
#### **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: <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>

# 2014-15 School Quality Guide / ES

**School Enrollment and Demographic Data** 

## **Student Enrollment**

Grade	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
Kindergarten	90	54	70
Grade 1	80	94	77
Grade 2	84	64	67
Grade 3	94	82	70
Grade 4	108	92	82
Grade 5	75	92	77
All students	567	532	515

# **Student Demographics**

	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015
% English Language Learners	2%	3%	2%
% Free Lunch Eligible	73%	73%	72%
% Student with IEPs	15%	14%	15%
% Student with IEPs (less than 20% time)	7%	6%	4%
% HRA Eligible	-	47%	46%
% Temporary Housing	-	8%	8%
% Asian	2%	1%	1%
% Black	91%	91%	92%
% Hispanic	5%	5%	5%
% White	2%	1%	1%
% Other	0%	1%	1%

18K279

## **Student Achievement Scoring Appendix**

Student Achievement Rating	Student Achievement Score
Meeting Target	3.38

		2014-15 Targets								
9	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
S	itate Test Results - ELA									
	Average Student Proficiency	220	2.46	1.99	2.30	2.51	2.75	3.06	2.76	9.09%
	Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	220	21.8%	0.5%	15.9%	27.0%	39.6%	55.4%	2.53	9.09%
	Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	144	65.0	47.2	54.9	61.6	66.2	77.3	3.74	9.09%
•	Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	54	80.0	57.2	65.2	72.1	77.0	88.7	4.26	9.09%
	Early Grade Progress	66	1.74	0.45	1.29	2.03	2.54	3.77	2.61	9.09%
S	itate Test Results - Math									
	Average Student Proficiency	222	2.49	1.85	2.34	2.69	3.09	3.59	2.43	9.09%
	Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	222	25.7%	0.0%	20.4%	35.0%	51.7%	72.6%	2.36	9.09%
•	Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	144	68.5	35.6	49.0	60.5	68.5	87.8	4.00	9.09%
•	Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	51	81.0	47.6	59.4	69.4	76.4	93.2	4.27	9.09%
	Early Grade Progress	68	1.75	0.02	1.51	2.81	3.71	5.91	2.18	9.09%
• N	AS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	80	94.3%	67.7%	77.2%	83.6%	90.9%	100.0%	4.37	9.09%
									Weighted Average Score	3.23

						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	11	5.0%	24.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.9%	2.7%	4.6%		0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	2	0.9%	4.6%		0.0%	3.7%	6.5%	9.3%	15.8%		0.030	0.000
o SETSS	19	8.6%	81.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	6.2%	8.9%	15.0%	1.00	0.030	0.000
Math - Percent at Level 3 or 4												
Self-Contained	11	5.0%	24.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	5.2%	7.4%	12.6%		0.030	0.000
Integrated Co-Teaching	2	0.9%	4.6%		0.0%	7.2%	12.9%	18.4%	31.2%		0.030	0.000
o SETSS	19	8.6%	82.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	11.7%	16.8%	28.4%	1.00	0.030	0.000
ELA - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
ELL	10	6.9%	14.7%	40.0%	12.7%	26.0%	36.3%	46.4%	69.9%		0.030	0.000
Lowest Third Citywide	50	34.7%	49.6%	58.0%	28.0%	38.8%	47.1%	55.4%	74.4%	4.14	0.030	0.024
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	35	24.3%	61.5%	57.1%	23.6%	36.2%	45.9%	55.6%	77.8%	4.07	0.030	0.023
SC/ICT/SETSS	25	17.4%	38.7%	52.0%	22.0%	34.9%	44.8%	54.7%	77.4%	3.73	0.030	0.021
Math - Percent at 75th+ Growth Percentile												
ELL	11	7.6%	15.6%	36.4%	7.8%	22.3%	33.5%	44.6%	70.2%		0.030	0.000
Lowest Third Citywide	65	45.1%	62.0%	56.9%	19.1%	32.5%	42.8%	53.1%	76.7%	4.16	0.030	0.024
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	41	28.5%	74.2%	58.5%	14.4%	29.5%	41.2%	52.8%	79.4%	4.21	0.030	0.024
• SC/ICT/SETSS	25	17.4%	39.5%	80.0%	15.4%	29.5%	40.4%	51.3%	76.2%	4.99	0.030	0.030
ELL Progress	8	1.8%	4.6%	87.5%	31.6%	44.8%	55.1%	65.2%	88.6%		0.030	0.000
										CtAG Add	ditional Points	0.15
									Overa	all Student Achie	vement Score	3.38

