

## Proposed Changes to the School Quality Reports for 2016-17

Last updated: May 1, 2017

This document describes proposed changes to the 2016-17 School Quality Reports. These changes build on the methodology described in the [2015-16 Educator Guides to the School Quality Reports](#). The School Performance team will collect feedback about these proposed changes during an open-comment period. Please send any feedback to [SchoolPerformance@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:SchoolPerformance@schools.nyc.gov) by May 31, 2017. After considering feedback, a Final Changes document will be published describing the changes for the 2016-17 School Quality Reports.

### Proposed Changes

Schools that receive Quality Reviews in 2016-17 will receive ratings on ten indicators—instead of the five rated indicators in Quality Reviews from the past several years. The following table lists the proposed data sources for the Framework elements in the 2016-17 School Quality Reports:

Element	2015-16 Data Sources	Proposed 2016-17 Data Sources <i>(new data source)</i>
Rigorous Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• QR 1.1 (curriculum)</li> <li>• QR 1.2 (instruction)</li> <li>• QR 2.2 (assessment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• QR 1.1 (curriculum)</li> <li>• QR 1.2 (instruction)</li> <li>• QR 2.2 (assessment)</li> </ul>
Collaborative Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• QR 4.2 (teacher teams)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• <i>QR 4.1 (teacher support and supervision)</i></li> <li>• QR 4.2 (teacher teams)</li> </ul>
Supportive Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• QR 3.4 (high expectations)</li> <li>• Chronic absenteeism (change in attendance for transfer schools, YABC, and District 75 only)</li> <li>• Movement to less restrictive environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• <i>QR 1.4 (positive learning environment)</i></li> <li>• QR 3.4 (high expectations)</li> <li>• Chronic absenteeism (change in attendance for transfer schools, YABC, and District 75 only)</li> <li>• Movement to less restrictive environment</li> </ul>
Effective School Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• <i>QR 1.3 (resources aligned to instructional goals)</i></li> <li>• <i>QR 3.1 (school-level goals and action plans)</i></li> <li>• <i>QR 5.1 (school-level decisions)</i></li> </ul>
Strong Family-Community Ties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> <li>• <i>QR 3.4 (high expectations)</i></li> </ul>
Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NYC School Survey</li> </ul>

Notes:

- For schools that do not receive a Quality Review in 2016-17, the applicable data sources that are available will be used. Examples:
  - For a school that received a Quality Review in 2015-16 but not in 2016-17, the Collaborative Teachers section will be based on the NYC School Survey and Quality Review Indicator 4.2.
  - For a school that did not receive a Quality Review in 2016-17, the Effective School Leadership section will be based on the NYC School Survey.
  
- Quality Review Indicator 3.4 appears in both the Supportive Environment section and the Strong Family-Community Ties section because it measures areas that are relevant to both elements. The scoring weights for this Quality Review indicator will be set in a way that prevents it from having a disproportionate impact on the Framework ratings compared to the other Quality Review indicators.

## Technical Changes

1. **College Readiness Index:** The College Readiness Index for the 2016-17 School Quality Reports has been updated to reflect [CUNY's standards for college readiness](#) for Fall 2017.

Note the following changes:

- The advanced coursework requirement for math readiness applies only if a student uses a non-Common Core Regents math exam to demonstrate math readiness. If a student uses a Common Core Regents math exam or PBAT to demonstrate math readiness, the advanced coursework requirement does not apply.
- For SAT exams taken in March 2016 and later, the minimum score is 480 on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing Test (instead of 26 on the SAT Reading Test, as used for 2015-16). (Also, note that the Math score required on SAT exams taken in March 2016 and later is 530. For prior SAT exams, the minimum Math score is 500.)
- The CUNY Assessment Test requirements have been modified to reflect new exams being used.

Here are the full rules:

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 Evidence-Based Reading and Writing Test (March 2016 and later)	480
ACT English	20
CUNY Assessment Test	Reading – 55 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, plus coursework requirement
Common Core Math Regents (Algebra I or Geometry)	70
Common Core Math Regents (Algebra 2/Trigonometry)	65
SAT Math (pre-March 2016)	500
SAT Math (March 2016 and later)	530
ACT Math	21
CUNY Assessment Test	Elementary Algebra (Math 5) – 57
New York State Performance Standards Consortium PBAT	Pass, plus coursework requirement

If a student uses a non-Common Core Regents math exam in Integrated Algebra, Geometry, or Algebra 2/Trigonometry to demonstrate math proficiency, the student must also demonstrate completion of coursework through at least Algebra 2 / 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.

2. **Student Achievement Targets for 2016-17 School Quality Reports:** The Student Achievement targets include several technical changes.
  - a. **Comparison Group:** In the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, the Student Achievement targets were set primarily based on Comparison Group results (85%), but also took into account citywide results (15%). For 2016-17, the methodology has been modified so that targets are based 100% on the Comparison Group results. Because the Comparison Group takes into account the specific student population served by the school, it provides the best information about expected outcomes for students and the school, which are used to set appropriate targets.
  - b. **Floors/Ceilings:** Targets cannot fall below the floors and cannot be above the ceilings. Some of the floors and ceilings, which are set forth in the [2015-16 Educator Guides to the School Quality Reports](#), have been adjusted from the previous year’s levels. They are designed to prevent unreasonable results and to avoid an unintended incentive for high-performing schools to engage in test prep in order to help students achieve near-perfect scores on the exams. For example, if the school has a Regents average of 94 while their Comparison Group has 97, the school will not be penalized for this.