Department of Education
Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

School Quality Guide

2013-2014

School: P.S. 38 Roberto Clemente

DBN: 04M038

Principal: Carlina Santos Barton

School Type: Elementary

In this report:

School Overview	1
School Quality Guide Summary	2
Quality Review	3–4
Graphs Walk-Through	5
Student Progress	6-7
Student Achievement	8-9
School Environment	10
Closing the Achievement Gap	11
Summary of Section Ratings	12-13
Additional Information	14
Peer Group Schools	15
Metric Targets for 2014–15	16-17

School Overview

Grade	Enrollment		
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Pre-K	35	32	35
Kindergarten	32	51	31
Grade 1	36	36	49
Grade 2	41	39	32
Grade 3	35	54	45
Grade 4	49	42	47
Grade 5	46	40	44
All Students	**274**	**294**	**283**

Student Population Characteristics	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
% English Language Learners	17%	18%	16%
% Students with IEPs	31%	31%	35%
% Students with IEPs (less than 20% time with non-disabled peers)	8%	6%	7%
% Free Lunch Eligible	83%	89%	89%
% Asian	5%	7%	7%
% Black	29%	32%	33%
% Hispanic	62%	58%	57%
% White	3%	3%	2%
% Other	0%	0%	1%

Quality Review

Dates of Review: November 3-4, 2011
Principal at Time of Review: Norma Caraballo

UNDERDEVELOPED	DEVELOPING	**PROFICIENT**	WELL DEVELOPED

Student Progress

NOT MEETING TARGET	APPROACHING TARGET	**MEETING TARGET**	EXCEEDING TARGET

Student Achievement

NOT MEETING TARGET	**APPROACHING TARGET**	MEETING TARGET	EXCEEDING TARGET

School Environment

NOT MEETING TARGET	APPROACHING TARGET	MEETING TARGET	EXCEEDING TARGET

Closing the Achievement Gap

NOT MEETING TARGET	APPROACHING TARGET	**MEETING TARGET**	EXCEEDING TARGET

State Accountability

The school's current status: **Good Standing**

This designation is determined by the New York State Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver. More information on New York State accountability can be found here: http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/tools/accountability/default.htm.

Quality Review

PROFICIENT 3

Dates of Review: November 3-4, 2011
Principal at Time of Review: Norma Caraballo
QR Lead Reviewer: Luz T. Cortazzo

The Quality Review is an evaluation of the school by an experienced educator based on a formal school visit. The educator observes classrooms and engages in conversations with parents, students, teachers, and school leaders to assess schoolwide practices. The Quality Review report provides specific feedback to support the school's efforts. The information displayed here reflects the most recent year that a Quality Review was conducted at this school. Some schools will not have Quality Review information if they opened within the last two years or if their most recent review took place prior to August 2010.

To what extent does the school...

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?*

Excerpt: The implementation of a rigorous curriculum that is aligned to key State standards is closing the achievement gap between a diversity of learners.

PROFICIENT

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?*

Excerpt: The implementation of well-differentiated, curriculum aligned project based learning allows students to undertake research and solve problems meeting the needs of all learners.

WELL DEVELOPED

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?*

Excerpt: Through regular use of a wide range of relevant data, teachers and administrators monitor the progress of students which informs effective instructional and organizational decisions for growth.

PROFICIENT

3.4 *Establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to staff, students, and families, and provide supports to achieve those expectations?*

Excerpt: N/A - This indicator was rated but not written about in the school's final report.

PROFICIENT

4.2 *Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams using an inquiry approach that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning?*

Excerpt: All teachers collaborate on inquiry teams analyzing student data, to support and share best instructional practices which has increased academic performance for all learners.

WELL DEVELOPED

Quality Review - continued

PROFICIENT 4

Dates of Review: November 3-4, 2011
Principal at Time of Review: Norma Caraballo
QR Lead Reviewer: Luz T. Cortazzo

Areas of Celebration

- Research-based, effective instruction that yields high quality student work
- Aligned use of resources to support instructional goals that meet students' needs
- Structures for positive learning environment, inclusive culture, and student success
- Teacher teams engaged in collaborative practice using the inquiry approach to improve classroom practice
- Rigorous, engaging and coherent curricula aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards

Areas of Focus

- Support and evaluation of teachers through feedback using the Danielson framework and analysis of learning outcomes
- Progress tracked at the school, teacher team and classroom level and regularly communicated to ensure the achievement of learning goals
- Transparent, collaborative system(s) for measuring progress towards interim and long term goals and making adjustments during the year and over time
- Data used to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of structured professional collaboration, capacity building, and leadership development strategies

How to Interpret the Graphs Used in the Remainder of the Report

Most of the metrics in the report are presented through two standard graphs, which are intended to help place the school's performance in context.

