

School Quality Reports

Educator Guide

High Schools

2015-16

Last Updated: October 25, 2016

Overview

The School Quality Reports are an important part of the New York City Department of Education's (NYC DOE's) efforts to share information about school performance, set expectations for schools, and promote school improvement. The School Quality Reports include (1) the **School Quality Snapshot**, a short report designed primarily to give families and community members a summary of key information about a school's practices and performance, and (2) the **School Quality Guide**, a more detailed report designed primarily to assist educators with their efforts at school improvement, but also publicly available for community members interested in more information about the school.

The School Quality Reports include information from a variety of sources, including Quality Reviews, the NYC School Survey, and student performance in courses and on state tests. The School Quality Reports provide context for a school's performance results by including the results of a Comparison Group, consisting of similar students from throughout the city. The School Quality Guide includes customized, school-specific targets for each quantitative metric, set in advance primarily based on the past performance of the school's Comparison Group of similar students.

This Educator Guide describes the methodology used to calculate metric values and ratings in the School Quality Reports.

School Quality Report Sections

The School Quality Reports are organized around the [Framework for Great Schools](#), which sets forth six elements—Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, Supportive Environment, Effective School Leadership, Strong Family-Community Ties, and Trust—that drive student achievement and school improvement.

The School Quality Reports do not include an overall grade or rating for the school. Instead, they share ratings and information on how schools are performing on the six Framework elements and on Student Achievement.

Rigorous Instruction: This rating reflects the degree to which curriculum and instruction are designed to engage students, foster critical-thinking skills, and are aligned to the Common Core. This section draws upon data from the Quality Review and the NYC School Survey.

Collaborative Teachers: This rating reflects the degree to which teachers participate in opportunities to develop, grow, and contribute to the continuous improvement of the school community. This section draws upon data from the Quality Review and the NYC School Survey.

Supportive Environment: This rating reflects the degree to which the school establishes a culture where students feel safe, challenged to grow, and supported to meet high expectations. This section draws upon data from the Quality Review, the NYC School Survey, percentage of students with attendance rates of 90% or higher, and movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments.

Effective School Leadership: This rating reflects the degree to which school leadership inspires the school community with a clear instructional vision and effectively distributes leadership to realize this vision. This section draws upon data from the NYC School Survey.

Strong Family-Community Ties: This rating reflects the degree to which the school forms effective partnerships with families to improve the school. This section draws upon data from the NYC School Survey.

Trust: This rating reflects the degree to which relationships between administrators, educators, students, and families are based on trust and respect. This section draws upon data from the NYC School Survey.

Student Achievement: This section rating reflects students' progress towards graduation by accumulating credits and passing Regents exams, graduation rates, college-and-career readiness of students based on their achievements in high school and their outcomes after leaving high school, and how students in higher-need groups performed. The section rating is based on how the school performed against the targets published in the prior year's School Quality Guide.

These section ratings are presented on a four-level scale. In the School Quality Guide, the four levels are called Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, Approaching Target, and Not Meeting Target. In the School Quality Snapshots, the four levels are called Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor.

New York State School Designations

New York State implements a state accountability system, which measures student performance on NYS ELA and math exams and Regents exams as well as graduation rates. State accountability status is not incorporated into the School Quality Guide ratings, but is another tool used to evaluate school performance.

Definitions

School Quality Report School Type

For 2015-16, School Quality Reports are provided for the following school types:

School Type	Grades and Students Served
Early Childhood School	K, K-1, K-2, K-3
Elementary School	K-4, K-5, and K-6
K-8 School*	K-7, K-8, and K-12 (minus grades 9-12)
Middle School	5-8, 6-8, and 6-12 (minus grades 9-12)
District 75 School	K-8 and K-12, focused on students with disabilities
High School	9-12, K-12 (minus grades K-8), and 6-12 (minus grades 6-8)
Transfer High School	9-12, focused on overage and undercredited students.
Young Adult Borough Center (YABC) Program	9-12, focused on overage and undercredited students

* If a new K-8 school has grade 6, but does not yet have grades 3 or 4 it will be considered a middle school until it adds one of those grades.

A school that serves grades 6-12 (or K-12) will receive two separate School Quality Reports: one for the middle (or K-8) school, and one for the high school. In those cases, the middle (or K-8) school report is based on the students in grades 6-8 (or K-8 only) and the high school report is based on the students in grades 9-12 only.

This document details the rules for the School Quality Reports for high schools. Separate Educator's Guides detail the rules for the other school types.

Survey School Type

For analyzing and scoring survey results in the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, schools are categorized by a survey school type:

School Type	Grades and Students Served
Early Childhood School	K, K-1, K-2, K-3
Elementary School	K-4, K-5, K-6
Elementary / Middle School	K-7, K-8
Elementary / Middle / High School	K-12
Middle School	5-8, 6-8
Middle / High School	5-12, 6-12
High School	9-12

Transfer High School	Transfer High School
YABC	YABC
District 75 School	District 75 School

For example, the survey results of a school that served grades 6-12 will be compared to the survey results of other schools that served grades 5-12 or 6-12.

Comparison Group

Please see pages 20-22 of this Educator Guide for a detailed explanation of a school's Comparison Group.

Economic Need Index

A school's Economic Need Index estimates the percentage of students at the school facing economic hardship. The metric is calculated as follows:

- The student's Economic Need Value is 1.0 if:
 - The student is eligible for public assistance from the NYC Human Resources Administration (HRA); or
 - The student lived in temporary housing in the past four years; or
 - The student has a home language other than English and entered the NYC DOE for the first time within the last four years.
- Otherwise, the student's Economic Need Value is based on the percentage of families (with school-age children) in the student's Census tract whose income is below the poverty level, as estimated by the American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate. The student's Economic Need Value equals this percentage divided by 100.
- The school's Economic Need Index is the average of its students' Economic Need Values.

The Economic Need Index takes into account economic factors that affect student achievement without relying on student lunch forms, which can be burdensome and unreliable.

The school's Economic Need Index is used as part of the matching process to create Comparison Groups.

Students in a School's Lowest Third

The school's lowest third for high schools is based on a student's average 8th grade ELA and math scores. For each school, three separate cutoffs are calculated: one for first-year students, one for second-year students, and one for third-year students. As students in their fourth year or beyond do not contribute to the credit-accumulation metrics, they are not included in the school's lowest third calculations. Students without 8th grade scores cannot be in the school's lowest third.

Students in Lowest Third Citywide

High-school students with 8th grade test scores are included in the lowest third

citywide based on their average 8th grade ELA and math scores. The cutoff for the lowest third citywide depends on a student's year in high school in 2015-16, and the cutoff values are presented in following table:

Year in High School	Lowest Third Citywide ELA / Math Cutoff
1 st	2.110
2 nd	2.075
3 rd	2.045
4 th or beyond	2.700

A student without 8th grade scores will also be included in the lowest third citywide if the student meets any of the following criteria:

- Had a self-contained placement anytime in the past five school years (2011-12 through 2015-16);
- Is considered over-age or over-age/under-credited; or
- Is a long-term ELL on entry to school.

Minimum N (Number of Students)

In general, the minimum number of values used for reported calculations at the school level is 15. For Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, the minimum number of students for each metric is five. Metrics are excluded for a school when the sample-size criteria are not met because of confidentiality considerations and the unreliability of measurements based on small numbers.

Year in High School / Cohort Letter

Most accountability measures for high schools are based on each student's "year in high school." This is determined by the amount of time that has passed since the year that the student entered ninth grade. This ninth-grade entry year, which is the school year when the student entered ninth grade (or the equivalent) anywhere in the world, is referred to as "year one of high school." The next school year is the second year of high school, and so on. The year in high school often corresponds to the grade level, but not always. For example, a student who is repeating ninth grade is a second-year student. If this student drops out during the second year, the next year is the student's third year even if the student is no longer in school.

A group of students in the same year in high school are referred to as a "cohort" and each cohort is assigned a letter of the alphabet. Cohorts are sometimes referred to colloquially as the "class of [year]," with the year of expected graduation based on graduating in four years after entering ninth grade. The following table shows the group of students corresponding to each cohort letter:

Year in High School During 2015-16	Cohort Letter	Ninth Grade Entry School Year	"Class Of" Designation
First	U	2015-16	Class of 2019
Second	T	2014-15	Class of 2018
Third	S	2013-14	Class of 2017
Fourth	R	2012-13	Class of 2016
Fifth	Q	2011-12	Class of 2015
Sixth	P	2010-11	Class of 2014

Overage / Undercredited

For high schools, the method of matching students for a school's Comparison Group takes into account students' overage/undercredited status upon entry to the school, as well as the school's percentage of overage/undercredited students upon their entry to the school. The overage/undercredited status is based on credits earned and Regents passed given the student's age (where age is as of December 31 of the entry school year, and the credits and Regents are before the start of the entry school year).

Age	Criteria
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits and two or fewer Regents passed.
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 33 credits and three or fewer Regents passed.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 33 credits and four or fewer Regents passed; or • Under 44 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.
19 or older	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 33 credits; or • Under 44 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.

For students entering a high school from outside of the DOE, a credits-only criteria is used (because those students generally would not have taken Regents exams at their prior school).

Age	Criteria for students entering from outside of DOE
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 11 credits.
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 33 credits.
19 or older	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 44 credits.

Students with history of incarceration are also considered overage/undercredited.

Most at Risk

A subset of the overage/undercredited category is called "most at risk," and takes into account students who are very far behind when they enter the school. A student is considered "most at risk" based on the following criteria (where age is as of

December 31 of the entry school year, and the credits and Regents are before the start of the entry school year).

