	08 or higher							
	05 or higher							
Math - Average Proficiency Rating								
Self-Contained 1.71 or lower 1.72 to 1.85 1.86 to 1.96 1.	97 or higher							
Integrated Co-Teaching 2.24 2.15 or lower 2.16 to 2.32 2.33 to 2.45 2.	46 or higher							
SETSS 2.48 2.13 or lower 2.14 to 2.31 2.32 to 2.44 2.	45 or higher							
ELL 2.62 2.49 or lower 2.50 to 2.68 2.69 to 2.83 2.	84 or higher							
Lowest Third Citywide 2.10 1.95 or lower 1.96 to 2.03 2.04 to 2.09 2.	10 or higher							
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide 2.00 1.91 or lower 1.92 to 2.00 2.01 to 2.07 2.								
ELL Progress 56.7% 44.9% or lower 45.0% to 54.8% 54.9% to 62.4% 62	08 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 <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		80.3% or lower	80.4% to 85.3%	85.4% to 89.1%	89.2% or higher				
Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments	0.27	0.09 or lower	0.10 to 0.14	0.15 to 0.19	0.20 or higher				