



**Proposed Changes to Transfer High School Progress Reports for 2011-12**  
*Last Updated: February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012*

This document describes proposed changes to the methodology for the 2011-12 Transfer High School Progress Reports, and provides answers to frequently asked questions. These changes build on the methodology described in the [Educator’s Guide to the 2010-11 Transfer High School Progress Report](#). Through meetings with principals and community members, we will collect feedback about these proposed changes through March 30. After considering feedback, we will release the final methodology for 2011-12 in April. To provide feedback or ask questions, please email [PR\\_Support@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:PR_Support@schools.nyc.gov).

## College Readiness Section

To raise the bar for student achievement and promote college and career readiness, we are proposing to begin awarding Progress Report points for the college readiness metrics reported but not scored on the 2010-11 Progress Report. The 2011-12 Progress Report will include a new College Readiness section, worth 10 points and including:

- **College Preparatory Course Index** (3.33 points): the percentage of students who, by the end of the sixth year of high school have successfully completed approved rigorous courses and assessments.\*
- **College Readiness Index** (3.33 points): the percentage of students who, by the end of the sixth year of high school, have graduated and demonstrated proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics as defined by the CUNY standards for passing out of remedial coursework.\*
- **College Enrollment Rate** (3.33 points): the percentage of students that entered high school in 2005 who graduated and enrolled in a two- or four-year college by December 31, 2011.

\* Note: for specific information about the College Readiness Index (CRI) and the College Preparatory Course Index (CPCI) see questions #2 and #3 in the frequently asked questions section at the end of this document.

**Scoring:** Each of these metrics will be scored by comparing a school’s result to the historical results of its peer schools (at 75% weight) and to the historical results of all City high schools (at 25% weight). This is the same scoring methodology as the Student Progress, Student Performance, and School Environment sections.

To accommodate the new section, other metrics will decrease in point value, as follows:

Metrics	2010-11 Point Value	Proposed 2011-12 Point Value
Graduation Rate for All Students	5 points	4 points
Weighted Diploma Rate	5 points	4 points
Graduation Rates by Credits at Entry	3 metrics worth 15 points total	3 metrics worth 12 points total
Credit Accumulation Metrics	4 metrics worth 24 points total	4 metrics worth 19 points total

## Other Changes

Progress Report Component	2010-11 Measure	Proposed Change for 2011-12	Reason for Proposed Change
1. Weighted Regents Pass Rate and Regents Completion Rate	Ten Regents exams counted toward the Regents metrics.	<p><a href="#">State-approved Regents alternatives</a>, including some Advanced Placement exams, International Baccalaureate exams, and SAT II exams, will also be included in the Regents metrics. The possible point table for the Weighted Regents Pass Rate for each alternative exam will be calculated separately, so more difficult exams will be worth more points.</p> <p>As with higher-level Regents exams, if a student has already passed a required exam in the subject, a passing score on a Regents alternative will count positively and a non-passing score will not count negatively in the Weighted Regents Pass Rate.</p>	By including state-approved Regents alternatives in the Regents metrics, the Progress Report will recognize and incentivize more rigorous coursework.
2. Closing the Achievement Gap College Readiness Metrics	The Closing the Achievement Gap section measured the percent of overage/under-credited students earning a 75 or higher in the Math and English Regents exams	<p>The two metrics based on earning a 75 on the Regents exams will be replaced with three metrics for overage/under-credited students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College Preparatory Course Index</li> <li>• College Readiness Index</li> <li>• College Enrollment Rate</li> </ul>	This change aligns the requirements of the Closing the Achievement Gap section with the college readiness section. It is intended to recognize schools that help high-need students become college ready.