Age	Criteria
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 11 credits and zero Regents passed.
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 33 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.
19 or older	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 44 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.

For students entering a high school from outside of the DOE, a credits-only criteria is used (because those students generally would not have taken Regents exams at their prior school).

Age	Criteria for students entering from outside of DOE
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 11 credits.
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 11 credits.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits.
19 or older	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 33 credits.

Students with history of incarceration are also considered most at risk.

Student Achievement

Metrics

This section describes the Student Achievement metrics in the School Quality Guide. The School Quality Snapshot includes a subset of those metrics.

Progress Toward Graduation

Student Attribution

Students in grades 9-12 who are continuously accountable in the NYC DOE from October 31, 2015 through June 30, 2016 are attributed to the last diploma-granting school responsible as of October 31, 2015. That date is used to attribute students because it is tied to funding and there are yearly procedures in place to ensure the accuracy of the register on that date.

A student is considered continuously accountable for the year if the student is accountable to one or more NYC DOE schools or programs on every day from October 31 through June 30. Students who receive a cohort-removing discharge during the period are non-accountable for the year. Students who enter the DOE for the first time or who return from a cohort-removing discharge during the period are also non-accountable.

Students who graduate mid-year remain accountable for the remainder of that school year only. Students who are discharged with anything other than a cohort-removing discharge or graduation are considered dropped out. Dropped-out students are accountable in the Progress Toward Graduation metrics through the end of the fourth year of high school. Students in non-diploma granting programs, such as YABC, GED, home/hospital instruction, or programs for incarcerated students, are also accountable through the end of the fourth year of high school. Dropped-out students and students in non-diploma granting programs become non-accountable in the Progress Toward Graduation metrics starting in year five of high school.

► ***Percentage of Students Earning 10+ Credits in Year 1 of High School; in Year 2 of High School; and in Year 3 of High School.***

These metrics show the percentage of the school's students, in the relevant year of school, who accumulated 10 or more academic credits. Credits earned in the fall, spring, and summer terms contribute to this metric. A particular focus is given to credits earned in the four main subjects: English, math, science and social studies. A student contributes positively (contributes 1.0 to the numerator) to this metric if the student meets the following criteria:

- Earned 10 or more credits between Fall 2015 and Summer 2016;
- At least 6 credits of these credits were earned from the four main subjects (English, math, science and social studies); and
- At least some credit (greater than zero) is earned in at least three of the four main subjects. Both elective and core courses count toward this requirement.

Eligible students who do not meet the above requirements contribute negatively

(contribute 0.0 to the numerator) to this metric. Students who drop out of school or enter non-diploma granting programs remain in this metric for as long as they would have been in the first three years of high school.

Students eligible for the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) are excluded from this metric.

► *Percentage of Students in the School's Lowest Third Earning 10+ Credits in Year 1 of High School; in Year 2 of High School; and in Year 3 of High School*

These metrics are the same as the previous measures, except they measure only students in the school's lowest third as determined by the average of the 8th grade ELA and math proficiency ratings.

► *Average Completion Rate for Remaining Regents*

This metric evaluates a school's ability to help students progress each year toward passing the five Regents subject tests required for a Regents diploma: English, Math, Science, Social Studies, and an "additional" exam. The "additional" exam can be a second exam in Math, Science, or Social Studies. This metric applies to students in years two, three, and four of high school.

The metric value for the school is the total number of needed subjects passed (the numerator) divided by the total number of needed subjects (the denominator).

For students in years three and four of high school, the denominator contribution (exams needed) is the total number of subjects not passed as of the beginning of 2015-16. The numerator (exams passed) is the total number of needed subjects passed in 2015-16.

For students in year two of high school, the first and second years are considered together as if they were one long year. Also, because second-year students are only expected to have passed any three of the five subjects total, the denominator contribution (exams needed) is three minus the number of subjects passed in middle school. The numerator contribution is the number of needed subjects passed during years one or two.

When applying these rules, the denominator is never allowed to go below zero and the numerator is never allowed to be higher than the denominator.

On Regents exams, the required passing score for all students in all exams is 65 or higher. Scores of "PR" on component exams are considered passing. RCT exams in the corresponding subject are also considered passing. Successful completion of state-approved Regents alternatives, including some Advanced Placement exams, International Baccalaureate exams, and SAT subject exams, also count towards satisfying the Regents requirements. The minimum acceptable scores that can be substituted for Regents exams are described on the [NYSED website](#). Subjects with Regents waivers (WA) are excluded from the numerator and denominator unless the student actually takes an exam in that subject.

Exams that are failed have no impact on this metric. Since the denominator is based on the needed exams for the entire cohort, failing a needed exam counts the same as having never taken it. Students who are dropped out or in non-diploma granting programs contribute to this metric (until after their 4th year of high school). Students

eligible for NYSAA are excluded. Schools with a waiver from the state to use portfolio assessments instead of some Regents exams do not get values for this metric.

► **Average Regents Score on the Following Exams:**
English (non-Common Core), English (Common Core), Living Environment, Global History, U.S. History, Algebra I (non-Common Core), Algebra I (Common Core)

These metrics are equal to the school's mean scores on the listed Regents exams. There is a separate metric for each of the listed exams.

NOTE: Because it was not possible to accurately predict who will take the Regents exams in advance, we shared *estimated* targets for these Regents score metrics in the 2014-15 School Quality Guide. These targets were adjusted based on the students at the school who actually took the exams. Similarly, the 2015-16 School Quality Guide will share estimated targets for 2016-17, which will be adjusted based on the students at the school who actually take the exams during 2016-17.

Graduation, Diploma, and Non-Dropout Metrics

Student Attribution

4-Year Graduation Cohort

Attribution for graduation metrics uses a separate system from the Progress Toward Graduation metrics. Students are attributed to the last diploma-granting school as of June 30 of the fourth year of high school. Consistent with state and federal graduation reporting rules, continuous enrollment is not necessary. Any student enrolled for one or more days (including no-shows) are accountable if their enrollment represents the last diploma-granting school before June 30 of the fourth year of high school.

For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, a school's 4-year graduation cohort, represented by the letter 'R', consists of all students who:

- Entered 9th grade for the first time anywhere in 2012-13 (these students are referred to as "cohort R");
- Were active in the school as of June 30, 2016, or the school is the last diploma-granting high school that they attended before June 30, 2016; *and*
- Did not meet the criteria for a documented cohort removing discharge (see below) before June 30, 2016.

There are limited circumstances under which a discharged student can become non-accountable. If the student leaves school for one of the reasons below before June 30 of year four, then the student will become non-accountable if all required documentation is collected and stored on file. For more information about discharges, please see the [Transfer Discharge Guidelines](#).

Potentially Cohort-Removing Discharge Codes:

Code	Description
08	Admitted to nonpublic NYC school with documentation

10	Discharged to a court ordered placement (non-incarceration)
11	Transferred to a school outside of NYC with documentation
15	Deceased
20	Early admission to a four year university
25	Already received a high school diploma outside DOE at time of enrollment

6-Year Graduation Cohort

For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, a school's 6-year graduation cohort consists of all students who were in the school's 4-year graduation cohort in 2013-14. These students are represented by cohort letter 'P'. The rules for inclusion and exclusion are the same as for the 4-year cohort. Because attribution is by June 30th of year four, if a student transfers to a new school in year five, the student remains accountable for graduation to the year-four school.

► Four-Year Graduation Rate

This metric shows the percentage of students in the school's four-year cohort (defined above) that graduated with a Regents or Local Diploma, including August graduates. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, the four-year cohort reflects the 'R' cohort which includes students who first entered high school during the 2012-13 school year. This cohort can be viewed in ATS using the command RGCS.

For schools with at least 1.5% of students who are NYSAA-eligible, a separate metric indicates the school's graduation rate for only students eligible for standard assessment. This graduation rate is printed on the School Quality Snapshot for informational purposes. The graduation rate including all students is used for purposes of the rating calculation in the School Quality Reports.

► Six-Year Graduation Rate

This metric is similar to the four-year graduation rate, except that it evaluates the percentage of students in a school's cohort that graduated with a Regents or Local Diploma within six years of beginning high school, including August graduates. For the 2015-16 School Quality Guide, the six-year cohort reflects the 'P' cohort which includes students who first entered high school during the 2010-11 school year. This cohort can be viewed in ATS using the command RGCS.

► 4-Year Non-Dropout Rate

This metric is the percentage of the students in the 4-year graduation cohort who earned a local or higher diploma, earned a HS equivalency (formerly known as GED), earned a CDOS/SACC (only NYSAA-eligible students), or are still enrolled in a DOE school or program with at least 50% attendance since February 1, 2016.

► 6-Year Non-Dropout Rate

This metric is the same as the 4-Year Non-Dropout Rate except that it is calculated based on students in the 6-year graduation cohort.

College and Career Readiness Metrics

Student Attribution

For the College and Career Readiness metrics, students are attributed to the last diploma-granting school as of June 30 of their fourth year of high school. The inclusion criteria are the same as those used for the graduation rate; both graduates and non-graduates are included.

If a student earns an Associate's Degree before the end of high school, that student contributes positively to all of the college and career readiness metrics regardless of whether they meet the other requirements.

► *College and Career Preparatory Course Index*

This measure indicates the percentage of students in the school's four-year cohort who have successfully completed approved rigorous courses and assessments after four years of high school. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'R' (students who first entered high school during the 2012-13 school year / "Class of 2016").

A student who has accomplished any of the following achievements contributes positively to this metric:

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

Students who meet more than one of the requirements above will only be counted once in the numerator.