<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

18K279

P.S. 279 Herman Schreiber

Proficient   Proficient   Proficient   3.40   22%		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 88% 2.48 34%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.08  Section Rating: Meeting Target Proficient 3.40 50%  NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.92 50%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16  Ipportive Environment  Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30%  NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35%  Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 3.20 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS 0.14 2.00 5%  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Fetcive School Leadership  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Forg Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72	·	Proficient	3.40	22%
Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.08    Section Rating: Meeting Target   Section Score: 3.40   S0%     NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers   85%   2.92   S0%     Section Rating: Meeting Target   Section Score: 3.16    Ipportive Environment   Quality Review 3.4   Well Developed   4.99   3.0%     NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment   87%   2.96   35%     NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment   87%   2.96   35%     Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance   EMS   82.3%   3.20   3.0%     Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive   environments   EMS   0.14   2.00   SM     HS   SOverall   0.14   2.00   5%     Section Rating: Meeting Target   Section Score: 3.60      Section Rating: Meeting Target   Section Score: 3.20     Trong Family-Community Ties   Section Score: 3.72   100%     Section Rating: Meeting Target   Section Score: 3.72   100%     Section Rating: Meeting Target   Section Score: 3.72   100%	Quality Review 2.2	Proficient	3.40	22%
Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% INTERPRETATION OF Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16  IMPORTIVE Environment Well Developed 4.99 30% INTERPRETATION OF SECTION SURVEY - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 3.20 3.20 Section Students with 90%+ attendance EMS 3.20 3.20 Section 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: 3.60  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Fective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72	NYC School Survey - Rigorous Instruction	88%	2.48	34%
Quality Review 4.2 Proficient 3.40 50% INTERPRETATION OF Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16  IMPORTIVE Environment Well Developed 4.99 30% INTERPRETATION OF SECTION SURVEY - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 3.20 3.20 Section Students with 90%+ attendance EMS 3.20 3.20 Section 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: 3.60  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Fective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72				
Quality Review 4.2	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.08	
NYC School Survey - Collaborative Teachers 85% 2.92 50%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.16  Ipportive Environment Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 82.3% 3.20 HS Overall 82.3% 3.20 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments EMS 0.14 2.00 SECTION Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.60  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Fong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72	llaborative Teachers			
Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  Section Score:	Quality Review 4.2	Proficient	3.40	50%
Importive Environment Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 82.3% 3.20 HS Overall 82.3% 3.20 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: 3.60  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Trong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  WELL School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%	·	85%	2.92	50%
Importive Environment Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 82.3% 3.20 HS Overall 82.3% 3.20 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: 3.60  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Trong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  WELL School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%				
Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 82.3% 3.20 SCHOOL 88.23% 3.20 SCHOOL	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.16	
Quality Review 3.4 Well Developed 4.99 30% NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35% Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance EMS 82.3% 3.20 SCHOOL 88.23% 3.20 SCHOOL				
NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment 87% 2.96 35%  Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance  EMS HS Overall 82.3% 3.20 30%  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.60  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72	pportive Environment			
Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance  EM/S  Overall  82.3%  3.20  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EM/S  Overall  0.14  2.00  5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.60  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.20  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.72	Quality Review 3.4	Well Developed	4.99	30%
EMS HS Overall 82.3% 3.20 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: 3.60  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Formally-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Formally-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Formally-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Score: 3.72	NYC School Survey - Supportive Environment	87%	2.96	35%
HS Overall  Overall  Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS	Percentage of students with 90%+ attendance			
Overall 82.3% 3.20 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: 3.60  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Frong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Forg Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72	EMS	82.3%	3.20	
Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments  EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.60  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Frong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72	HS			
environments  EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.60  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  rong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  ust NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%		82.3%	3.20	30%
EMS HS Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.60  Fective School Leadership NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  Frong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Fust NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%	Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive			
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties NYC School Survey - Trust NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%				
Overall 0.14 2.00 5%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.60  fective School Leadership  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%		0.14	2.00	
Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.60  fective School Leadership  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.20  rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.72  Section Score: 3.72				
Fective School Leadership  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.20  Frong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.72  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.72  Section Score:  3.72  Section Score:  3.72	Overall	0.14	2.00	5%
fective School Leadership  NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.20  rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.72  100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score:  3.72  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust  91%  3.68  100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.60	
NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership 79% 3.20 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.20  rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%	Section nating. Meeting ranges		0.00	
Section Rating: Meeting Target  Frong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties  Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.72  Ust  NYC School Survey - Trust  91%  3.68  100%	fective School Leadership			
rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Section Score: 3.72  NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%	NYC School Survey - Effective School Leadership	79%	3.20	100%
rong Family-Community Ties  NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%				
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  ust  NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.20	
NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties 89% 3.72 100%  Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.72  Fust NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%	rong Fourily Community Ties			
Section Rating: Meeting Target  Section Score: 3.72  Fust  NYC School Survey - Trust  91%  3.68  100%		000/	2.72	40001
rust  NYC School Survey - Trust  91% 3.68 100%	NYC School Survey - Strong Family-Community Ties	89%	3.72	100%
NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.72	
NYC School Survey - Trust 91% 3.68 100%				
		91%	3.68	100%
Section Rating: Meeting Target Section Score: 3.68		31/0	3.00	100/0
	Section Rating: Meeting Target	Section Score:	3.68	