Progress Report Component	2010-11 Measure	Proposed Change for 2011-12	Reason for Proposed Change
<p>3. Scoring for the Closing the Achievement Gap Section</p>	<p>Additional credit for closing the achievement gap was awarded only to schools with metric values in the top 20% (full credit) or top 40% (half credit) for each metric. The percentage of high-need students in the school population did not factor into the determination of additional credit.</p>	<p>Additional credit will be awarded based on <i>both</i> the percentage of high-need students achieving an exemplary outcome <i>and</i> the percentage of students at the school in that high-need group. The two percentages will be multiplied together and then multiplied by a set point value to determine the additional credit earned (see frequently asked questions for an example).</p>	<p>The proposed scoring system will award some points for each high-need student that reaches the target for a metric. Schools with more high-need students have the opportunity to earn more points, but only if students meet the high standard for the outcome.</p> <p>More schools will be able to earn additional credit for their success with high-need students, and those schools that are succeeding with more high-need students will earn more points. At the same time, the standards for demonstrating success with those students remain high.</p>
<p>4. Weighted Diploma Rate</p>	<p>Students in the following groups who earn a local diploma or higher are weighted more heavily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overage/Under-credited – x2</li> <li>• Most At Risk Overage/Under-credited – x4</li> <li>• SETSS placement within past 5 years – 2x</li> <li>• CTT placement within past 5 years – 3x</li> <li>• Self-contained placement within past 5 years – 4x</li> </ul>	<p>In addition, students in the following groups who receive a local diploma or higher will be weighted more heavily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-term ELL at entry to the school – 2x</li> <li>• Students who were in temporary housing in past five years – 2x</li> </ul> <p>As before, if a student qualifies for more than one multiplier, only the highest multiplier applies. This applies to the weighted diploma rates in the Student Performance section and in the Closing the Achievement Gap section.</p>	<p>Principals indicated, and research confirms, that students in these groups graduate at a lower rate than their peers citywide. Adding weights for these groups recognizes the additional challenges schools serving these students face.</p>

Progress Report Component	2010-11 Measure	Proposed Change for 2011-12	Reason for Proposed Change
<p>5. Disaggregated Graduation Rates</p>	<p>There were three separate graduation rate metrics based the number of credits at admission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six Year Graduation Rate by Credits at Admission, 0.00 - 11.00 Credits</li> <li>• Six Year Graduation Rate by Credits at Admission, 11.01 - 22.00 Credits</li> <li>• Six Year Graduation Rate by Credits at Admission, More than 22.00 credits</li> </ul>	<p>These graduation rate metrics will instead be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six Year Graduation Rate for Most at Risk Overage/Under-credited Students</li> <li>• Six Year Graduation Rate for Other Overage/Under-credited Students</li> <li>• Six Year Graduation Rate for Non-Overage/Under-credited Students</li> </ul> <p>The definitions for those categories are the same as in 2010-11 (see <a href="#">Educator’s Guide</a>).</p>	<p>We have received feedback that students within each graduation category can have wide variability in their level of need. By using criteria based on both credits and age at the time of entry, each student will be compared to a group more similar in need.</p>
<p>6. Graduation Cohort Timing</p>	<p>Students contributed to all the graduation rates, weighted diploma rates, and many college and additional credit metrics at the end of the sixth year of high school.</p>	<p>Students that enter a transfer high school for the first time in year five or six meeting the most-at-risk overage/under-credited criteria will contribute to the graduation rates at the end of year seven instead. Other students would still contribute at the end of year six. In general, students who enter in year five or six meeting the most-at-risk criteria would be treated as if their year in high school was one less than it really is. This would affect all the graduation and diploma metrics and the college readiness metrics.</p> <p>Since the adjusted metrics are no longer strictly six-year graduation rates we will change the name on the report to “Transfer School Graduation Rate.”</p>	<p>Transfer schools accept some students who are close to the six year graduation deadline, but have so few credits that it is impossible for them to graduate by that date. By giving these students an extra year, this metric will more accurately capture whether the school is successful with these high-need students.</p>