► *College Readiness Index*

This metric shows the percentage of students in the school's four-year cohort who, by the August after their fourth year in high school, have graduated with a Local Diploma or higher and have met CUNY's standards for college readiness in English and mathematics. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'R' (students who first entered high school during the 2012-13 school year / "Class of 2016").

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

Assessment	Minimum Score Needed
NYS English Regents	75
SAT Verbal (pre-March 2016)	480
SAT Reading Test (March 2016 and later)	26
ACT English	20
CUNY Assessment Test	Reading – 70 and Writing – 56

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

Assessment	Minimum Score Needed
Integrated Algebra, Geometry, or Algebra 2/Trigonometry Regents	80
Common Core Math Regents	70
SAT Math (pre-March 2016)	500
SAT Math (March 2016 and later)	530
ACT Math	21
CUNY Assessment Test	Math 2 – 40
New York State Performance Standards Consortium PBAT	Pass, plus coursework requirement

If a student uses a NYS Regents math exam (or PBAT) to demonstrate math proficiency, the student must also demonstrate completion of coursework through at least Algebra II / Trigonometry. Any of the following accomplishments satisfy the coursework requirement:

- Passing a course identified 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;
- Passing the Algebra II / Trigonometry Regents exam or any A.P. / I.B. math exam;
- Earning two credits in a course identified as Geometry and earning two credits in a course identified as Algebra II / Trigonometry or Pre-Calculus;
- Passing a course identified as Calculus; or
- Passing a course identified as a math class that results in college credit.

Math courses are identified by schools in STARS, with the exception of charter schools. Charter schools use the UACR screen in ATS to identify advanced math courses.

► **Postsecondary Enrollment Rate by Six Months after High School**

This metric shows the percentage of students who have graduated and enrolled in a two- or four-year college, vocational program, or public service within six months of their scheduled graduation date. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric

evaluates cohort 'Q' (students who first entered high school during the 2011-12 school year / "Class of 2015"). To contribute positively, a student must have graduated high school with a local or higher diploma and enrolled in a qualifying postsecondary program by December 31, 2015.

For this metric, public service includes enlistment in armed forces (U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard) or participation in AmeriCorps or the City Year Volunteer Corps.

► ***Postsecondary Enrollment Rate by 18 Months after High School***

This metric is similar to the Postsecondary Enrollment Rate by Six Months after High School measure except that it evaluates the percentage of students who have graduated and enrolled in a two- or four-year college, vocational program, or public service within 18 months of their scheduled graduation date. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'P' (students who first entered high school during the 2010-11 school year / "Class of 2014"). To contribute positively, a student must have graduated and enrolled in a qualifying postsecondary program by December 31, 2015.

► ***6-Year College Readiness Index Including Persistence***

Phase-Out Metric

This metric is included in the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, but is being phased out and will not be included in the 2016-17 School Quality Reports.

This metric shows the percentage of students in the six-year cohort who (1) graduated with a Regents diploma and have met CUNY's standards for English and mathematics after six years of high school (including the summer following the sixth year) by August 2016, or (2) graduated, enrolled, and persisted in college through the beginning of their third semester, within six years of starting high school. To count as having persisted, a student must have enrolled in college for three consecutive semesters. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'P' (students who first entered high school during the 2010-11 school year / "Class of 2014").

► ***6-Year College Readiness Index***

Phase-In Metric

This metric is being phased into the School Quality Reports. It is not included in the 2015-16 ratings, but targets will be set for 2016-17 and it will be included in the 2016-17 School Quality Report ratings.

This metric shows the percentage of students in the six-year cohort who graduated with a Regents diploma and have met CUNY's standards for English and mathematics after six years of high school (including the summer following the sixth year) by August 2016. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'P' (students who first entered high school during the 2010-11 school year / "Class of 2014").

► **College Persistence**

Phase-In Metric

This metric is being phased into the School Quality Reports. It is not included in the 2015-16 ratings, but targets will be set for 2016-17 and it will be included in the 2016-17 School Quality Report ratings.

This metric shows the percentage of students in the six-year cohort who graduated, enrolled, and persisted in college through the beginning of their third semester, within six years of starting high school. To count as having persisted, a student must have enrolled in college for three consecutive semesters. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort ‘P’ (students who first entered high school during the 2010-11 school year / “Class of 2014”).

Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics

These metrics reflect the degree to which the school helps high-need students succeed. In some cases, schools will not receive ratings for these metrics because those students make up a very small proportion of the school’s student population.

The metric values show the school’s results with its students in the relevant group. Data is not provided for any metric where the school has fewer than five students in the relevant high-need category. Metric scores and ratings show how the school’s results compared to its customized targets. A metric will not be scored, however, if those students are a very small proportion of the school—specifically, if the school’s population percentage is more than one standard deviation below the citywide average. These unscored metrics receive a rating of “N/A” in the School Quality Snapshot.

The following table summarizes these rules:

Closing the Achievement Gap	
No metric value if...	Fewer than five students in the category.
No metric score (or rating) if...	School’s population percentage is more than one standard deviation below the citywide average.

► **College and Career Preparatory Index for Students in the Lowest Third Citywide**

► **Four-Year College Readiness Index for Students in the Lowest Third Citywide**

► **Postsecondary Enrollment Rate by Six Months after High School for Students in the Lowest Third Citywide**

These metrics are calculated the same way as the corresponding metrics in the College and Career Readiness category, except that the population for each metric is limited to students in the lowest third citywide.

► **4-Year Graduation Rate for Student Subgroups:
English Language Learners; Self-Contained, ICT, SETSS;
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide; Black and Hispanic Males
in the Lowest Third Citywide**

These metrics are calculated in the same way as the Four-Year Graduation Rate for the school, except that each metric is limited to students in each of the specified groups.

For this metric, students are included in the Students with Disabilities group if their most restrictive placement in the last five school years was self-contained, ICT, or SETSS.

Any student identified as an English Language Learner for any of the last five school years will be considered an ELL for this metric.

If a student belongs to more than one of these groups, the student is counted in all groups in which the student belongs.

Additional Information

► **“Then and Now” Table**

The School Quality Snapshot includes a table showing key student results broken out by students’ starting points.

For high schools, the Snapshot shows four-year graduation rates and college-readiness rates (based on the College Readiness Index) broken out by 8rd grade starting points (Level 1, 2, 3-4). Comparison Group percentages are provided for context. The data are based on students, who were in their 4th year of high school in 2014-15 (Cohort Q) and in 2015-16 (Cohort R).

The starting point Levels are based on rescaled test scores, so that a starting point of Level 1 on the 8th grade exams reflects a score on a prior version of the state exam that would be equivalent to a Level 1 on the most recent state exam.

In addition, for purposes of this table, students are categorized based on the *lower* of their levels on the Math and ELA state tests in 8th grade. For example, a student who scored a Level 3 on Math and a Level 2 on ELA would be characterized as a Level 2 in the table.

► **Attendance**

The attendance rate includes the attendance for all HS students on a school’s register at any point during the school year (September through June). The attendance rate is calculated by adding together the total number of days attended by all students and dividing it by the total number of days on register for all students. Pre-K attendance is excluded for any school that has a pre-K grade, students in grades 6-8 are not included in the high school report of a 6-12 school, and students in grades K-8 are not included in the high school report of a K-12 school.

Student Achievement

Scores and Ratings

The 2015-16 School Quality Guides include scores and ratings based on the targets that were published in the 2014-15 School Quality Guides. Those targets were customized for each school, and were based mostly on the performance of the Comparison Group of similar students. The targets specified the values needed for a school to receive a metric rating of Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, Approaching Target, or Not Meeting Target.

Metric Scores and Ratings

For each metric, the school earns a metric score from 1.00 to 4.99 based on how the school's metric value compared to the published targets. The score is analogous to the state test proficiency ratings based on scale scores: the first digit indicates the rating level, and the subsequent digits show how close the result is to the next level.

- If the school did not meet its Approaching Target level, the first digit is 1.
- If the school met its Approaching Target level (but not higher targets), the first digit is 2.
- If the school met its Meeting Target level (but not the higher target), the first digit is 3.
- If the school met its Exceeding Target level, the first digit is 4.

The subsequent digits reflect where the school's value fell between the highest target level that it met and the next higher target level.

Example: If a school surpassed the Meeting Target level (t_3) but did not reach the Exceeding Target level (t_4), the metric score would be: $3 + (\text{school's metric value} - t_3) / (t_4 - t_3)$, with the score not to exceed 3.99.

Example: If a school received a metric score of 2.50, the 2 means that the school's value met the Approaching Target level (but did not meet the Meeting Target level), and the .50 means that the school's result fell halfway between the Approaching Target level and the Meeting Target level.

To generate scores between 1.00 and 1.99 and between 4.00 and 4.99, a bottom and top of the target range must be used in addition to the published target levels. The bottom of the target range = $0.85 \times 2014\text{-}15$ bottom of Comparison Group range + $0.15 \times 2014\text{-}15$ bottom of city range. The top of the target range = $0.85 \times 2014\text{-}15$ top of Comparison Group range + $0.15 \times 2014\text{-}15$ top of city range.¹

Example: If a school surpassed the Exceeding Target level (t_4), the metric score would be: $4 + (\text{school's metric value} - t_4) / (\text{top of target range} - t_4)$, with the score not to exceed 4.99.

¹ See pages 20-23 for further details on the Comparison Group range and city range.

In the School Quality Snapshot, the 4-bar ratings for specific metrics are based on the metric ratings described above.