				City Range			
		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Rigorous Instruction			•			•	
Common Core shifts in literacy	Teachers	94	86.4	94.8	100.0	0.52	3.08
<ul> <li>Common Core shifts in math</li> </ul>	Teachers	82	83.3	93.1	100.0	0.00	1.00
Course clarity	Students		84.3	92.7	100.0		
Quality of student discussion	Teachers	87	68.7	85.3	100.0	0.58	3.32
ection Results:		88%					2.48
ollaborative Teachers							
Cultural awareness:							
Cultural awareness	Teachers	83	85.4	95.0	100.0	0.00	
Cultural awareness	Parents	96	90.5	94.9	99.3	0.75	
Cultural awareness	Students	90	68.6	87.4	100.0	0.75	
		90	08.0	87.4	100.0	0.20	2 52
Cultural awareness	Combined	89	04.3	04.6	100.0	0.38	2.52
Inclusive classroom instruction     Outlity of professional development	Teachers	82	84.2	94.6	100.0	0.00	1.00
Quality of professional development		75	51.4	77.4	100.0	0.49	2.96
School commitment	Teachers	69	59.9	85.3	100.0	0.23	1.92
Innovation	Teachers	88	70.3	86.7	100.0	0.61	3.44
Reflective dialogue	Teachers	98	87.9	95.9	100.0	0.84	4.36
Peer collaboration	Teachers	90	77.6	92.2	100.0	0.57	3.28
Focus on student learning	Teachers	83	68.2	89.0	100.0	0.47	2.88
Collective responsibility ection Results:	Teachers	89 85%	65.7	84.7	100.0	0.69	3.76 <b>2.92</b>
upportive Environment Safety:							
Safety	Teachers	98	80.0	94.6	100.0	0.88	
Safety	Students		74.5	88.5	100.0		
<ul> <li>Safety</li> </ul>	Combined	98				0.88	4.52
Classroom behavior:							
Classroom behavior	Teachers	72	66.9	85.5	100.0	0.15	
Classroom behavior	Students		67.3	84.3	100.0		
<ul> <li>Classroom behavior</li> </ul>			07.10				
Ciassi oomi bellavioi	Combined	72	07.10			0.15	1.60
Social-emotional measure	Combined Teachers	72 91	89.0	96.6	100.0	0.15 0.50	1.60 3.00
Social-emotional measure	Teachers		89.0	96.6	100.0		
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions	Teachers Students Students		89.0	96.6	100.0		
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance	Teachers Students Students		89.0	96.6	100.0		
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement	Teachers Students Students :: ment Teachers	91	89.0 68.2	96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0	0.50	
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achiever	Teachers Students Students :: ment Teachers ment Students	91	89.0 68.2 75.0	96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0	0.50	3.00
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever	Teachers Students Students :: ment Teachers ment Students	<b>91</b> 85	89.0 68.2 75.0	96.6 84.8	100.0 100.0	0.50	3.00
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever	Teachers Students Students  Teachers  ment Teachers ment Students ment Combined	<b>91</b> 85	89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3	96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9	100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5	0.50	3.00
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever	Teachers Students Students :: ment Teachers ment Students ment Combined Students	<b>91</b> 85	89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3	96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9	100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5	0.50	3.00
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Personal attention and support Peer support for academic work:	Teachers Students Students  Teachers  ment Teachers ment Students ment Combined Students  Teachers	91 85 85	89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3	96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9	100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5	0.50 0.39 0.39	1.60 3.00
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Personal attention and support Peer support for academic work: Peer support for academic work	Teachers Students Students :: ment Teachers ment Students ment Combined Students  Teachers A Teachers	91 85 <b>85</b>	89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3 77.8	96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9 89.6	100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5 100.0	0.50 0.39 0.39	3.00
Social-emotional measure Peer interactions Next-level guidance Press toward academic achievement Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Press toward academic achiever Personal attention and support Peer support for academic work: Peer support for academic work	Teachers Students Students  Teachers ment Teachers ment Students  Teachers ment Combined Students  Teachers Students  Teachers Students  Teachers Students	91 85 <b>85</b>	89.0 68.2 75.0 85.3 77.8	96.6 84.8 88.8 91.9 89.6	100.0 100.0 100.0 98.5 100.0	0.50 0.39 0.39	3.00

			City Range				
		Survey % Positive	Bottom of Range	City Avg	Top of Range	Percent of Range	Score
Effective School Leadership							
Inclusive principal leadership	Parents	90	79.3	90.9	100.0	0.50	3.00
Teacher influence	Teachers	49	28.8	60.8	92.8	0.32	2.28
Program coherence	Teachers	90	60.0	85.2	100.0	0.75	4.00
Principal instructional leadership	Teachers	85	61.6	87.0	100.0	0.61	3.44
Section Results:		79%					3.20
Strong Family Community Ties							
Teacher outreach to parents:							
Teacher outreach to parents	Teachers	97	84.5	94.5	100.0	0.83	
Teacher outreach to parents	Parents	94	86.0	92.6	99.2	0.61	
Teacher outreach to parents	Combined	96				0.72	3.88
Parent involvement in the schools	Parents	81	62.4	76.6	90.8	0.64	3.56
Section Results:		89%					3.72
Trust							
<ul> <li>Parent-teacher trust</li> </ul>	Parents	96	90.9	95.3	99.7	0.75	4.00
Parent-principal trust	Parents	93	82.7	93.3	100.0	0.58	3.32
Student-teacher trust	Students		64.6	85.2	100.0		
Teacher-principal trust	Teachers	75	56.4	85.0	100.0	0.42	2.68
<ul> <li>Teacher-teacher trust</li> </ul>	Teachers	98	74.1	90.5	100.0	0.91	4.64
Section Results:		91%					3.68

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.

<b>Student Achievement Metrics</b>	2014-15	2015-16 Targets					
	School Value	Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target		
State Test Results - ELA*							
Average Student Proficiency	2.46	2.39 or lower	2.40 to 2.49	2.50 to 2.57	2.58 or higher		
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	2.05	1.95 or lower	1.96 to 2.07	2.08 to 2.16	2.17 or higher		
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	21.8%	19.7% or lower	19.8% to 25.2%	25.3% to 29.4%	29.5% or higher		
State Test Results - Math*							
Average Student Proficiency	2.49	2.50 or lower	2.51 to 2.65	2.66 to 2.77	2.78 or higher		
Average Student Proficiency - School's Lowest Third	1.93	1.91 or lower	1.92 to 2.08	2.09 to 2.21	2.22 or higher		
Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	25.7%	27.5% or lower	27.6% to 34.8%	34.9% to 40.3%	40.4% or higher		
MS Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	94.3%	85.4% or lower	85.5% to 89.1%	89.2% to 91.9%	92.0% or higher		
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	1.87	1.75 or lower	1.76 to 1.84	1.85 to 1.90	1.91 or higher		
Integrated Co-Teaching		1.91 or lower	1.92 to 2.02	2.03 to 2.10	2.11 or higher		
SETSS	1.91	1.89 or lower	1.90 to 2.01	2.02 to 2.10	2.11 or higher		
ELL	2.42	2.20 or lower	2.21 to 2.34	2.35 to 2.44	2.45 or higher		
Lowest Third Citywide	2.03	1.91 or lower	1.92 to 1.98	1.99 to 2.03	2.04 or higher		
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	2.03	1.85 or lower	1.86 to 1.93	1.94 to 1.99	2.00 or higher		
Math - Average Proficiency Rating							
Self-Contained	1.94	1.72 or lower	1.73 to 1.86	1.87 to 1.97	1.98 or higher		
Integrated Co-Teaching		2.01 or lower	2.02 to 2.18	2.19 to 2.31	2.32 or higher		
SETSS	1.92	1.92 or lower	1.93 to 2.09	2.10 to 2.23	2.24 or higher		
ELL	2.31	2.37 or lower	2.38 to 2.57	2.58 to 2.71	2.72 or higher		
Lowest Third Citywide	1.98	1.90 or lower	1.91 to 1.98	1.99 to 2.04	2.05 or higher		
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	1.96	1.86 or lower	1.87 to 1.95	1.96 to 2.01	2.02 or higher		
ELL Progress	87.5%	54.9% or lower	55.0% to 64.9%	65.0% to 72.4%	72.5% or higher		

<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	82.3%	74.9% or lower	75.0% to 81.3%	81.4% to 86.1%	86.2% or higher			
Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments	0.14	0.14 or lower	0.15 to 0.22	0.23 to 0.28	0.29 or higher			