Progress Report Component	2010-11 Measure	Proposed Change for 2011-12	Reason for Proposed Change
7. Additional Information Page	n/a	<p>We will add a new page to the Progress Report with information that does not contribute to the score or grade, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of students completing individual components of the College Readiness Index and College Prep Course Index</li> <li>• Unweighted results on the Regents exams</li> </ul>	<p>We have received feedback that reporting this kind of additional, concrete information about student achievement in the Progress Report would be useful to school staff and families.</p>
8. Peer Index	<p>The peer index formula was:</p> <p>(Average 8th grade English and Math proficiency) -  (2 X % students with disabilities) -  (2 X % students in self-contained placements)</p>	<p>There will be three changes to the peer index formula:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The percentage overage/under-credited on entry to the school will be subtracted from the peer index</li> <li>• Students who had an IEP any time the last seven years will count toward the % students with disabilities</li> <li>• Students who had a self-contained placement at any time in the last seven years will count toward the % students with self contained placements</li> </ul> <p>The new peer index formula will be:</p> <p>(Average 8th grade English and Math proficiency) -  (2 X % students with disabilities (7-year)) -  (2 X % students with self-contained placements (7-year)) -  (% overage/under-credited on entry)</p>	<p>By adding the overage/under-credited factor to the peer index, the peer groups will more accurately reflect the level of need of the students in the school.</p> <p>An important measure of success with students with disabilities is movement to less restrictive settings. Taking into account previous special education placements will allow schools to make these transitions without an impact on Progress Report peer group.</p> <p>These multi-year definitions are already in place for demographic adjustments and additional credit inclusion; this change aligns the peer index to those measures.</p>

Progress Report Component	2010-11 Measure	Proposed Change for 2011-12	Reason for Proposed Change
9. Credit Accumulation	In the credit metrics, all students attributed to the school counted equally, except for students who graduated mid-year.	Students who are registered at a transfer school for part of the year will be weighted based on the proportion of the year they were registered. For details, see the frequently asked questions section.	Principals have expressed that holding a transfer school accountable for an entire year of credits is inaccurate if students entered late in the school year, as is common for some transfer schools.

## Technical Changes

- *Replacement for discontinued 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies Exam:* If a student taking a Social Studies Regents exam does not have an 8<sup>th</sup> grade social studies exam, we will use the results on the 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA exam to determine the decile for the weighted Regents pass rate.
- *Minor change to the calculation of the peer and city range:* If the mean minus two standard deviations is lower than the theoretical minimum for a metric, then “100% of range” will be adjusted downward so that the mean stays in the middle of the range. If the mean plus two standard deviations is greater than the theoretical maximum, it will still be possible for a school scoring the mean to get more than half of the available points. The purpose of this change is to ensure that a school that achieves the peer or city average will have a “percent of range” of at least 50%, which corresponds to half the available points.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### 1. How will scores and grades be determined for 2011-12?

Fixed cut scores for each letter grade will be announced in the final methodology document in April 2012.

### 2. How is the College Preparatory Course Index calculated?

This metric is based on the percentage of students in the graduation cohort who have accomplished any one of the following achievements (new items for 2011-12 are in bold):

- Scored 65+ on the Algebra II or Math B Regents exam, or
- Scored 65+ on the Chemistry Regents exam, or
- Scored 65+ on the Physics Regents exam, or
- Scored 3+ on any Advanced Placement (AP) exam, or
- Scored 4+ on any International Baccalaureate (IB) exam, or
- Earned a grade of “C” or higher in a college credit-bearing course (e.g. College Now, Early College), or
- Passed another course certified by the DOE as college- and career-ready, or
- **Earned a diploma with a Career and Technical Education (CTE) endorsement, or**
- **Passed an industry-recognized technical assessment.\***

\*For a technical assessment to count toward the CPCI, it must be nationally-recognized and based on industry standards. It must consist of both written and performance assessments and include a student

project. The list of assessments approved by New York State for inclusion in a technical endorsement will be used as a starting point, but we may add or remove assessments from the list based on input from educators, input from the industry, and/or research into the outcomes of students passing the assessment.