Weighted Average Score

The Weighted Average Score is a weighted average of the Student Achievement metric scores (not including the Closing the Achievement Gap metrics), where each metric score is multiplied by its weight percentage.

If any metrics (not including the Closing the Achievement Gap metrics) are missing, their weight is distributed proportionally to the other metrics.

The weight percentage for each metric is listed in the Student Achievement Scoring Appendix in the 2015-16 School Quality Guides.

Closing the Achievement Gap Additional Points

The Closing the Achievement Gap metrics are additional points that can increase a school's Student Achievement score.

For each Closing the Achievement Gap metric, a score will be generated on the 1.00 – 4.99 scale, based on the published targets, in the same way as for the other Student Achievement metrics—except that the metric score will be blank (N/A) if the school's population percentage for the applicable high-need group is more than one standard deviation below the citywide average.

For each Closing the Achievement Gap metric, the extra points will be $(\text{metric score} - 1.00) / (4.99 - 1.00) \times \text{extra points possible}$. The extra points possible are specified in the scoring appendix. If a Closing the Achievement Gap metric score is N/A, the extra points associated with that metric do not shift to any other metrics.

The total Closing the Achievement Gap Additional Points is the sum of the extra points earned on each metric.

Overall Student Achievement Score and Rating

The Overall Student Achievement Score equals the Weighted Average Score plus the Closing the Achievement Gap Additional Points, rounded to the nearest hundredth, and capped at 4.99.

The Student Achievement section rating will be based on the first digit of the Overall Student Achievement Score:

- If the first digit is 4, the section rating is Exceeding Target.
- If the first digit is 3, the section rating is Meeting Target.
- If the first digit is 2, the section rating is Approaching Target.
- If the first digit is 1, the section rating is Not Meeting Target.

Schools designated for phase-out and schools in their first year of operation in 2015-16 will not receive a Student Achievement rating.

Rating Labels in the Guide and Snapshot

The ratings in the School Quality Snapshot are the same as in the School Quality Guide, except that different rating labels are used in the Snapshot:

School Quality Guide Rating Labels	School Quality Snapshot Rating Labels
Exceeding Target	Excellent
Meeting Target	Good
Approaching Target	Fair
Not Meeting Target	Poor

Student Achievement

Metric Comparisons

In addition to the scores and ratings based on the targets published last year, the School Quality Reports provide context for a school's performance by sharing a variety of comparisons—including city averages, borough averages, and the results of a Comparison Group of similar students throughout the city.

City and Borough Averages

In general, city and borough averages are calculated by taking n-weighted averages of school-level results for all schools within the same school type. The n-weighting is based on the number of students at each school included in the metric; it means that a school with many students included in a metric will count more toward the city and borough averages than a school with fewer students included in that metric.

For graduation cohort metrics (including graduation rates, high school persistence rates, College Readiness Index metrics, College and Career Preparatory Course Index, post-secondary enrollment rates, and College Persistence), the city and borough averages are calculated based on the full cohort of high school students.

Comparison Group's Results

To understand how effectively a school is helping its students, it is important to take into account students' starting points and challenges that they face. Without that context, schools can be mischaracterized as ineffective simply because they serve higher-need students.

The School Quality Reports provide context for each school's performance by presenting the results of a Comparison Group of similar students. The Comparison Group takes into account the student population served by the school, and allows the reader to assess the school's effectiveness at helping its students improve. The Comparison Group results can be thought of as an estimate of how the students at the school would have performed if they had attended other schools throughout the city.

To generate the Comparison Group, each student at the school is matched to the 50 most similar students from other schools throughout the city, based on prior test scores and demographic factors. The similar students identified for each student are grouped together into a large Comparison Group. We then calculate the performance results (such as average test scores and graduation rates) of the Comparison Group.

The process of matching each student with the 50 most similar students involves two main steps.

- **Step 1:** For each student, the DOE identifies a large group of students who are exact matches on the following student characteristics:

High School (9+)
-Graduation Cohort -Overage/under-credited or history of incarceration category -IEP category (past 5 yrs) ² -Temporary housing (past 4 years) or HRA-eligible

Example: If a student is in Cohort S, is not overage/under-credited, is in a self-contained disability setting, and was in temporary housing, the first step is to identify all other students from other schools who are in Cohort S, are not overage/undercredited, are or were in self-contained disability settings during the past 5 years, and are in temporary housing or eligible for public assistance.

- **Step 2:** Within the group of students identified in Step 1, the DOE finds the 50 students who are most similar to the main student based on the following factors:

High School (9+)
Primary Factors -Grade 8 ELA score -Grade 8 Math score
Secondary Factors - School's % students with IEPs -School's Economic Need -School's % overage/undercredited -School's % ELL

- To find the 50 most similar students from the group, the primary factors are weighed more heavily than the secondary factors.
 - Example:** Student A is in her second year of high school. Her group of Step 1 matches includes Student B and Student C. Student A scored 2.8 on both her Grade 8 ELA and Math exams, Student B scored 2.1, and Student C scored 2.9. Student A is more likely to be matched with Student C than with Student B.
 - Example:** Student D is in his third year of high school. His group of Step 1 matches includes Student E and Student F. All three students scored 2.7 on both their Grade 8 ELA and Math exams. Student D's school has 25% students with disabilities, Student E's school has 23% students with disabilities, and Student F's school has 2% students with disabilities. Student D is more likely to be matched with Student E than with Student F.
- In addition to the primary factors based on the student's own characteristics, the secondary factors about school characteristics are also taken into account because the school's population can have peer effects on the student.

Once the Comparison Group has been established by finding 50 matches for each of the students attributed to the school for 2015-16, we calculate the performance results (such as 4-year graduation rate) achieved by that Comparison Group.

² The IEP category is defined as the most restrictive of the following three categories, over the lookback period: (1) Self-Contained, (2) ICT or SETSS, (3) Related Services only or no IEP.

Example: For a school with 300 students, we find 50 matches for each student and the Comparison Group has $300 \times 50 = 15,000$ students in it.³ We then calculate performance results for the Comparison Group—such as 4-year graduation rate.

The Comparison Group results are shared in the Snapshot and the Guide.

Citywide and Comparison Group Percent of Range

The School Quality Reports also use a comparison called “percent of range,” including a citywide percent of range and a Comparison Group percent of range. These values are not displayed directly in the reports, but are used to calculate metric targets.

Range

The range spans two standard deviations above and below the average, and it represents a continuum from very poor to very strong results (excluding extreme outliers).

For example, if the average graduation rate was 70%, with a standard deviation of 10%, the top of the range is $70\% + 2 \times 10\% = 90\%$. And the bottom of the range is $70\% - 2 \times 10\% = 50\%$.

If the calculated top of the range extends beyond what is theoretically possible, the range is cut off so that only the possible values are used. For example, if the average core course pass rate for a peer group was 96% and the standard deviation was 3%, the peer range might extend up to 102%, which is impossible for a school to achieve. In that case, we would use 100% as the highest value in the range instead.

If the calculated bottom of the range is lower than the theoretical minimum for a metric, then the top of the range will be adjusted downward so that the average stays in the middle of the range. This ensures that a school that achieves the average will fall at the middle of the range.

The Comparison Group range is similar to the citywide range, with two differences. First, the middle of the range is the Comparison Group’s result (instead of the citywide average). Second, the top and bottom of the range are two *conditional standard deviations* away from the middle. While the standard deviation used for the citywide range reflects how far away each school in the city was from the citywide mean, the conditional standard deviation used for the Comparison Group range reflects how far away each school in the city was from its own Comparison Group’s result. The conditional standard deviation sheds light on the degree to which very poor performers fall below their Comparison Group’s result and the degree to which very strong performance surpass their Comparison Group’s result.

Example: A school’s 4-year graduation rate is 73%, which is 14% higher than the Comparison Group’s 59%. Is the school’s result exceptional, or just somewhat above average? If the conditional standard deviation is 7%, then the Comparison Group performance range runs from 45% to 73%. This school’s result is at the top of this range, two conditional standard deviations

³ While the same student cannot appear more than once in an individual student’s group of 50 matches, a student can appear multiple times in the school’s Comparison Group. This will occur if the same student falls within the group of 50 matches for multiple students at the school.

above average—a very strong performance. Based on the conditional standard deviation in this example, only a very small percentage of schools throughout the city would be expected to exceed their Comparison Group value by 14% on this metric. (Note that the conditional standard deviation used in this example is hypothetical.)

Percent of Range

The percent of range reflects the position of the school’s result within the range.

The percent of range can be interpreted as showing how far along the path, from very poor performers to very strong performers, the school’s result fell. For example, a percent of range of 70% means that the school’s result covered 70% of the distance between the results of very poor performers and very strong performers.

Another way to interpret percent of range is based on standard deviations away from the mean:

Percent of Range	Interpretation
0%	Two or more standard deviations below average
25%	One standard deviation below average
50%	Equal to the average
75%	One standard deviation above average
100%	Two or more standard deviations above average

In general (assuming that results are normally distributed), approximately 2% of schools achieve results that are two or more standard deviations above (or below) average, approximately 15% of schools achieve results that are one or more standard deviations above (or below) average, and approximately two-thirds of schools achieve results within one standard deviation of the mean.

The percent of range can be calculated based on the following formula:

$$\text{percent of range} = \frac{(\text{school's result}) - (\text{bottom of range})}{(\text{top of range}) - (\text{bottom of range})}$$

Student Achievement

Targets for 2016-17

The targets for 2016-17 are realistic and rigorous goals customized for each school, based on the historical performance of the Comparison Group and city schools. The targets are driven primarily by results that have been achieved in the past by the similar students in the Comparison Group, and also reflect results achieved by all schools citywide (of the same school type).