Graph Showing Metric Values

This graph shows the school's performance on each metric over the past three years, as well as the range of historical performance by peer schools and citywide schools used in the School Quality Guide (or Progress Report) for those three years. Peer schools for an elementary or K-8 school are similar along the following student population characteristics: Economic Need Index, percent of students with disabilities, percent of black or Hispanic students, and percent of English language learners. Peer schools for middle schools are similar along the following student population characteristics: students' average proficiency on 4th grade ELA and math tests, percent of students with disabilities, and percent of students two or more years overage upon entry into 6th grade. Peer schools for high schools are similar along the following student population characteristics: average 8th grade ELA proficiency, average 8th grade math proficiency, percent students with disabilities, percent students with self-contained placements, and percent over-age students.

- The vertical bars show the school's values on the metric for the last three years, with the school's numerical values (e.g., **30, 19, and 19** in the example below) displayed at the bottom of the bars. These bars can show trends over time in the school's own performance.

- Each year, the School Quality Guide compares the school's performance against multiple years of historical performance by peer and city schools. The middle horizontal line, in black, shows the average from this pool of historical performance by peer schools or the city, depending on which comparison group is being used. Comparing the top of the vertical bar with this black line shows whether the school is above or below the average of the pool of historical results achieved by the comparison group.

- The top and bottom horizontal lines, in gray, show the top and bottom of the "range" of historical values for the comparison group. The range spans two standard deviations above and below the average; in general, this range contains approximately 96% of the values attained by schools in the comparison group. The lower gray line shows the value at the bottom of the range for the comparison group and the higher gray line shows the value at the top of the range for the comparison group. The position of the vertical bar between the two gray lines shows visually where the school falls within the distribution of results achieved by the comparison group.



Graph Showing Percent of Range

This graph displays the "percent of range" of the school's values for the last three years. The percent of range reflects where the school's value falls between the bottom and top of the range. In mathematical terms, *percent of range = (school's value – bottom of range) / (top of range – bottom of range)*. The colors to the right of the chart display the ranges for the various ratings. The range for Exceeding Target is shown in dark green, Meeting Target is shown in light green, Approaching Target is shown in orange, and Not Meeting Target is shown in red.



Student Progress

MEETING TARGET

Student Progress includes growth metrics based on how students improved on the state tests between 2013 and 2014.

English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile (n=85)

This metric calculates the median adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile (n=85)

This metric calculates the median adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third (n=29)

This metric calculates the median adjusted growth percentile of a school's lowest third of students in prior year English scores. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third (n=29)

This metric calculates the median adjusted growth percentile of a school's lowest third of students in prior year Math scores. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Student Progress includes growth metrics based on how students improved on the state tests between 2013 and 2014.

English Early Grade Progress (n=45)

This metric reflects the proficiency levels attained by third grade students on the state exam, weighted based on the likelihood of achieving those levels given the students' demographic indicators. Schools receive more credit on this metric when students achieve at higher levels than expected based on their demographic indicators.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Math Early Grade Progress (n=45)

This metric reflects the proficiency levels attained by third grade students on the state exam, weighted based on the likelihood of achieving those levels given the students' demographic indicators. Schools receive more credit on this metric when students achieve at higher levels than expected based on their demographic indicators.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Student Achievement

APPROACHING TARGET 8

Student Achievement is based on results on the 2014 state tests in English and Math, and a measure of readiness for middle school.

English - Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 (n=132)

This metric shows the percentage of students who are performing at or above proficiency as defined by New York State on Common Core ELA exams in the current year. This is the percentage of students at either Level 3 (proficient) or Level 4 (advanced).

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Math - Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 (n=133)

This metric shows the percentage of students who are performing at or above proficiency as defined by New York State on Common Core math exams in the current year. This is the percentage of students at either Level 3 (proficient) or Level 4 (advanced).

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

English - Average Student Proficiency (n=132)

This metric represents the average (mean) Proficiency Rating in ELA for all students attributed to the school. The Average Proficiency Rating is measured on a scale of 1.00 to 4.50, and is based on students' scale scores on the State exams in ELA.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Math - Average Student Proficiency (n=133)

This metric represents the average (mean) Proficiency Rating in Math for all students attributed to the school. The Average Proficiency Rating is measured on a scale of 1.00 to 4.50, and is based on students' scale scores on the State exams in Math.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Student Achievement is based on results on the 2014 state tests in English and Math, and a measure of readiness for middle school.

Middle School Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students (n=34)

This metric is based upon the core course pass rates of the school's 2012-13 5th graders who, in 2013-14, attended a NYC DOE middle school.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

School Environment

NOT MEETING TARGET

The NYC School Survey is administered annually to all parents, all teachers, and students in grades 6–12. Through the survey, these members of school communities respond to questions that gauge their satisfaction with elements of the school's learning environment. In 2013–14 accountability reports, these responses were reorganized to broadly align to guiding concepts in the Quality Review rubric: the instructional core, school culture, and systems for improvement. Please note that this organization is designed to help school communities better interpret survey responses, but survey responses do not contribute to Quality Review ratings in these categories.

Survey Satisfaction - Instructional Core

This metric shows the average percent of positive responses to the NYC School Survey questions related to the school's instructional core.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Survey Satisfaction - School Culture

This metric shows the average percent of positive responses to the NYC School Survey questions related to the school's culture.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Survey Satisfaction - Systems for Improvement

This metric shows the average percent of positive responses to the NYC School Survey questions related to the school's systems for improvement.

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Attendance

The attendance rate includes the attendance for all K-8 students on a school's register at any point during the school year (September through June).

Peer



School and Peer Values



Percent of Peer Range

City



School and City Values



Percent of City Range

Closing the Achievement Gap

MEETING TARGET

Closing the Achievement Gap measures the extent to which the school serves and succeeds with students in special populations.

	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	SCHOOL'S RESULTS	POPULATION PERCENTAGE	SCHOOL'S RESULTS	POPULATION PERCENTAGE	SCHOOL'S RESULTS	POPULATION PERCENTAGE
Percent at Level 3 or 4						
English						
Self-Contained (n = 20)	11.8%	13.5%	0.0%	11.2%	5.0%	15.2%
Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) (n = 33)	19.2%	20.6%	3.0%	24.6%	3.0%	25.0%
Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) (n = 7)	0.0%	5.6%			0.0%	5.3%
Mathematics						
Self-Contained (n = 20)	35.3%	13.5%	0.0%	11.2%	10.0%	15.0%
Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) (n = 33)	38.5%	20.6%	3.0%	24.6%	15.2%	24.8%
Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) (n = 7)	42.9%	5.6%			0.0%	5.3%
Percent at 75th Growth Percentile or Higher						
English						
English Language Learners (n = 15)	27.3%	25.9%	46.7%	20.3%	53.3%	17.6%
Lowest Third Citywide (n = 49)	40.5%	49.4%	65.0%	54.1%	46.9%	57.6%
Self-Contained/ICT/SETSS (n = 39)	38.2%	40.0%	76.9%	35.1%	53.8%	45.9%
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide (n = 25)	30.8%	30.6%	88.9%	24.3%	52.0%	29.4%
Mathematics						
English Language Learners (n = 15)	50.0%	25.9%	26.7%	20.3%	33.3%	17.6%
Lowest Third Citywide (n = 45)	40.0%	58.8%	48.8%	58.1%	37.8%	52.9%
Self-Contained/ICT/SETSS (n = 39)	61.8%	40.0%	61.5%	35.1%	41.0%	45.9%
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide (n = 18)	46.4%	32.9%	60.0%	20.3%	38.9%	21.2%
Movement from SC/ICT/SETSS to Less Restrictive Environments (n = 54)	0.53	23.0%	0.18	18.7%	0.09	21.8%
English Language Learner Progress (n = 34)	48.8%	17.3%	73.3%	17.2%	44.1%	13.7%

Summary of Section Ratings

This section shows how the ratings are calculated for the Student Progress, Student Achievement, School Environment, and Closing the Achievement Gap sections.

	This School's Results	Peer Comparison (weighted 75%)				City Comparison (weighted 25%)				Points Possible	Points Earned
		Peer Range			Percent of Peer Range	City Range			Percent of City Range		
		0%	Average	100%		0%	Average	100%			
Student Progress											
English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile (n = 85)	65.0	45.7	64.2	82.7	52.2%	47.6	63.7	79.8	54.0%	16.7	8.8
Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile (n = 85)	57.0	35.0	59.5	84.0	44.9%	39.3	61.7	84.1	39.5%	16.7	7.3
English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third (n = 29)	76.0	64.6	79.7	94.8	37.7%	57.0	74.1	91.2	55.6%	16.7	7.0
Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third (n = 29)	79.0	54.5	75.2	95.9	59.2%	52.0	71.6	91.2	68.9%	16.7	10.3
English Early Grade Progress (n = 45)	1.57	0.00	1.39	2.78	56.5%	0.44	1.98	3.52	36.7%	16.7	8.6
Math Early Grade Progress (n = 45)	2.48	0.00	1.83	3.66	67.8%	0.09	2.54	4.99	48.8%	16.7	10.5

Student Progress Section Rating			
Not Meeting Target 25.4 or Lower	Approaching Target 25.5 to 47.6	**Meeting Target 47.7 to 63.1**	Exceeding Target 63.2 or Higher

52.5

Student Achievement											
English - Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 (n = 132)	8.3%	0.0%	10.3%	20.6%	40.3%	0.0%	28.0%	56.0%	14.8%	22.5	7.6
Math - Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4 (n = 133)	13.5%	0.0%	12.7%	25.4%	53.1%	0.0%	35.0%	70.0%	19.3%	22.5	10.0
English - Average Student Proficiency (n = 132)	2.15	1.90	2.16	2.42	48.1%	1.83	2.51	3.19	23.5%	22.5	9.4
Math - Average Student Proficiency (n = 133)	2.28	1.83	2.21	2.59	59.2%	1.81	2.69	3.57	26.7%	22.5	11.5
Middle School Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students (n = 34)	78.7%	72.5%	87.1%	100.0%	22.5%	75.0%	91.8%	100.0%	14.8%	10.0	2.1

Student Achievement Section Rating			
Not Meeting Target 28.0 or Lower	**Approaching Target 28.1 to 48.2**	Meeting Target 48.3 to 71.2	Exceeding Target 71.3 or Higher

40.6

School Environment											
School Survey - Instructional Core	81.4%	76.9%	90.3%	100.0%	19.5%	82.3%	92.0%	100.0%	0.0%	22.2	3.2
School Survey - School Culture	79.2%	75.3%	88.2%	100.0%	15.8%	81.7%	91.1%	100.0%	0.0%	22.2	2.6
School Survey - Structures for Improvement	74.2%	71.5%	86.8%	100.0%	9.5%	76.5%	88.7%	100.0%	0.0%	22.2	1.6
Attendance Rate	88.0%	88.0%	91.1%	94.2%	0.0%	89.1%	93.3%	97.5%	0.0%	33.3	0.0

School Environment Section Rating			
Not Meeting Target 20.6 or Lower	Approaching Target 20.7 to 50.3	Meeting Target 50.4 to 68.0	Exceeding Target 68.1 or Higher

7.4

This section shows how the ratings are calculated for the Student Progress, Student Achievement, School Environment, and Closing the Achievement Gap sections.

	This School's Population Percentage	This School's Population Percentage (Percent of City Range)	This School's Results	This School's Results (Percent of City Range)
Closing the Achievement Gap				
Percent at Level 3 or 4				
English				
Self-Contained (n = 20)	15.2%	67.3%	5.0%	100.0%
Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) (n = 33)	25.0%	100.0%	3.0%	19.0%
Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) (n = 7)	5.3%	44.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Mathematics				
Self-Contained (n = 20)	15.0%	66.7%	10.0%	79.4%
Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) (n = 33)	24.8%	100.0%	15.2%	48.7%
Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) (n = 7)	5.3%	44.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Percent at 75th Growth Percentile or Higher				
English				
English Language Learners (n = 15)	17.6%	35.9%	53.3%	71.0%
Lowest Third Citywide (n = 49)	57.6%	81.5%	46.9%	40.7%
Self-Contained/ICT/SETSS (n = 39)	45.9%	100.0%	53.8%	57.4%
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide (n = 25)	29.4%	70.5%	52.0%	52.4%
Mathematics				
English Language Learners (n = 15)	17.6%	34.6%	33.3%	40.9%
Lowest Third Citywide (n = 45)	52.9%	71.0%	37.8%	32.5%
Self-Contained/ICT/SETSS (n = 39)	45.9%	100.0%	41.0%	42.1%
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide (n = 18)	21.2%	52.3%	38.9%	37.7%
Movement from SC/ICT/SETSS to Less Restrictive Environments (n = 54)	21.8%	100.0%	0.09	15.0%
English Language Learner Progress (n = 34)	13.7%	34.7%	44.1%	21.9%
			Average of Results (Percent of City Range)	**41.2**

Closing the Achievement Gap			
Not Meeting Target 23.1 or Lower	Approaching Target 23.2 to 41.1	Meeting Target 41.2 to 58.9	Exceeding Target 59.0 or Higher

This Closing the Achievement Gap section reflects the degree to which the school is helping high-need students succeed. In some cases, schools will not receive a rating in this section because those students make up a very small proportion of the school's student population.

The metric values, listed as "This School's Results," show the school's results with its students in the relevant group. The metric scores, listed as "This School's Results (Percent of City Range)," show how the school's results compared to the rest of the city. A metric will not be scored, however, if those students are a very small proportion of the school—specifically, if "This School's Population Percentage (Percent of City Range)" is less than 25.0% (meaning that the school's population percentage is more than one standard deviation below the citywide average). For these unscored metrics, "This School's Results (Percent of City Range)" will be left blank.

The section score is the average of the school's metric scores, and the section rating is determined by the range that the score falls within, which will be shaded in the ratings table above. A school will not receive a rating, however, if it has fewer than five scored metrics in this section.

This page provides more granular data on student outcomes. While the numbers here do not individually count for points, the detailed deconstruction should provide deeper insight into 2013–14 student outcomes.

State Exam Scores by Grade

	AVERAGE STUDENT PROFICIENCY	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS AT LEVEL 3 OR LEVEL 4	MEDIAN ADJUSTED GROWTH PERCENTILE
Mathematics			
3rd Grade (n = 45)	2.37	17.8%	
4th Grade (n = 46)	2.18	8.7%	51.0
5th Grade (n = 42)	2.31	14.3%	62.5
English			
3rd Grade (n = 45)	2.16	8.9%	
4th Grade (n = 45)	2.06	6.7%	66.0
5th Grade (n = 42)	2.22	9.5%	64.5
Science			
4th Grade (n = 46)	2.78	43.5%	

Chronic Absenteeism

	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCHOOLWIDE	AVERAGE OF SCHOOLS CITYWIDE
Students With Less Than 90% Attendance (n = 303)	50.2%	21.6%

Peer Group Schools

Each school's performance is compared to the performance of schools in its peer group. Peer schools are those New York City public schools with a student population most like this school's population, according to the peering characteristics. Each school has up to 40 peer schools (except for K-8 schools, which have up to 30 peer schools).

Peer groupings are created using a matching methodology that examines the mathematical difference between a school and all potential peers on the peering characteristics. Schools with the smallest difference across all the characteristics are peered together.

DBN	SCHOOL	ECONOMIC NEED INDEX	% STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	% BLACK OR HISPANIC	% ELL
04M038	**P.S. 38 Roberto Clemente**	**1.18**	**35.5%**	**89.9%**	**15.7%**
01M015	P.S. 015 Roberto Clemente	1.33	37.2%	92.1%	11.6%
01M064	P.S. 064 Robert Simon	0.95	37.8%	85.8%	7.5%
01M137	P.S. 137 John L. Bernstein	1.02	39.1%	80.4%	14.1%
01M142	P.S. 142 Amalia Castro	1.02	32.6%	89.5%	9.1%
03M241	STEM Institute of Manhattan	1.14	32.3%	96.0%	13.1%
03M242	P.S. 242 - The Young Diplomats Magnet Academy	1.08	34.1%	96.1%	10.2%
04M102	P.S. 102 Jacques Cartier	0.91	32.8%	90.7%	13.4%
04M375	Mosaic Preparatory Academy	1.26	35.4%	90.2%	13.5%
05M030	P.S. 030 Hernandez/Hughes	1.10	30.4%	95.2%	14.8%
05M092	P.S. 092 Mary McLeod Bethune	1.15	28.3%	98.4%	13.5%
05M125	P.S. 125 Ralph Bunche	0.98	37.6%	91.7%	15.3%
05M133	P.S. 133 Fred R Moore	1.03	32.6%	95.3%	8.6%
05M154	P.S. 154 Harriet Tubman	1.00	29.0%	95.8%	14.5%
05M194	P.S. 194 Countee Cullen	1.23	28.7%	95.9%	17.9%
07X065	P.S. 065 Mother Hale Academy	1.26	27.8%	97.6%	17.1%
07X385	Performance School	1.05	36.4%	99.1%	18.2%
08X048	P.S. 048 Joseph R. Drake	1.21	29.5%	97.9%	16.3%
08X107	P.S. 107	1.06	28.7%	97.8%	9.6%
09X110	P.S. 110 Theodore Schoenfeld	1.07	28.3%	95.6%	12.2%
09X132	P.S. 132 Garret A. Morgan	1.07	28.0%	98.6%	13.2%
09X230	P.S. 230 Dr Roland N. Patterson	1.01	31.7%	96.5%	18.1%
09X449	Grant Avenue Elementary School	1.06	31.9%	95.9%	19.5%
10X023	P.S. 023 The New Children's School	1.10	35.1%	98.1%	16.8%
10X059	P.S. 059 The Community School of Technology	1.17	28.2%	97.3%	13.0%
12X050	P.S. 050 Clara Barton	0.98	36.9%	98.4%	11.8%
13K067	P.S. 067 Charles A. Dorsey	1.14	32.4%	86.9%	8.5%
14K019	P.S. 019 Roberto Clemente	0.95	36.3%	95.6%	23.9%
14K196	P.S. 196 Ten Eyck	0.99	32.7%	98.4%	10.1%
14K257	P.S. 257 John F. Hylan	0.87	32.6%	96.5%	16.3%
16K025	P.S. 025 Eubie Blake School	1.16	29.6%	98.5%	8.5%
16K081	P.S. 081 Thaddeus Stevens	1.12	33.5%	96.8%	9.2%
16K309	P.S. 309 The George E. Wibecan Preparatory Academy	1.09	30.6%	96.1%	6.6%
17K022	P.S. 022	1.15	41.7%	95.8%	12.5%
17K375	P.S. 375 Jackie Robinson School	0.98	29.2%	91.4%	20.5%
19K260	P.S. 260 Breuckelen	0.95	35.7%	96.4%	7.1%
23K150	P.S. 150 Christopher	1.05	30.5%	92.0%	15.5%
23K631	General D. Chappie James Elementary School of Science	1.19	34.7%	92.6%	7.4%
31R014	P.S. 014 Cornelius Vanderbilt	0.94	37.0%	88.0%	11.0%
31R044	P.S. 044 Thomas C. Brown	0.93	31.7%	94.9%	8.4%
31R057	P.S. 057 Hubert H. Humphrey	0.88	33.6%	89.5%	9.9%
PEER GROUP AVERAGES		1.07	32.9%	94.3%	13.0%

Metric Targets for 2014-15

The previous pages in this report have shown the school's performance in 2013-14 and earlier. In contrast, this page is forward looking and shows targets connected to the category ratings for the 2014-15 school year.

	This School's 2013-14 Result	2014-15 Metric Values Needed for Each Rating			
		Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target
Student Progress					
English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	65.0	55.2 or lower	55.3 to 63.1	63.2 to 68.7	68.8 or higher
Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile	57.0	48.3 or lower	48.4 to 58.9	59.0 to 66.3	66.4 or higher
English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	76.0	70.7 or lower	70.8 to 77.6	77.7 to 82.4	82.5 or higher
Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - School's Lowest Third	79.0	64.2 or lower	64.3 to 73.2	73.3 to 79.6	79.7 or higher
English Early Grade Progress	1.57	0.82 or lower	0.83 to 1.45	1.46 to 1.89	1.90 or higher
Math Early Grade Progress	2.48	1.00 or lower	1.01 to 1.87	1.88 to 2.48	2.49 or higher
Student Achievement					
English - Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	8.3%	6.8% or lower	6.9% to 11.7%	11.8% to 17.3%	17.4% or higher
Math - Percentage of Students at Level 3 or 4	13.5%	8.4% or lower	8.5% to 14.5%	14.6% to 21.4%	21.5% or higher
English - Average Student Proficiency	2.15	2.05 or lower	2.06 to 2.18	2.19 to 2.32	2.33 or higher
Math - Average Student Proficiency	2.28	2.07 or lower	2.08 to 2.25	2.26 to 2.45	2.46 or higher
Middle School Adjusted Core Course Pass Rate of Former Students	78.7%	80.6% or lower	80.7% to 86.0%	86.1% to 92.2%	92.3% or higher
School Environment					
School Survey - Instructional Core	81.4%	82.9% or lower	83.0% to 89.3%	89.4% to 93.1%	93.2% or higher
School Survey - School Culture	79.2%	81.9% or lower	82.0% to 88.6%	88.7% to 92.7%	92.8% or higher
School Survey - Structures for Improvement	74.2%	78.4% or lower	78.5% to 86.5%	86.6% to 91.3%	91.4% or higher
Attendance Rate	88.0%	89.5% or lower	89.6% to 91.5%	91.6% to 92.6%	92.7% or higher

The previous pages in this report have shown the school's performance in 2013-14 and earlier. In contrast, this page is forward looking and shows targets connected to the category ratings for the 2014-15 school year.

	This School's 2013-14 Result	2014-15 Metric Values Needed for Each Rating			
		Not Meeting Target	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target
Closing the Achievement Gap					
Percent at Level 3 or 4					
English					
Self-Contained	5.0%	1.0% or lower	1.1% to 1.8%	1.9% to 2.6%	2.7% or higher
Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT)	3.0%	3.6% or lower	3.7% to 6.4%	6.5% to 9.2%	9.3% or higher
Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS)	0.0%	3.4% or lower	3.5% to 6.1%	6.2% to 8.8%	8.9% or higher
Mathematics					
Self-Contained	10.0%	2.8% or lower	2.9% to 5.1%	5.2% to 7.3%	7.4% or higher
Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT)	15.2%	7.1% or lower	7.2% to 12.8%	12.9% to 18.3%	18.4% or higher
Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS)	0.0%	6.5% or lower	6.6% to 11.6%	11.7% to 16.7%	16.8% or higher
Percent at 75th Growth Percentile or Higher					
English					
English Language Learners	53.3%	25.9% or lower	26.0% to 36.2%	36.3% to 46.3%	46.4% or higher
Lowest Third Citywide	46.9%	38.7% or lower	38.8% to 47.0%	47.1% to 55.3%	55.4% or higher
Self-Contained/ICT/SETSS	53.8%	34.8% or lower	34.9% to 44.7%	44.8% to 54.6%	54.7% or higher
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	52.0%	36.1% or lower	36.2% to 45.8%	45.9% to 55.5%	55.6% or higher
Mathematics					
English Language Learners	33.3%	22.2% or lower	22.3% to 33.4%	33.5% to 44.5%	44.6% or higher
Lowest Third Citywide	37.8%	32.4% or lower	32.5% to 42.7%	42.8% to 53.0%	53.1% or higher
Self-Contained/ICT/SETSS	41.0%	29.4% or lower	29.5% to 40.3%	40.4% to 51.2%	51.3% or higher
Black and Hispanic Males in Lowest Third Citywide	38.9%	29.4% or lower	29.5% to 41.1%	41.2% to 52.7%	52.8% or higher
Movement from SC/ICT/SETSS to Less Restrictive Environments	0.09	0.13 or lower	0.14 to 0.24	0.25 to 0.34	0.35 or higher
English Language Learner Progress	44.1%	44.7% or lower	44.8% to 55.0%	55.1% to 65.1%	65.2% or higher