3. *How is the College Readiness Index calculated?*

The College Readiness Index is the percent of students in the graduation cohort who, by August 2012, have graduated with a Regents Diploma and met CUNY’s standards in English and mathematics. CUNY’s standards for English and math are below with new options for 2011-12 in **bold** text:

English College Readiness Standards

A student can demonstrate college readiness in English with any one of the following assessments:

Assessment	Minimum Score Needed
NYS English Regents	75
SAT I Verbal	480
<b>ACT English</b>	<b>20</b>

Math College Readiness Standards

A student can demonstrate college readiness in math with any one of the following assessments:

Assessment	Minimum Score Needed
NYS Math Regents (any)	80*
SAT I Math	480
<b>ACT Math</b>	<b>20</b>

\*If a student uses the Regents exam to demonstrate math proficiency, he or she must also demonstrate completion of coursework through at least Algebra II/Trigonometry. Any of the following accomplishments will be sufficient for the coursework requirement:

- Passing a course identified in STARS as “Algebra II/Trigonometry” or “Pre-Calculus” and also attempting (scoring 1 or higher on) the Algebra II/Trigonometry Regents or any A.P. / I.B. math exam, or
- Passing the Algebra II / Trigonometry Regents exam or any A.P./I.B. math exam, or
- **Passing a course identified in STARS as calculus, or**
- **Passing a course identified in STARS as a math class that results in college credit**

Note: Charter schools use the UACR screen in ATS instead of STARS to identify advanced math courses.

4. *How will the proposed scoring methodology for the Closing the Achievement Gap section work?*

For each high need student that meets the success criteria for a metric in the Closing the Achievement Gap section, the school will earn a certain number of points. The number of points will depend on the percentage of the school’s population that is in the high-need group, the percentage of that group that is successful, and a “fixed point value” based on how difficult it is to achieve the success criteria.

Example:

A school has 300 students in the graduating cohort. Of those, 50 are overage/under-credited. Of those 50, seven met the requirements for the College Preparatory Course Index (CPCI). On their Progress Report, the CPCI OA/UC metric would look like this:

	THIS SCHOOL'S RESULTS	POPULATION PERCENTAGE	FIXED POINT VALUE	MAXIMUM POINTS	POINTS EARNED
College Preparatory Course Index Overage/Under-Credited Students (n=50)	14.0%	16.7%	0.35	2.00	0.82

- This “school’s result” on the metric is 14.0% because 7 of the 50 high need students met the CPCI criteria.
- The “population percentage” is 16.7% because there are 50 high need students out of 300 total in the cohort.
- The “fixed point value” is set at 0.35 (this is an example). This number will be the same for all transfer high schools, but will vary from metric to metric. It will be determined based on how common it was for the achievement criteria to be met by the group under consideration. In this example, it would be based on the likelihood that OA/UC students would meet the CPCI standard.
- The “maximum points” is 2.00 for all additional credit metrics.
- The “points earned” is equal to the school’s result x the population percentage x the fixed point value x 100, up to a maximum of 2.00 points. In this example, the result would be  $14.0\% \times 16.7\% \times 0.35 \times 100 = 0.82$  points. Based on the formula for this example, for each additional student in the lowest third citywide that met the CPCI standard, the school would get an extra 0.12 points.

For the weighted diploma rate and college readiness metrics, the total number in the population will be based on the corresponding graduation cohort. For the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) metric, the total population is all students as of audited register and the relevant high-need group is students with disabilities that meet the inclusion criteria for the LRE metric.

5. *How will the student attribution work in the Progress Section?*

The attribution rules will be the same as in 2010-11 ([see Educator’s Guide page 6](#)): students who are continuously accountable in the NYC DOE from October 31, 2011 through June 30, 2012 are attributed to the last diploma granting school responsible as of June 30, 2012.

Students who are dropped out as of June 30<sup>th</sup> have a weight of 1. Students who have non-accountable discharges will be attributed to no school. Students that are still enrolled or graduated will be assigned a weight based on the proportion of the year the student was enrolled at that particular school. This is calculated day-by-day (like the change in attendance metric). For example, if a student transferred from a regular high school to a transfer high school on February 1<sup>st</sup>, the weight would be about 0.5.

In the numerator, only credits earned at the accountable transfer school will be included, plus any credits earned in summer school. The credit cap for each student is 16 times the weight.

For example, if a school has 50 students that earn 10 credits in a full year, plus 10 students that earn 5 credits after being on the register for half of a year, the average number of credits per year for the school is 10.

6. *How can I receive additional support in understanding these changes?*

Please contact your network accountability liaison or email [PR\\_support@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:PR_support@schools.nyc.gov) with any questions or feedback.