The process for calculating specific targets for each school follows these main steps:

- **Step 1:** For each school, we calculate a “combined percent of range” (on a 0-100% scale) for each of its 2015-16 metric values. The combined percent of range is a weighted average of the school’s Comparison Group percent of range (85%) and the school’s citywide percent of range (15%). Step 1 results in each school having a combined-percent-of-range value for Student Achievement metric, which primarily reflects the school’s performance against its Comparison Group performance range, and also takes into account its performance against the citywide performance range.
- **Step 2:** For each metric, we review the combined-percent-of-range results from Step 1 for each school, and determine the cut levels associated with the 75th percentile, the 50th percentile, and the 10th percentile. These are combined-percent-of-range cut scores for Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, and Approaching Target.
- **Step 3:** For each school, we set specific targets by finding the actual metric values that would be needed for the school to achieve the combined-percent-of-range cut score. Step 3 can be thought of as taking each school’s customized comparison range, and running a specified percentage of the way along that range to find a specific target for the school.

Example: For a specific metric, suppose that Steps 1 and 2 produce a combined-percent-of-range cut level of 70% for Exceeding Target—meaning that only the top 25% of schools achieved combined-percent-of-range scores of 70% or higher on that metric in 2015-16. Suppose that a school’s comparison range for ELA percent proficient ran from 10% to 40%. The school’s specific target for ELA percent proficient in 2016-17 would be 70% of the way along that range—or $70\% \times (40\% - 10\%) + 10\% = 31\%$.⁴

- **Step 4:** The targets calculated in Step 3 are compared to a set of floors and ceilings: the targets cannot fall below the floors and cannot be above the ceilings.

⁴ This example is simplified because it refers to a single percent of range and comparison range. The actual target calculation is more complicated because it involves the combined percent of range and two comparison ranges (one for the Comparison Group and one for the city). But the concept is the same as what is described in the example.

These floors and ceilings are designed to prevent unreasonable results (e.g., a school receiving a very low metric rating despite achieving a very high raw metric value, or a school receiving a very high metric rating despite achieving a very low raw metric value). See Appendix B for a table of target floors and ceilings.

The Comparison Group range used in Step 3 of the target-setting is based on a Comparison Group of matches to the students attributed to the school in October 2016. The matching method works the same as described above in the section on Comparison Group Results, except that there is a one-year offset: each student at the school is matched to 50 students who were in the student's grade last year.

Example: To create a Comparison Group to set targets for 2016-17, the fourth graders at a school (in October 2016) are each matched to the closest 50 students throughout the city who were fourth graders in 2015-16 (and are fifth graders in 2016-17).

This approach allows the school's targets for 2016-17 to be customized and based on the closest matches to the specific students at the school in 2016-17.

The target levels will be used to generate metric ratings and scores in 2016-17. Although Step 2 of the target-setting process involves finding cut levels associated with fixed percentiles, the ratings for 2016-17 do not have a fixed distribution. Because these targets are set ahead of time, schools will not be competing for a limited number of top ratings. The percentages of schools achieving each rating will not be fixed, and will depend on how schools perform in 2016-17 against their targets. If all schools perform well, then all schools can get strong ratings.

Framework Elements

Metrics

The sections of the School Quality Reports on the Framework elements draw from the following data sources:

Section	Data
Rigorous Instruction	Quality Review indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2; NYC School Survey data related to Rigorous Instruction
Collaborative Teachers	Quality Review indicator 4.2; NYC School Survey data related to Collaborative Teachers
Supportive Environment	Quality Review indicator 3.4; NYC School Survey data related to Supportive Environment; student chronic absenteeism; movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments
Effective School Leadership	NYC School Survey data related to Effective School Leadership
Strong Family-Community Ties	NYC School Survey data related to Strong Family-Community Ties
Trust	NYC School Survey data related to Trust

Quality Review

The School Quality Reports include ratings that the school received during its most recent Quality Review (that took place after August 2012) on the following five indicators:

- 1.1 Ensure engaging, rigorous, and coherent curricula in all subjects, accessible for a variety of learners and aligned to Common Core Learning Standards and/or content standards.
- 1.2 Develop teacher pedagogy from a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best that is informed by the instructional shifts and Danielson Framework for Teaching, aligned to the curricula, engaging, and meets the needs of all learners so that all students produce meaningful work products.
- 2.2 Align assessments to curricula, use on-going assessment and grading practices, and analyze information on student learning outcomes to adjust instructional decisions at the team and classroom levels.
- 3.4 Establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to staff, students and families, and provide supports to achieve those expectations.
- 4.2 Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams using an inquiry approach that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning.

For each indicator, the rating given to the school by the reviewer is presented on a four-level scale, corresponding to the ratings of Well Developed, Proficient, Developing, and Underdeveloped. The School Quality Guide includes short excerpts from the Quality Review report.

For additional information about the Quality Review, please visit <http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/tools/review/default.htm>.

NYC School Survey

The NYC School Survey is administered annually to parents, teachers, and students in 6th grade and above. The survey was designed to gather information from school communities on the six elements of the Framework for Great Schools.

The survey is organized as groups of questions relating to a measure, and groups of measures relating to an element.

- **Example:** The element of Rigorous Instruction is composed of four measures: Common Core Shifts in Literacy, Common Core Shifts in Math, Course Clarity, and Quality of Student Discussion. The NYC School Survey includes groups of questions related to each of those four measures.

See Appendix B for a detailed explanation of the element-measure-question survey structure.

► **Question-Level Percent Positive**

For each survey question, we calculate the percentage of “positive” responses (excluding “I don’t know” or missing responses from the denominator).

Positive responses are defined as those in the favorable half of response options (i.e., out of four possible response options, the two most favorable options are treated as positive responses).

► **Measure-Level Percent Positive**

For each measure, we calculate the percentage of positive responses. This value is the average of the question-level percent positives of all the questions that fall within the measure.

► **Element-Level Percent Positive**

For each element, we calculate the percentage of positive responses. This value is not simply the average of the percent positives of all the questions that fall within the element. Instead, this value is the average of the measure-level percent positives for all the measures within the element. (For example, the percent positive for the Rigorous Instruction element is the average of the percent positives on its four measures: Common Core Shifts in Literacy, Common Core Shifts in Math, Course Clarity, and Quality of Student Discussion.)

The School Quality Snapshot reports element-level percent positives as well as the percent positives for selected questions.

NYC School Survey Reports, which include detailed information about the responses to each survey question, are available at each school's website. For additional information about the survey, please visit <http://schools.nyc.gov/surveys> or email surveys@schools.nyc.gov.

Other Metrics

► **Percentage of Students with Attendance Rates of 90% or Higher**

This metric shows the percentage of students at the school with attendance rates of 90% or higher. Because chronic absenteeism is defined as students with attendance rates below 90%, this metric shows the percentage of students who are not chronically absent.

Each student's attendance rate is calculated by adding together the total number of days when the student was present and dividing it by the total number of days on register for the student (the sum of the days when the student was present and the days when the student was absent). If a student's total number of days on register is less than 20, the student's attendance rate is treated as N/A and the student does not contribute to this metric.

Pre-K attendance is excluded for any school that has a Pre-K grade. For a 6-12 (or K-12) school, this metric is calculated separately for the high school and non-high school portions of the school.

► **Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments**

This measure recognizes schools that educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment that is educationally appropriate. Students with an IEP during any of the last four school years are sorted into four tiers based on primary program recommendations and the amount of time spent with general education peers, as of the end of September of each year. The denominator for this measure includes all K-8 students with tier two or higher in any of the years 2014-15, 2013-14, or 2012-13. Students who are newly certified in 2015-16 are excluded.

The numerator contribution of each student is the highest tier number from the last four school years minus the tier number for 2015-16. This number can range from zero (for students who are in their highest tier in 2015-16) to three (for students who were previously in Tier Four and are in Tier One in 2015-16). Negative numbers are not possible; students who move to a more restrictive environment count the same as if they had always been in that setting.

Tier One – General education

- No IEP, or
- IEP with a recommendation of related services only

Tier Two – 80-100% of time with general education peers

- Primary recommendation of SETSS or ICT, or

- Primary recommendation of self-contained, spend 80-100% of instructional periods with general education peers

Tier Three – 40-79% of time with general education peers

- Primary recommendation of self-contained, spend 40-79% of instructional periods with general education peers

Tier Four – 0-39% of time with general education peers

- Primary recommendation of self-contained, spend 0-39% of instructional periods with general education peers

Framework Elements

Scoring and Ratings

Ratings on each element of the Framework are generated from the raw metric scores (described in the previous section of this Educator Guide) through a multi-step process:

- **Step 1:** Raw metric values are collected from data sources.
- **Step 2:** Raw metric values are converted into standard scores⁵, on a scale from 1.00 – 4.99.
- **Step 3:** Standard scores on different metrics are combined to generate element scores for the school.
- **Step 4:** The element scores are used to generate element ratings.

This section of the Educator Guide explains this multi-step process for the different data sources and elements. It explains how raw metric scores are converted into standard scores for Quality Reviews, the NYC School Survey, chronic absenteeism, and movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments. It explains how the standard scores on metrics are combined into element scores for the six elements—Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, Supportive Environment, Effective School Leadership, Strong Family-Community Ties, and Trust. It then explains how ratings are determined for each of the six elements.

Converting Metric Values into Standard Scores

This section explains how raw metric values and scores are converted into standard scores for each of the different data sources in the Framework Report.

For ease of interpretation, the standard scores are placed on a scale from 1.00 – 4.99 (similar to the scoring scale for the Student Achievement metrics), where 1, 2, 3, 4 reflect the cut levels for the four ratings.

Quality Reviews

Quality Review ratings on Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, and 4.2 are converted into standard scores as follows:

QR Rating	Standard Score
Well Developed	4.99
Proficient	3.50
Developing	2.00
Under Developed	1.00

⁵ “Standard scores” place the raw scores on different metrics onto a common scale, so that scores on different metrics can be combined.

The scoring uses a school's most recent published Quality Review ratings, from a review that took place after August 2013. If a school's most recent review took place in August 2013 or earlier, the Quality Review scores are N/A.

NYC School Survey

For purposes of survey scoring, schools are categorized by survey school type, and are compared to other schools of the same survey school type.⁶

The scoring method for the NYC School Survey follows the structure of the survey, which was organized as groups of questions relating to a measure, and groups of measures relating to an element.⁷ Measures are sub-topics within each element.

The following process is used to generate a *standard survey element score* from *raw question scores*:

- (1) **Raw question score** (based on percent positive responses to question)
- ↓
- (2) **Raw measure score** (based on average of raw question scores for all questions within the measure)
- ↓
- (3) **Standard measure score** (standardized version of raw measure score)
- ↓
- (4) **Standard survey element score** (based on average of standard measure scores for all measures within the element)

Each step in this process is described in detail below.

(1) *Raw question score*

For each question, the *raw question score* is the percent of “positive” responses (excluding “I don’t know” or missing responses from the denominator).

“Positive” responses are defined as those in the favorable half of response options (i.e., out of four possible response options, the two most favorable options are treated as positive responses; out of six possible response options, the three most favorable are treated as positive responses).

(2) *Raw measure score*

This metric is the average of the *raw question scores* for all questions within the measure.

For example, Outreach to Parents is a measure (within the element of Strong Family-Community Ties). The Outreach to Parents score is the average of the raw question scores on all the Outreach to Parents questions.

(3) *Standard measure score*

This metric is a standardized version of the *raw measure score*, which is converted to a scale that reflects standard deviations away from the mean. This standard score

⁶ See the Definitions section of this Educator Guide for more information on the survey school types.

⁷ See Appendix B for a detailed explanation of the element-measure-question survey structure.

uses the “percent of range” method, which shows where the school’s score falls with a range of two standard deviations above and below the city average (for the same survey school type).

For example, if the school is an Early Childhood School, the average and standard deviation are calculated based on the results from all Early Childhood Schools throughout the city.

The standard measure score is calculated by first calculating percent of range = (raw score – bottom of range) / (top of range – bottom of range), where top of range = city average + 2 standard deviations and bottom of range = city average – 2 standard deviations. The top of the range cannot exceed the maximum possible score of 100 and the bottom of the range cannot fall below the minimum possible score of 0. The percent of range is then converted from a 0 – 100 scale to a 1.00 – 4.99 scale using the following method: standard score = 1.00 + (percent of range / 25), with result capped at 4.99.

After the standard score is calculated using the percent-of-range method, an additional rule is applied: If the *raw measure score* meets certain thresholds, then the *standard measure score* cannot fall below certain floor levels:

If raw measure score is at least...	Standard measure score cannot fall below...
95%	4.00
90%	3.00
85%	2.00

(4) Standard survey element score

This metric is the average of the *standard measure scores* for all measures within the element.

For example, the Strong Family-Community Ties element contains two measures: Teacher Outreach to Parents and Parent Involvement in the School. The school’s *standard survey element score* for the Strong Family-Community Ties element is the average of the *standard measure score* for the Teacher Outreach to Parents measure and the *standard measure score* for the Parent Involvement in the School measure.

Low Response Rates and Numbers

Each element in the Framework draws primarily from questions asked of one (or two) respondent groups. If there was a low response rate or very few responses submitted by that respondent group, then the *standard survey element score* will be N/A. The following table describes these situations:

Element	Standard survey element score will be N/A if...
Rigorous Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or Fewer than 5 teachers responded.
Collaborative Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or Fewer than 5 teachers responded.

Supportive Environment	<p>For Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded. <p>For other school types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 students responded.
Effective School Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded.
Strong Family-Community Ties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of teacher response rate and parent response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded, or • Fewer than 5 parents responded.
Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of teacher response rate and parent response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded, or • Fewer than 5 parents responded.

Percentage of Students with Attendance Rates of 90% or Higher

The raw value of this metric shows the percentage of students at the school with attendance rates of 90% or higher. The standard score for this metric is calculated based on how the school performed against its targets published in the 2014-15 School Quality Reports. It is calculated based on the same methodology used to calculate metric scores for Student Achievement metrics based on targets, as described on page 17 of this Educator Guide.

We calculate and report this metric separately for EMS grades and HS grades. If a school spans both EMS grades and HS grades (and received metric values for both school types), the average of the EMS standard score and the HS standard score is used for Framework scoring.

Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments

The standard score for this metric is based on how the school performed against its targets published in the 2014-15 School Quality Guide. It is calculated based on the same methodology used to calculate metric scores for Student Achievement metrics based on targets, as described on page 17 of this Educator Guide.

We calculate and report this metric separately for EMS grades and HS grades. If a school spans both EMS grades and HS grades (and received metric values and scores for both school types), the average of the EMS standard score and the HS standard score for less restrictive environment is used for Framework scoring.

Framework Element Scores

This section explains how the standard scores from the various data sources are combined to create element scores.

Weighted Average of Standard Scores

The school’s element scores are a weighted average of the standard scores from the data sources within each element category. The weights applied depend on the survey response rate(s) of the primary group(s) of respondents asked about that element on the NYC School Survey. When survey responses rates are lower, greater weight is given to non-survey data sources within that element (when non-survey data sources are available). If the survey response rates or numbers fall below specified thresholds, the element score will be N/A. The following table shows the weights applied to the different data sources to produce the element scores:

Weighted Combinations of Data Scores to Produce Framework Element Scores

Different Weights Based on Survey Response Rates

	<i>If teacher response rate is at least 50%</i>	<i>If teacher response rate is below 50% but at least 30%</i>	<i>If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses</i>
Rigorous Instruction			
Quality Review 1.1	22%	25%	Element score is N/A.
Quality Review 1.2	22%	25%	
Quality Review 2.2	22%	25%	
Survey (Rigorous Instruction)	34%	25%	
Collaborative Teachers	<i>If teacher response rate is at least 50%</i>	<i>If teacher response rate is below 50% but at least 30%</i>	<i>If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses</i>
Quality Review 4.2	50%	67%	Element score is N/A.
Survey (Collaborative Teachers)	50%	33%	
Supportive Environment	<i>If teacher response rate is at least 50% (for elementary schools); If student response rate is at least 50% (for non-elementary schools)</i>	<i>If teacher response rate is below 50% but at least 30% (for ES); If student response rate is below 50% but at least 30% (for non-ES)</i>	<i>If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses (for ES); If student response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses (for non-ES)</i>
Quality Review 3.4	30%	35%	Element score is N/A.
Survey (Supportive Environment)	35%	25%	
Chronic Absenteeism	30%	35%	

Less Restrictive Environment	5%	5%	
Effective School Leadership Survey (Effective School Leadership)	<i>If teacher response rate is at least 30%</i> 100%	<i>If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses</i> Element score is N/A.	
Strong Family-Community Ties Survey (Strong Family-Community Ties)	<i>If average of teacher and parent response rates is at least 30%</i> 100%	<i>If average of teacher and parent response rates is at less than 30% or fewer than 5 teacher or parent responses</i> Element score is N/A.	
Trust Survey (Trust)	<i>If average of teacher and parent response rates is at least 30%</i> 100%	<i>If average of teacher and parent response rates is at less than 30% or fewer than 5 teacher or parent responses</i> Element score is N/A.	

Examples:

- If the teacher response rate was over 50%, the school’s element score for Rigorous Instruction = $0.22 \times \text{QR 1.1 standard score} + 0.22 \times \text{QR 1.2 standard score} + 0.22 \times \text{QR 2.2 standard score} + 0.34 \times \text{survey element score}$ for Rigorous Instruction.
- If the teacher response rate was under 50% but at least 30%, the school’s element score for Collaborative Teachers = $0.67 \times \text{QR 4.2 standard score} + 0.33 \times \text{survey element score}$ for Collaborative Teachers.
- For a high school, if the student response rate was under 30%, the school’s element score for Supportive Environment is N/A.

Rigorous Instruction – Additional Rule

The Rigorous Instruction score, after being calculated based on the weighted average of standard scores as described in the table above, is supplemented with an additional rule:

The Rigorous Instruction score cannot fall below 3.00 if

- The school received a Quality Review during the past three years but not during the past year (i.e., during 2013-14 or 2014-15 but not 2015-16); and
- The school’s Rigorous Instruction survey score is at least 3.50; and
- The school’s Student Achievement score is at least 3.50.

This rule is designed to make it possible for schools that attain strong results on the Rigorous Instruction survey questions and in student achievement to earn Meeting Target in Rigorous Instruction if they do not have updated Quality Review ratings from 2015-16.

Missing Data

If Quality Review data is unavailable for a district school, its element scores will be

N/A for Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, and Supportive Environment.

For charter schools and YABCs, which do not receive Quality Reviews, any weight that would be applied to the Quality Review is shifted to the other data sources in the element. For example, if a charter school had a teacher response rate above 30%, then its element score for Rigorous Instruction would be based 100% on the survey.⁸

If a school does not have a score for Chronic Absenteeism, Average Change in Student Attendance, or Less Restrictive Environment, the weight for that metric is shifted to the other data sources in the element.

⁸ Because standard scores based on Quality Reviews and survey results are systematically different from standard scores based on surveys only, a rescaling is applied to the overall standard scores for charter schools and YABCs in Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, and Supportive Environment. The rescaling has the effect of putting the results for charter schools and YABCs (without Quality Reviews) on the same scale as the element scores of district schools (that include Quality Reviews).

Framework Element Ratings

Element Ratings

Element ratings are assigned based on the first digit of the school's element score:

Rating	Element Score
Exceeding Target (4 bars)	4.00 to 4.99
Meeting Target (3 bars)	3.00 to 3.99
Approaching Target (2 bars)	2.00 to 2.99
Not Meeting Target (1 bar)	1.00 to 1.99

Schools designated for phase-out and schools in their first year of operation in 2015-16 will not receive Framework element ratings in the 2015-16 School Quality Reports.

Rating Labels in the Guide and Snapshot

The metric and section ratings in the School Quality Snapshot are the same as in the School Quality Guide, except that different rating labels are used in the Snapshot:

School Quality Guide Rating Labels	School Quality Snapshot Rating Labels
Exceeding Target	Excellent
Meeting Target	Good
Approaching Target	Fair
Not Meeting Target	Poor

Appendix A

Floors and Ceilings for 2016-17 Targets

The following table shows floors (levels that the specific targets cannot go below) and ceilings (levels that the specific targets cannot go above).

	Target Floors			Target Ceilings		
	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target
Credit Accumulation						
Percent of Students Earning 10+ Credits in 1st Year	50%	60%	70%	92%	95%	97%
Percent of Students in School's Lowest Third Earning 10+ Credits in 1st Year	30%	45%	60%	92%	95%	97%
Percent of Students Earning 10+ Credits in 2nd Year	50%	60%	70%	92%	95%	97%
Percent of Students in School's Lowest Third Earning 10+ Credits in 2nd Year	30%	45%	60%	92%	95%	97%
Percent of Students Earning 10+ Credits in 3rd Year	50%	60%	70%	92%	95%	97%
Percent of Students in School's Lowest Third Earning 10+ Credits in 3rd Year	30%	45%	60%	92%	95%	97%
Regents Performance						
Average Completion Rate for Remaining Regents	25%	30%	40%	92%	95%	97%
Average Regents Score - English (non-Common Core)	60	65	67	80	85	90
Average Regents Score - English (Common Core)	60	65	67	80	85	90
Average Regents Score - Living Environment	60	65	67	80	85	90
Average Regents Score - Global History	55	60	65	80	85	90
Average Regents Score - US History	60	65	67	80	85	90
Average Regents Score - Algebra I (Common Core)	55	60	65	80	85	90
Graduation / Non-Dropout						
4-Year Graduation Rate	50%	60%	70%	92%	95%	97%
6-Year Graduation Rate	50%	60%	70%	92%	95%	97%
4-Year Non-Dropout Rate	60%	70%	80%	92%	95%	97%
6-Year Non-Dropout Rate	50%	60%	70%	92%	95%	97%

	Target Floors			Target Ceilings		
	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target
College and Career Readiness						
College and Career Preparatory Course Index	5%	10%	15%	92%	95%	97%
4-Year College Readiness Index	5%	10%	15%	92%	95%	97%
6-Year College Readiness Index	5%	10%	15%	92%	95%	97%
Postsecondary Enrollment Rate - 6 months	20%	25%	30%	92%	95%	97%
Postsecondary Enrollment Rate - 18 months	25%	30%	35%	92%	95%	97%
4-Year Graduation Rate (subgroups)						
English Language Learners	20%	30%	40%	92%	95%	97%
Self-Contained / ICT / SETSS	20%	30%	40%	92%	95%	97%
Lowest Third Citywide	20%	30%	40%	92%	95%	97%
Black / Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	20%	30%	40%	92%	95%	97%
College and Career Readiness of Students in Lowest Third Citywide						
College and Career Preparatory Course Index	5%	10%	15%	92%	95%	97%
4-Year College Readiness Index	1%	3%	5%	92%	95%	97%
Postsecondary Enrollment Rate - 6 months	10%	15%	20%	92%	95%	97%
Percentage of Students with 90%+ Attendance	50%	60%	70%			
Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments	0.10	0.15	0.20			

Appendix B

Element-Measure-Question Structure of the NYC School Survey

The following tables show the measures within each element, the respondent group(s) asked about each measure, and the questions that were asked.

Element Measure	Non-elementary schools			Elementary schools	
	Students	Teachers	Parents	Teachers	Parents
Rigorous Instruction					
Common Core shifts in literacy		✓		✓	
Common Core shifts in math		✓		✓	
Course clarity	✓				
Quality of student discussion		✓		✓	
Collaborative Teachers					
Collective responsibility		✓		✓	
Cultural awareness and inclusive classroom instruction	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Innovation		✓		✓	
Peer collaboration		✓		✓	
School commitment		✓		✓	
Quality of professional development		✓		✓	
Supportive Environment					
Classroom behavior	✓			✓	
Guidance	✓				
Peer support for academic work	✓			✓	
Personal attention and support	✓				
Press toward academic achievement	✓			✓	
Safety	✓			✓	
Social-emotional		✓		✓	
Effective School Leadership					
Inclusive principal leadership			✓		✓
Instructional leadership		✓		✓	
Program coherence		✓		✓	
Teacher influence		✓		✓	
Strong Family-Community Ties					
Parent involvement in the school			✓		✓
Outreach to parents		✓	✓	✓	✓
Trust					
Parent-principal trust			✓		✓
Parent-teacher trust			✓		✓
Student-teacher trust	✓				
Teacher-principal trust		✓		✓	
Teacher-teacher trust		✓		✓	

Rigorous Instruction

Questions included within each measure in the Rigorous Instruction element.

Common Core shifts in literacy

For general/self-contained/literacy/science/social studies: In planning my last instructional unit, I had the resources and tools I needed to include multiple opportunities for...

- T q16a building students' knowledge through content-rich non-fiction.
- T q16b reading and writing experiences grounded in evidence from text, both literary and informational.
- T q16c students to interact with complex grade-level text.
- T q16d students to interact with academic language.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Common Core shifts in math

For general/self-contained/math/science: In planning my last instructional unit, I had the resources and tools I needed to include multiple opportunities for...

- T q17a focusing deeply on the concepts emphasized in the standards to help students build strong foundations for learning.
- T q17b creating coherent progressions within the standards from previous grades to current grade so student knowledge/skills build onto previous learning as foundations for math concepts.
- T q17c creating coherent progressions within the standards from current grade to next grades so student knowledge/skills build onto previous learning as foundations for math concepts taught in later years.
- T q17d developing students' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and their ability to apply math in context.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Course clarity

In how many of your classes is the following statement true?

- S q2a I learn a lot from feedback on my work.
- S q2b It's clear what I need to do to get a good grade.
- S q2c The work we do in class is good preparation for our class tests.
- S q2d The homework assignments help me learn the course material.
- S q2e I know what my teacher wants me to learn in class.

1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

Quality of student discussion

How many students in your classes...

- T q18a build on each other's ideas during class discussions?
- T q18b use data or text references to support their ideas?
- T q18c show that they respect each other's ideas?
- T q18d provide constructive feedback to their peers/teachers?
- T q18e participate in class discussions at some point?

1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

Collaborative Teachers

Questions included within each measure in the Collaborative Teachers element.

Collective responsibility

- How many teachers at this school...*
- T q1a help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom?
 - T q1c take responsibility for improving the school?
 - T q1d feel responsible for helping students develop self-management?
 - T q1g feel responsible that all students learn?
- 1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All*

Cultural awareness and inclusive classroom instruction

- How much do you agree with the following statements?*
- S q1f My teachers use examples of students' different cultures/backgrounds/families in their lessons to make learning more meaningful for me.
 - S q1g I see people of many races, ethnicities, cultures, and backgrounds represented in the curriculum.
 - S q1h My teachers call on students of different races, ethnicities, cultures, and backgrounds.
 - S q1i I feel that my teachers respect my culture/background.
- 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know*
- Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. I am able to...*
- T q2a use my students' prior knowledge related to their cultural and linguistic backgrounds to help make learning meaningful.
 - T q2b modify instructional activities and materials to meet the developmental needs and learning interests of all my students.
 - T q2c critically examine the curriculum to determine whether it appropriately represents all groups.
 - T q2d design appropriate instruction that is matched to English language learners (ELL) proficiency and students with disabilities.
 - T q2f develop appropriate Individual Education Programs for my students with disabilities.
 - T q2g distinguish linguistic/cultural differences from learning difficulties.
- 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know*
- Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.*
- P q1i My child's teachers incorporate materials about different races, ethnicities, cultural backgrounds, and families into the curriculum to make learning more meaningful.
 - P q1j My child sees people of many different races, ethnicities, or cultural backgrounds represented in the curriculum.
- 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know*
- Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.*
- P q2g My child's school communicates with me in a language and in a way that I can understand.
- 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree*

Innovation

- How many teachers at this school...*
- T q1b are really trying to improve their teaching?
 - T q1e are willing to take risks to make the school better?
 - T q1f are eager to try new ideas?
- 1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All*

Peer collaboration

- Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school...*
- T q10a teachers design instructional programs together.
 - T q10b teachers make a conscious effort to coordinate their teaching with instruction at other grade levels.
 - T q10c the principal, teachers, and staff collaborate to make this school run effectively.
 - T q10d teachers talk about instruction in the teacher's lounge, faculty meetings, etc.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

School commitment

- Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following.*
- T q4a I usually look forward to each working day at this school.
 - T q4b I wouldn't want to work in any other school.
 - T q4c I would recommend this school to parents/guardians seeking a place for their child.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Quality of professional development

- Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. Overall, my professional development experiences this year have...*
- T q11a been sustained and coherently focused, rather than short-term and unrelated.
 - T q11b included enough time to think carefully about, try, and evaluate new ideas.
 - T q11c included opportunities to work productively with colleagues in my school.
 - T q11d included opportunities to work productively with teachers from other schools.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Supportive Environment

Questions included within each measure in the Supportive Environment element.

Classroom behavior

In how many of your classes at this school do students...

- S q6a listen carefully when the teacher gives directions?
- S q6b follow the rules in class?
- S q6c pay attention when they are supposed to?
- S q6d work when they are supposed to?
- S q6e behave well even when the teacher isn't watching?

1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

How many students in your classes...

- T* q19b listen carefully when the teacher gives directions?
- T* q19d follow the rules in class?
- T* q19f pay attention when they are supposed to?
- T* q19h do their work when they are supposed to?
- T* q19i behave well in class even when the teacher isn't watching?

1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Guidance

If you are a student in grades 6-8, ANSWER this question. If you are a student in grades 9-12, SKIP this question.

- S q9a This school provides useful information to students about the application/enrollment process to high school.
- S q9b This school provides guidance for the application process for high school.
- S q9c This school educates families about the application/enrollment process for high school.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

If you are a student in grades 9-12, ANSWER this question. How much do you agree with the following statements? Adults at this school (including teachers, administrators, counselors, and the principal)...

- S q10a help keep me on track for college or career.
- S q10b provide me with information about the college enrollment process.
- S q10c help me plan for my next steps after graduation (career planning, college selection and application process, financial aid process, etc.).
- S q10d help me choose which colleges to apply to.
- S q10e talk with me about how to pay for college.
- S q10f help me plan for how to meet my future career goals.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Peer support for academic work

In how many of your classes at this school do students...

- S q6f feel it is important to come to school every day?
- S q6g feel it is important to pay attention in class?
- S q6h think doing homework is important?
- S q6i try hard to get good grades?

1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

How many of the students in your class(es)...

- T* q23a feel it is important to come to school every day?
- T* q23b feel it is important to pay attention in class?
- T* q23c think doing homework is important?
- T* q23d try hard to get good grades?

1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Personal attention and support

In how many of your classes is the following statement true? My teachers...

- S q3a help me catch up if I am behind.
- S q3b notice if I have trouble learning something.
- S q3c give me specific suggestions about how I can improve my work in class.
- S q3d explain things a different way if I don't understand something in class.
- S q3e notice when I am upset.

1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

Press toward academic achievement

In how many of your classes ...

- S q4a are you challenged?
- S q4b do your teachers ask difficult questions on tests?
- S q4c do your teachers ask difficult questions in class?
- S q4d do you work in small groups?
- S q4e do your teachers want students to become better thinkers, not just memorize things?

1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

How much do you agree with the following statements?

- S q5a I'm learning a lot in my classes at this school to prepare me for the next level or grade.
- S q5g My classes at this school really make me think.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

How many students in your classes...

- T* q19a feel challenged?
- T* q19c have to work hard to do well?
- T* q19e respond to challenging test questions?
- T* q19g respond to challenging questions in class?

1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

How often do students in your class(es)...

- T* q22a Work in small groups?

1 = None of the time, 2 = Some of the time, 3 = Most of the time, 4 = All of the time

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Safety

How much do you agree with the following statements?

- S q5h Discipline is applied fairly in my school.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

How much do you agree with the following statements? I feel safe...

- S q7a outside around this school.
- S q7b traveling between home and this school.
- S q7c in the hallways, bathrooms, locker rooms, and cafeteria of this school.
- S q7d in my classes at this school.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

How much do you agree with the following statements? My students are safe...

- T* q24a outside around this school.
- T* q24b traveling between home and this school.
- T* q24c in the hallways, bathrooms, locker rooms, and cafeteria of this school.
- T* q24d in my class(es).

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

How much do you agree with the following statement?

- T* q25a Discipline is applied to students fairly in my school.
- 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree*

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Social-emotional

How many adults at this school...

- T q20a help students develop the skills they need to complete challenging coursework despite obstacles?
- T q20b tell their students they believe they can achieve high academic standards?
- T q20c teach critical thinking skills to students?
- T q20d teach students how to advocate for themselves?
- T q20e teach students the organizational skills needed to be prepared for their next level?
- T q20f recognize disruptive behavior as social-emotional learning opportunities?
- T q20g teach students the skills they need to regulate their behavior (i.e. by focusing their attention, controlling their emotions, or managing their thinking, behavior, and feelings)?
- T q20h have access to school based supports to assist in behavioral/emotional escalations?
- T q28a create an atmosphere that encourages students to work towards a college degree?

1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All, 5 = I don't know

Effective School Leadership

Questions included within each measure in the Effective School Leadership element.

Inclusive principal leadership

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.

- P q1g The principal/school leaders encourage feedback from parents/guardians and the community through regular meetings with parent and teacher leaders.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements. The principal/school leader at this school...

- P q3a is strongly committed to shared decision making.
 P q3b works to create a sense of community in the school.
 P q3c promotes family and community involvement in the school.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know

Instructional leadership

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. The principal/school leader at this school...

- T q12a makes clear to the staff his or her expectations for meeting instructional goals.
 T q12b communicates a clear vision for this school.
 T q12c understands how children learn.
 T q12d sets high standards for student learning.
 T q12e sets clear expectations for teachers about implementing what they have learned in professional development.
 T q12f carefully tracks student academic progress.
 T q12g knows what's going on in my classroom.
 T q12h participates in instructional planning with teams of teachers.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Program coherence

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school...

- T q8a once we start a new program, we follow up to make sure that it's working.
 T q8b it is clear how all of the programs offered are connected to our school's instructional vision.
 T q8c curriculum, instruction, and learning materials are well coordinated across the different grade levels at this school.
 T q8d there is consistency in curriculum, instruction, and learning materials among teachers in the same grade level at this school.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Teacher influence

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school...

- T q9f The principal/school leader encourages feedback through regular meetings with parent and teacher leaders.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

How much influence do teachers have over school policy in each of the areas below?

- T q13c Selecting instructional materials used in classrooms.
 T q13d Developing instructional materials.
 T q13e Setting standards for student behavior.
1 = No influence, 2 = Little, 3 = A moderate amount, 4 = A great deal of influence

Strong Family-Community Ties

Questions included within each measure in the Strong Family-Community Ties element.

Parent involvement in the school

Since the beginning of the school year, how often have you...

- P q4a Been asked or had the opportunity to volunteer time to support this school (for example, spent time helping in classrooms, helped with wide school-wide events, etc.)?
- P q4b Communicated with your child's teacher about your child's performance?
- P q4c Seen your child's projects, artwork, homework, tests or quizzes?

1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often

Outreach to parents

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school...

- T q9a Parents/guardians are invited to visit classrooms to observe the instructional program.
- T q9c Teachers understand families' problems and concerns.
- T q9d Teachers work closely with families to meet students' needs.
- T q9e School staff regularly communicate with parents/guardians about how parents can help students learn.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.

- P q1a School staff regularly communicate with parents/guardians about how parents can help students learn.
- P q1b Parents/guardians are invited to visit classrooms to observe instruction.
- P q1c Parents/guardians are greeted warmly when they call or visit the school.
- P q1e Teachers work closely with families to meet students' needs.
- P q1f Teachers communicate regularly with parents/guardians.
- P q1h Teachers understand families' problems and concerns.

1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree, 5= I don't know

Trust

Questions included within each measure in the Trust element.

Parent-principal trust

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.

- P q2c I feel respected by my child's principal/school leader.
 P q2d I trust the principal/ school leader at his or her word (to do what he or she says that he or she will do)
 P q2e The principal/school leader is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly.
 P q2f The principal/school leader at this school works hard to build trusting relationships with parents/guardians like me.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Parent-teacher trust

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.

- P q1d Teachers and parents/guardians think of each other as partners in educating children.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.

- P q2a I feel respected by my child's teachers.
 P q2b Staff at this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents/guardians like me.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Student-teacher trust

How much do you agree with the following statements?

- S q5b There is at least one adult in the school that I can confide in.
 S q5c My teachers will always listen to students' ideas.
 S q5d My teachers always keep their promises.
 S q5e My teachers treat me with respect.
 S q5f When my teachers tell me not to do something, I know they have a good reason.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Teacher-teacher trust

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following.

- T q5a Teachers in this school trust each other.
 T q5b It's OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with other teachers.
 T q5c Teachers respect other teachers who take the lead in school improvement efforts.
 T q5d I feel respected by other teachers at this school.
 T q5e Teachers at this school respect those colleagues who have a specific expertise.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree

Teacher-principal trust

Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following.

- T q6a I feel respected by the principal at this school.
 T q6b The principal at this school is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly.
 T q6c The principal has confidence in the expertise of the teachers at this school.
 T q6d I trust the principal/school leader at his or her word (to do what he or she says that he or she will do).
 T q6e At this school, It's OK to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with the principal.

- T q6f The principal takes a personal interest in the professional development of teachers.
- T q6g The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the staff members.
- T q6h The principal places the needs of children ahead of personal interests.
- T q6i The principal and assistant principals function as a cohesive unit.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree