

School Quality Reports

Educator Guide

High Schools

2018-19

Last Updated: May 18, 2020

Overview

The School Quality Reports share information about school performance, set expectations for schools, and promote school improvement. The School Quality Reports include:

- **School Quality Snapshot:** A summary report for families and community members to learn about school performance and quality.
- **School Quality Guide:** A more detailed, interactive report for educators to investigate school data more deeply. The report is publicly available for community members interested in more information.
- **School Performance Dashboard:** An interactive report with data visualizations for educators to investigate multiple years of school performance data. The report is publicly available for community members interested in more information.

These reports include information from multiple sources, including Quality Reviews, the NYC School Survey, and student performance in courses and on state tests. The reports provide context for school performance results by showing results from a Comparison Group of similar students throughout the city.

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 includes 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. Instead, they share ratings and information on the six Framework elements and on Student Achievement.

Rigorous Instruction: This rating reflects how well the curriculum and instruction engage students, build critical-thinking skills, and are aligned to the Common Core. This section uses data from the Quality Review and the NYC School Survey.

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

Supportive Environment: This rating reflects how well the school establishes a culture where students feel safe, challenged to grow, and supported to meet high expectations. This section uses data from the Quality Review, the NYC School Survey, the 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 how well school leadership inspires the school community with a clear instructional vision and effectively distributes leadership to realize this vision. This section uses data from the Quality Review and the NYC School Survey.

Strong Family-Community Ties: This rating reflects how well the school forms effective partnerships with families to improve the school. This section uses data from the Quality Review and the NYC School Survey.

Trust: This rating reflects whether the relationships between administrators, educators, students, and families are based on trust and respect. This section uses data from the NYC School Survey.

Student Achievement: This 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 shows how the school performed against customized targets based on the past performance of similar students.

Scores and Ratings

School Quality Report scores are on a 1.00 – 4.99 scale, and ratings are 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 Needs Improvement, and are presented as 1-4 bars in a graphic.

Example of a 4-bar rating in Rigorous Instruction:



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 does not affect the School Quality Report ratings.

Definitions

School Quality Report School Type

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 K-12 receives two separate School Quality Reports: one for the K-8 part of the school, and one for the high school.

Similarly, a school that serves grades 6-12 receives two separate School Quality Reports: one for the middle school, and one for the high school.

This document explains the rules for the School Quality Reports for three school types: elementary schools, K-8 schools, and middle schools. Separate Educator Guides explain the rules for the other school types.

Survey School Type

For scoring survey results, schools are placed into a survey school type:

School type	Grade range
Early Childhood School	PK-K, PK-1, PK-2, PK-3, K, K-1, K-2, K-3
Elementary School	3K-5, PK-4, PK-5, PK-6, K-4, K-5, K-6, 2-5, 3-5, 4-5
Elementary / Middle School	3K-8, PK-7, PK-8, K-7, K-8, 3-8, 4-8
Elementary / Middle / High School	PK-9, PK-12, K-9, K-10, K-11, K-12, 3-12
Middle School	5, 5-6, 5-8, 6, 6-7, 6-8, 6-9
Middle / High School	5-12, 6-9, 6-10, 6-11, 6-12, 7-12
High School	9, 9-10, 9-11, 9-12, 10-12

Transfer School	Transfer Schools serving grades from 9-12
District 75 School	District 75 Schools
YABC	YABC

For example, the survey results of a school that served grades 6-12 are compared to the survey results of other schools in the Middle / High School category.

Comparison Group

See pages 22-24 of this Educator Guide for a detailed explanation of a school's Comparison Group.

Economic Need Index

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

- If the student is eligible for public assistance from the NYC Human Resources Administration (HRA) or lived in temporary housing in the past four years, the student's Economic Need Value is 1.
- Otherwise, the student's Economic Need Value is 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. This percentage is converted to a decimal from 0.00 to 1.00.
- The school's Economic Need Index is the average of its students' Economic Need Values.

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

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 2018-19, and the cutoff values are presented in following table:

Year in High School	Lowest Third Citywide ELA / Math Cutoff
1 st	2.370
2 nd	2.270
3 rd	2.210
4 th or beyond	2.105

A student without 8th grade scores will also be included in the lowest third citywide if the student:

- Had a self-contained placement anytime in the past five school years (2014-15 through 2018-19); or
- 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, a school's metric value is not reported if fewer than 15 students contributed to the metric. For graduation rate for ELLs and students with disabilities, the minimum number is 10. For the following metrics, the minimum number of students required for each metric is five: graduation rate for lowest third citywide, graduation rate for Black and Hispanic males in lowest third citywide, and College Readiness Index for Black and Hispanic males in lowest third citywide.

Metrics with fewer than the minimum number of students are not reported and do not contribute to the school's ratings 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 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 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 members of a "cohort" and each cohort is assigned a letter of the alphabet. Cohorts are sometimes referred to 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 2018-19	Cohort Letter	Ninth Grade Entry School Year	“Class Of” Designation
First	X	2018-19	Class of 2022
Second	W	2017-18	Class of 2021
Third	V	2016-17	Class of 2020
Fourth	U	2015-16	Class of 2019
Fifth	T	2014-15	Class of 2018
Sixth	S	2013-14	Class of 2017

Over-age / Under-credited

For high schools, finding similar students for a school’s Comparison Group takes into account students’ over-age/under-credited status upon entry to the school, as well as the school’s percentage of over-age/under-credited students upon their entry to the school. The over-age/under-credited 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 over-age/under-credited.

Most at Risk

A subset of the over-age/under-credited 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, 2018 through June 30, 2019 are attributed to the last diploma-granting school responsible as of October 31, 2018. We use that date 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 specified year of school, who met the following criteria:

- Earned 10 or more credits between Fall 2018 and Summer 2019 (i.e., during the fall, spring, and summer terms);
- 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) was 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 to the numerator and 1 to the denominator) for this metric. Students who drop out of school or enter non-diploma granting programs remain in the denominator for 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 metrics, except they are limited to 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 measures 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, Social Studies, or a Languages Other Than English (LOTE) assessment approved by the New York State Education Department for the 4+1 pathway to graduation. 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 2018-19. The numerator (exams passed) is the total number of needed subjects passed in 2018-19.

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 contribution is never allowed to go below zero and the numerator contribution 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. Because 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: English (Common Core), Living Environment, Global History, U.S. History, Algebra I (Common Core)**

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

As described above, students are attributed to the last diploma-granting school responsible as of October 31, 2018 (even if they took the exam while enrolled at a different school). If a student took the same Regents exam multiple times during the school year, the highest score is used.

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 2017-18 School Quality Guide. These targets were adjusted based on the students at the school who actually took the exams. Similarly, the 2018-19 School Quality Guide will share estimated targets for 2019-20, which will be adjusted based on the students at the school who actually take the exams during 2019-20.

Graduation, Diploma, and Non-Dropout Metrics

Student Attribution

4-Year Graduation Cohort

For graduation metrics, students are attributed to schools using different rules than for the Progress Toward Graduation metrics. Students are attributed to the last diploma-granting school as of June 30 of their 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 at their last diploma-granting school before June 30 of the fourth year of high school.

For the 2018-19 School Quality Reports, a school's 4-year graduation cohort, represented by the letter 'U', consists of all students who:

- Entered 9th grade for the first time anywhere in 2015-16;
- Were active in the school as of June 30, 2019, or the school is the last diploma-granting high school that they attended before June 30, 2019; *and*
- Did not meet the criteria for a documented cohort removing discharge (see below) before June 30, 2019.

A discharged student can become non-accountable under limited circumstances. If the student leaves school for one of the reasons below before June 30 of year four, the student will become non-accountable if all required documentation is collected and stored on file.

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 2018-19 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 2016-17. These students are represented by cohort letter 'S'. 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 2018-19 School Quality Reports, the four-year cohort reflects the 'U' cohort of students who first entered high school during the 2015-16 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 the Student Achievement rating calculation in the School Quality Reports.

► Six-Year Graduation Rate

This metric is similar to the four-year graduation rate, except that it shows 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 2018-19 School Quality Guide, the six-year cohort reflects the 'S' cohort of students who first entered high school during the 2013-14 school year. This cohort can be viewed in ATS using the command RGCS.

► 4-Year High School Persistence 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 were still enrolled in a

DOE school or program with at least 50% attendance since February 1, 2019.

► **6-Year High School Persistence Rate**

This metric is the same as 4-Year High School Persistence Rate except that it is 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 the student meets the other requirements.

► **College and Career Preparatory Course Index**

This metric shows the percentage of students in the school's four-year cohort who successfully completed approved rigorous courses and assessments after four years of high school. For the 2018-19 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'U' (students who first entered high school during the 2015-16 school year / "Class of 2019").

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 are only counted once in the numerator.

In addition, students who did not meet any of the requirements above but scored 2 on an AP exam or scored 3 on an IB exam contribute 0.5 to the numerator. This provides partial credit for these scores, which reflect some degree of readiness for higher-level courses.

► **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, graduated with a Local Diploma or higher and met CUNY’s standards for college readiness in English and mathematics. For the 2018-19 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort ‘U’ (students who first entered high school during the 2015-16 school year / “Class of 2019”).

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

Assessment	Minimum Score Needed
Integrated Algebra, Geometry, or Algebra II/Trigonometry Regents	80, plus coursework requirement
Common Core Math Regents (Algebra I or Geometry)	70
Common Core Math Regents (Algebra II)	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

* The CUNY Assessment Test counts only toward the school-level College Readiness Index, and does not contribute to city or borough averages for this metric.

If a student uses a non-Common Core NYS Regents math exam 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.

NOTE: For students in the Fall 2020 and subsequent entering classes, CUNY does not plan to use the CUNY Assessment Test to determine whether students are required to complete remedial interventions before enrolling in credit-bearing math and English courses. (Instead, CUNY plans to use a proficiency index based on high school grades, SAT scores, and Regents scores.) In light of this policy change, the 2018-19 School Quality Reports will show College Readiness Index (without CUNY Assessment Test) values for informational purposes. The 2019-20 School Quality Reports and beyond will show the College Readiness Index (without the CUNY Assessment Test) and use that metric for report scoring.

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

This metric shows the percentage of students who 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 2018-19 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'T' (students who first entered high school during the 2014-15 school year / "Class of 2018"). 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, 2018.

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 Postsecondary Enrollment Rate by Six Months after High School except that it shows the percentage of students who 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 2018-19 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'S' (students who first entered high school during the 2013-14 school year / "Class of 2017"). To contribute positively, a student must have graduated and enrolled in a qualifying postsecondary program by December 31, 2018.

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

This metric shows the percentage of students in the six-year cohort who graduated with a Regents diploma and met CUNY's standards for English and mathematics after six years of high school (including the summer following the sixth year) by August 2019. For the 2018-19 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'S' (students who first entered high school during the 2013-14 school year / "Class of 2017").

► College Persistence

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 2018-19 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates cohort 'S' (students who first entered high school during the 2013-14 school year / "Class of 2017").

The persistence metric is based primarily on semester-enrollment data from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) and CUNY. If these data show that a student enrolled for three consecutive semesters, the student contributes 1 to the numerator. If these data show that a student did not enroll for three consecutive semesters, the student contributes 0 to the numerator. If a student never enrolled in college in the first place, the student contributes 0 to the numerator. If school staff entered a student's college enrollment in CVER (and the student did not appear in the NSC/CUNY data), the student is given a persistence value equal to the school's percentage of students that persisted according to the NSC/CUNY data.

Example

Suppose a school had the following groups of students:

Groups of students	Contribution to persistence metric
50 student who never entered college	Contribute 0.00 each.
80 students who entered college and persisted, based on the NSC/CUNY data	Contribute 1.00 each.
20 students who entered college but did not persist, based on the NSC/CUNY data	Contribute 0.00 each.
10 students where the school staff recorded in CVER that they entered college	Contribute 0.80 each (because 80 out of 100 students at the school with NSC/CUNY data persisted).

The school's persistence rate is $(80 \times 1.00 + 10 \times 0.80) / 160 = 55\%$.

Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics

These metrics reflect how well 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 for its students in the relevant subgroup. The metric value is not reported if the school has fewer than five students in the subgroup. Metric scores and ratings show how the school's results compared to its customized targets. A metric will not be scored, however, if the 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 Metrics

No metric value if...	Fewer than minimum N for the metric.
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 the same way as the Four-Year Graduation Rate for the school, except that each metric is limited to students in 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 counts in all of those groups.

NOTE: Starting in 2019-20, schools will be able to earn additional points on their Student Achievement scores based on 4-Year Graduation Rate for American Indian, Black, and Hispanic or Latinx students.

► ***English Language Learner Progress***

This metric measures the percentage of English Language Learners demonstrating movement toward English language proficiency. To contribute to the denominator of this measure, a student must have taken the 2019 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT).

Students will contribute positively to this measure if they meet any of three criteria:

- They took the 2018 NYSESLAT exam and their 2019 NYSESLAT overall performance level is higher than in 2018;

- They did not take the 2018 NYSESLAT exam and their 2019 overall performance level is Emerging or higher; or
- They scored 65 or higher on the ELA Regents exam in 2019 and did not score 65 or higher on the ELA Regents exam in a prior year.

NOTE: This English Language Learner Progress metric will be for informational purposes in the 2018-19 School Quality Reports. Starting in 2019-20, schools will be able to earn additional points on their Student Achievement scores based on this metric.

Additional Information

► *Performance by Racial Subgroups*

Snapshot: The School Quality Snapshot includes the following performance metric for Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White students:

- 4-Year Graduation Rate

The Snapshot includes a graphic that shows the subgroup's metric value, and the Comparison Group value for the subgroup. This Comparison Group shows the performance of students with similar prior test scores, disability status, and economic need status. This Comparison Group can include students of different races, and is not restricted to students of the same race as the subgroup.

The minimum N for the subgroup metrics is 15; the metric value will be N/A if the number of students is less than 15.

School Quality Reports: In addition to the metric listed above (4-Year Graduation Rate), the School Quality Guide, School Performance Dashboard, and Citywide Results file will include the following performance metrics for American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, and White students:

- Percent of 1st Year Students Earning 10+ Credits
- Percent of 2nd Year Students Earning 10+ Credits
- Percent of 3rd Year Students Earning 10+ Credits
- Regents Completion Rate
- 6-Year Graduation Rate
- 4-Year High School Persistence Rate
- 6-Year High School Persistence Rate
- College and Career Preparatory Course Index (CCPCI)
- College Readiness Index without CAT (CRI)
- Post-secondary enrollment rate (PSER) – 6 months

For each subgroup metric, the School Quality Guide will show the subgroup N, the subgroup metric value, the Comparison Group value, and the difference between the subgroup and Comparison Group.

► **“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 2017-18 (Cohort T) and in 2018-19 (Cohort U).

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.

For 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.

► **Average SAT Score**

The School Quality Snapshot for high schools reports the average SAT score for informational purposes. The average SAT score is based on the highest “super score” of each student in the graduating cohort who took the SAT. The “super score” combines the highest section scores (in Math and Evidence-Based Reading & Writing) that the student has achieved, even if they were achieved during different test dates. The Average SAT Score is based on SATs that student took in or after March 2016. (SAT exams taken before March 2016 used a different scoring scale and are not included in the informational metric.)

Student Achievement

Scores and Ratings

The School Quality Reports include scores and ratings based on the targets that were published in the previous year's School Quality Reports. Those targets were customized for each school based 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 received 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 how close the school's value was to the next higher target level.

Example: If a school surpassed the Meeting Target level (t3) but did not reach the Exceeding Target level (t4), the metric score would be: $3 + (\text{school's metric value} - t3) / (t4 - t3)$, 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 are used in addition to the published target levels. The bottom of the target range is set at the bottom of Comparison Group range, and the top of the target range is set at the top of Comparison Group range.¹

Example: If a school surpassed the Exceeding Target level (t4), the metric score would be: $4 + (\text{school's metric value} - t4) / (\text{top of target range} - t4)$, with the score not to exceed 4.99.

¹ See pages 24-25 for further details on the Comparison Group 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 School Quality Guide Appendix, which can be accessed at the bottom of the “Student Achievement Outcomes” tab of the Online School Quality Guide.

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 is calculated 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 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 School Quality Guide 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 is 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 2017-18 do 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	Needs Improvement

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 city averages, borough averages, and the results of a Comparison Group of similar students throughout the city.

City and Borough Averages

In general, we calculate city and borough averages 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 students.

Comparison Group's Results

To understand how effectively a school helps 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 showing the results of a Comparison Group of similar students. The Comparison Group results estimate how the students at the school would have performed if they had attended other schools throughout the city. By comparing the school's results to the Comparison Group, a reader can assess the school's effectiveness at helping students improve and exceed expected outcomes.

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 Factors³
-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, 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.

³ If Grade 8 ELA or Math scores are missing, prior-grade test scores from middle school are used. If those scores are unavailable, the Grade 8 ELA or Math scores are imputed with multiple regression using the exact-match characteristics, the school's average proficiency in the subject, and prior NYSESLAT score.

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.⁴ We then calculate performance results for the Comparison Group—such as 4-year graduation rate.

Because schools in the New York Performance Standards Consortium use different assessment methods than other schools, students from those schools are not included in the pool of Comparison Group students from which matches for each student are selected.

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 goes 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.

⁴ 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 can occur if the same student falls within the group of 50 matches for multiple students at the school.

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 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 shows 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 ⁵
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:

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

Impact and Performance Scores

For informational purposes, the School Performance Dashboard summarizes the differences between the school’s results and the Comparison Group’s results as an “impact” score, and summarizes the differences between the school’s results and the citywide averages as a “performance” score. The impact score sheds light on the school’s effectiveness by taking into account student factors and comparing the school’s results to the Comparison Group of similar students. The performance score

⁵ These interpretations do not apply if the range has been cut off to leave out values that are theoretically impossible, as described on page 23.

reflects whether the school outperformed the citywide average, without making any adjustments to account for the student population of the school.

Impact Score Calculation

We calculate the impact score through the following steps:

- For each Student Achievement metric, we calculate the difference between the school's result and its Comparison Group result.
 - Example: The school's graduation rate was 5 percentage points higher than its Comparison Group.
- We standardize these differences by converting them to standard-deviation units.
 - Example: The school's graduation rate was 0.6 standard deviations higher than its Comparison Group.
- We translate the standardized differences to a 0.00 to 1.00 scale.
 - This scale spans four standard deviations, from -2 to +2, and transforms them to a 0.00-1.00 point scale centered around 0.50.
 - Examples:
 - If the school's result is the same as the Comparison Group, the score is 0.50.
 - If the school's result is 2 standard deviations above the Comparison Group, the score is 1.00.
 - If the school's result is 1 standard deviation below the Comparison Group, the score is 0.25. The calculation is $(-1 / 4) + 0.50 = 0.25$.
 - If the school's result is 0.6 standard deviations above the Comparison Group, the score is 0.65. The calculation is $(+0.6 / 4) + 0.50 = 0.65$.
 - Any difference more than 2 standard deviations below the Comparison Group is scored as 0.00, and any difference more than 2 standard deviations above the Comparison Group is scored as a 1.00.
- We take a weighted average of the 0.00-1.00 scores for each Student Achievement metric to produce an overall impact score for the school.
 - We use the same set of Student Achievement metrics and the same metric weights that we use to produce the Student Achievement rating in the School Quality Reports (except that the Impact score does not include any Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, which provide additional points on the School Quality Reports).

Performance Score Calculation

We calculate the performance score the same way, except that the school's results are compared to the citywide average instead of the Comparison Group value.

- For each Student Achievement metric, we calculate the difference between the school's result and the citywide average.
 - Example: The school's graduation rate was 5 percentage points higher than the citywide average.
- We standardize these differences by converting them to standard-deviation units.
 - Example: The school's graduation rate was 0.6 standard deviations higher than the citywide average.
- We translate the standardized differences to a 0.00 to 1.00 scale.
 - This scale spans four standard deviations, from -2 to +2, and transforms them to a 0.00-1.00 point scale centered around 0.50.
 - Examples:

- If the school's result is the same as the citywide average, the score is 0.50.
 - If the school's result is 2 standard deviations above the citywide average, the score is 1.00.
 - If the school's result is 1 standard deviation below the citywide average, the score is 0.25. The calculation is $(-1 / 4) + 0.50 = 0.25$.
 - If the school's result is 0.6 standard deviations above the citywide average, the score is 0.65. The calculation is $(+0.6 / 4) + 0.50 = 0.65$.
 - Any difference more than 2 standard deviations below the citywide average is scored as 0.00, and any difference more than 2 standard deviations above the citywide average is scored as a 1.00.
- We take a weighted average of the 0.00-1.00 scores for each Student Achievement metric to produce an overall performance score for the school.
 - We use the same set of Student Achievement metrics and the same metric weights that we use to produce the Student Achievement rating in the School Quality Reports (except that the Impact score does not include any Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, which provide additional points on the School Quality Reports).

Student Achievement Targets

The targets are realistic and rigorous goals customized for each school, based on the historical performance of their Comparison Group. In other words, the targets are driven by results that have been achieved in the past by students who are very similar—based on incoming test scores, economic need, and disability status—to the students at the main school.

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

- **Step 1:** For each school, we calculate the Comparison Group percent of range (on a 0-100% scale) for each of its Student Achievement metrics in the prior year. These results show where the school's metric value fell within its Comparison Group performance range.
- **Step 2:** For each metric, we review the set of Comparison Group percent of range results from Step 1 for all schools (of the same school type), and determine the Comparison Group percent of range cut levels associated with the following percentiles for Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, and Approaching Target:

School Type	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target
High School	15 th percentile	45 th percentile	70 th percentile

Example: For 4-year graduation rate, Step 1 produces a set of all the Comparison Group percent of range values on that metric by all high schools. In Step 2, the 70th percentile of that set of values is the Comparison Group percent of range cut level for Exceeding Target, the 45th percentile of that set is the cut level for Meeting Target, and the 15th percentile of that set is the cut level for Approaching Target. For example, if the 70th percentile of the set of values is 65%, that means that the top 30% of high schools achieved Comparison Group percent of range scores of 65% or higher on that metric, and 65% is the Comparison Group percent of range cut level for Exceeding Target on that metric.

- **Step 3:** For each school, we set specific targets for the next year by finding the actual metric values that would be needed for the school to achieve the Comparison Group percent of range cut score. Step 3 can be thought of as taking each school's customized comparison range, and going a specified portion of the way along that range to find a specific target for the school.

Example: For 4-year graduation rate, suppose that Step 2 produces a Comparison Group percent of range cut level of 65% for Exceeding Target—meaning that the top 30% of high schools achieved Comparison Group percent of range scores of 65% or higher on that metric. Suppose that the school's comparison range for 4-year graduation rate ran from 60% to 90%. The school's specific target for Exceeding Target on 4-year

graduation rate would be 65% of the way along that range—or $65\% \times (90\% - 60\%) + 60\% = 79.5\%$.

- **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. 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 A 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, shortly before the School Quality Reports are released. 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 2018-19, the students in their fourth year of high school (in October 2018) are each matched to the closest 50 students throughout the city who were in their fourth year of high school in 2017-18.

This approach allows the school's targets to be customized and based on the closest matches to the specific students at the school in the report year.

Although Step 2 of the target-setting process involves finding cut levels associated with fixed percentiles, the ratings 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 depend on how schools perform against their targets. If all schools perform well, then all schools can get strong ratings.

Framework Elements

Metrics and Data Sources

The Framework elements use the following data sources:

Section	Data Sources
Rigorous Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYC School Survey • Quality Review indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2
Collaborative Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYC School Survey • Quality Review indicators 4.1, 4.2
Supportive Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYC School Survey • Quality Review indicators 1.4, 3.4 • Chronic absenteeism (or average change in student attendance, for some school types) • Movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments
Effective School Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYC School Survey • Quality Review indicators 1.3, 3.1, 5.1
Strong Family-Community Ties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYC School Survey • Quality Review indicators 3.4
Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYC School Survey

Quality Review

The Framework ratings incorporate results from the school's most recent Quality Review on the following indicators:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 1.1 | Rigorous, engaging, and coherent curricula aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards. |
| 1.2 | Research-based, effective instruction that yields high quality student work. |
| 1.3 | Aligned resource use to support instructional goals that meet students' needs. |
| 1.4 | Structures for a positive learning environment, inclusive culture, and student success. |
| 2.2 | Curricula-aligned assessment practices that inform instruction. |
| 3.1 | School-level theory of action and goals shared by the school community. |
| 3.4 | A culture of learning that communicates and supports high expectations. |
| 4.1 | Support and evaluation of teachers through the Danielson Framework and analysis of learning outcomes |
| 4.2 | Teacher teams engaged in collaborative practice using the inquiry approach to improve classroom practice. |

5.1 Regularly evaluate school-level decisions with a focus on the Common Core Learning Standards.

Schools that received Quality Reviews in 2016-17 or later have ratings on all ten indicators. Schools that received their latest Quality Review in 2015-16 or earlier have ratings on five indicators: 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, and 4.2.

For additional information about the Quality Review, please visit <https://www.schools.nyc.gov/about-us/reports/school-quality/quality-review>

NYC School Survey

The NYC School Survey is administered annually to students in grades 6-12, and to parents and teachers of students in all grades (3-K through 12). The survey gathers 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 five measures: Common Core Shifts in Literacy, Common Core Shifts in Math, Course Clarity, Quality of Student Discussion, and Academic Press. The NYC School Survey includes groups of questions related to each of those 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 percent positives of all the questions within the measure.

► **Element-Level Percent Positive**

For each element, we calculate the percentage of positive responses. This value is not simply the straight average of the percent positives of all the questions 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 five measures: Common Core Shifts in Literacy, Common Core Shifts in Math, Course Clarity, Quality of Student Discussion, and Academic Press.)

For additional information about the survey, please visit <https://www.schools.nyc.gov/about-us/reports/school-quality/nyc-school-survey> or email surveys@schools.nyc.gov

Other Metrics

► **Percentage of Students with Attendance Rates of 90% or Higher (Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle, K-8, High Schools)**

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 at the school (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 at the school 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 K-12 schools, this metric is calculated separately for the K-8 grades and 9-12 grades. Similarly, for 6-12 schools, the metric is calculated separately for the 6-8 grades and the 9-12 grades.

► **Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments (Non-District 75 Schools)**

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 2017-18, 2016-17, or 2015-16. Students who are newly certified in 2018-19 are excluded.

The numerator contribution of each student is the highest tier number from the last four school years minus the tier number for 2018-19. This number can range from zero (for students who are in their highest tier in 2018-19) to three (for students who were previously in Tier Four and are in Tier One in 2018-19). 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

Students who start a less restrictive program at the beginning of 2018-19 count immediately, but if they start the less restrictive program mid-year, they will not contribute to the metric until the next year.

Framework Elements

Scoring and Ratings

Scoring and Rating Structure

Element ratings on the Framework Report are generated through a multi-step process:

- **Step 1:** Raw metric values are collected from the data sources.
- **Step 2:** Raw metric values are converted into metric scores, on a scale from 1.00 – 4.99.
- **Step 3:** The metric scores are combined to generate an element score.
- **Step 4:** The element score is used to generate an element rating.

This Technical Report explains this multi-step process for the different data sources and elements. It explains how raw metric values are converted into metric scores for Quality Reviews, the NYC School Survey, chronic absenteeism (and average change in student attendance), and movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments. It explains how the metric scores are combined to produce 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 from the element scores.

Raw Values and Metric Scores

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

Quality Reviews

Quality Review indicator ratings are converted into metric scores as follows:

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

NYC School Survey

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

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.⁶

The following process is used to generate a *survey element score*:

- (1) **Question-level percent positive** (percentage of positive responses to a question)
↓
- (2) **Measure-level percent positive** (average of the question-level percent positive values for all questions within the measure)
↓
- (3) **Measure score** (score based on the measure-level percent positive)
↓
- (4) **Survey element score** (average of measure scores for all measures within the element)

Each step in this process is described in detail below.

(1) Question-level percent positive

For each question, this metric 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).

(2) Measure-level percent positive

This metric is the average of the *question-level percent positive* values 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 percent positive is the average of the question-level percent positive values on all the Outreach to Parents questions.

(3) Measure score

This metric converts the *measure-level percent positive* into a score on a 1.00-4.99 scale.

The basic idea is that survey results fairly close to the city average receive scores in the 3-bar range (3.00 – 3.99), results substantially above average receive scores in the 4-bar range (4.00 – 4.99), and results substantially below average receive scores in the 2-bar or 1-bar range (2.00 – 2.99 or 1.00 – 1.99). In addition, if a school’s measure-level percent positive is very high, it will receive a high measure score (regardless of whether the result is substantially above the citywide average).

We implement this idea by setting cut levels (measure-level percent positive) for each rating category (e.g., the 4-bar category of Exceeding Target). The school’s 1.00-4.99 measure score is based on the highest category achieved, and the distance to the next-higher cut level. The cut levels are based on the citywide average percent positive (PP) and the standard deviation (SD) among school-level results of schools. We use the “top of scoring range” and “bottom of scoring range” values to help calculate scores in the 4.00-4.99 range and the 1.00-1.99 range.

⁶ See Appendix B for a detailed explanation of the element-measure-question survey structure.

Rating Category	Percent Positive (PP) Cut Level
Top of Scoring Range	citywide mean + 2 SD, not to exceed 100
Exceeding Target (4 bars)	citywide mean PP + 0.75 SD, not to exceed 95
Meeting Target (3 bars)	citywide mean PP – 0.5 SD, not to exceed 90
Approaching Target (2 bars)	citywide mean PP – 1 SD, not to exceed 85
Bottom of Scoring Range	citywide mean + 2 SD, not to fall below 0

Examples:

- If a school's percent positive on a Framework measure is halfway between the Meeting Target and Exceeding Target cut levels, it will receive a score of 3.50 on that Framework measure.
- If a school's percent positive on a Framework measure is one-quarter of the way between the Exceeding Target cut level and the Top of Scoring Range, it will receive a score of 4.25 on that Framework measure.

Additional Notes:

- We set separate targets for each Framework measure and for each survey school type. In other words, the citywide averages and standard deviations are calculated separately for each survey school type and for each Framework measure.
 - For example, the target cut levels for a middle school will be based on the citywide average and standard deviation among middle schools only.
- To avoid drawing significant scoring distinctions based on small PP differences, we will not allow the SD in the formula to fall below 5 points.
- The top of the scoring range is set at least 5 percentage points above the Exceeding Target level (but not to exceed 100).
- The bottom of the scoring range is set at least 5 percentage points below the Approaching Target level (but not to fall below 0).

(4) Survey element score

This metric is the average of the *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 *survey element score* for the Strong Family-Community Ties element is the average of the *measure score* for the Teacher Outreach to Parents measure and the *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 *survey element score* will be N/A. The following table describes these situations:

Element	Standardized 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 90% Attendance

The metric score for this metric is based on how the school performed against its 2018-19 targets in the previous year's School Quality Reports. The first digit reflects the highest target level achieved, and the two digits after the decimal point reflect how close the school was to the next higher target. (For example, a score of 3.50 means that the school met its Meeting Target level, and was halfway between the Meeting Target level and the Exceeding Target level.)

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), we use the average of the EMS score and the HS score for Framework scoring.

Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments

The metric score for this metric is based on the 2018-19 targets published in the previous year's School Quality Reports. The first digit reflects the highest target level achieved, and the two digits after the decimal point reflect how close the school was to the next higher target.

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), we use the average of the EMS score and the HS score for less restrictive environment for Framework scoring.

Element Scores

Weighted Average of Data Scores

The school’s element scores are a weighted average of the scores from the data sources within each element category. The weights depend on whether the school received a Quality Review in 2016-17 or later (with ten rated indicators) or whether the school received its most recent Quality Review in 2015-16 or earlier (with five rated indicators). If the survey response rates or numbers fall below specified thresholds, then the element score will be N/A.

The following table shows how scores from the different data sources are weighted and combined to produce the element scores:

Weighted Combinations of Data Scores to Produce Element Scores

Different Weights For Different Scenarios

	Received Quality Review in 2016-17 or later	Most Recent Quality Review from 2015-16 or earlier	Low Survey Responses
Rigorous Instruction			
Survey (Rigorous Instruction)	25%	25%	<i>If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses</i> Element score is N/A.
Quality Review 1.1	25%	25%	
Quality Review 1.2	25%	25%	
Quality Review 2.2	25%	25%	
Collaborative Teachers			
Survey (Collaborative Teachers)	50%	50%	<i>If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses</i> Element score is N/A.
Quality Review 4.1	25%	—	
Quality Review 4.2	25%	50%	
Supportive Environment			
Survey (Supportive Environment)	35%	35%	<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> Element score is N/A.
Quality Review 1.4	15%	—	
Quality Review 3.4	15%	30%	
Chronic Absenteeism (Average Change in Attendance for Transfer Schools, YABCs, and District 75 Schools)	30%	30%	
Less Restrictive Environment	5%	5%	

Weighted Combinations of Data Scores to Produce Element Scores

Different Weights For Different Scenarios

	Received Quality Review in 2016-17 or later	Most Recent Quality Review from 2015-16 or earlier	Low Survey Responses
Effective School Leadership			
Survey (Effective School Leadership)	40%	100%	<i>If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses</i>
Quality Review 1.3	20%	—	
Quality Review 3.1	20%	—	Element score is N/A.
Quality Review 5.1	20%	—	
Strong Family-Community Ties			
Survey (Strong Family-Community Ties)	85%	85%	<i>If average of teacher and parent response rates is at less than 30% or fewer than 5 teacher or parent responses</i>
Quality Review 3.4	15%	15%	
Element score is N/A.			
Trust			
Survey (Trust)	100%	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 school received a finalized Quality Review Report in 2016-17, the school's element score for Collaborative Teachers = 0.50 x survey element score for Collaborative Teachers + 0.25 x QR 4.1 metric score + 0.25 x QR 4.2 metric score.
- If the school's most recent Quality Review was in 2014-15, the school's element score for Collaborative Teachers = 0.50 x survey element score for Collaborative Teachers + 0.50 x QR 4.2 metric score.
- For a middle school, if the student response rate was under 30%, the school's element score for Supportive Environment is N/A.

Missing Data

If Quality Review data is unavailable for a district school, its element scores will be N/A for all elements except for Trust.

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, a charter school's element score for Rigorous Instruction is

based 100% on the survey.⁷

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 generally shifted to the other data sources in the element.

If a charter school’s attendance rate is N/A, then its Supportive Environment element score and rating are N/A.

Element Ratings

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

Rating	Element Score
Excellent (4 bars)	4.00 to 4.99
Good (3 bars)	3.00 to 3.99
Fair (2 bars)	2.00 to 2.99
Needs Improvement (1 bar)	1.00 to 1.99

Schools designated for phase-out or in their first year do not receive Framework element scores or ratings.

⁷ Because element scores based on Quality Reviews and survey results can be systematically different from element scores based on surveys only, we rescale the element scores for charter schools and YABCs in Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, Supportive Environment, and Strong Family-Community Ties. The rescaling puts the results for charter schools and YABCs (without Quality Reviews) on the same scale as the element scores of district schools (with Quality Reviews).

Appendix A

Floors and Ceilings for 2018-19 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%	80%	90%	95%
Percent of Students in School's Lowest Third Earning 10+ Credits in 1st Year	30%	45%	60%	70%	80%	90%
Percent of Students Earning 10+ Credits in 2nd Year	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	95%
Percent of Students in School's Lowest Third Earning 10+ Credits in 2nd Year	30%	45%	60%	70%	80%	90%
Percent of Students Earning 10+ Credits in 3rd Year	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	95%
Percent of Students in School's Lowest Third Earning 10+ Credits in 3rd Year	30%	45%	60%	70%	80%	90%
Regents Performance						
Average Completion Rate for Remaining Regents	25%	30%	40%	55%	70%	85%
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
Average Regents Score – English (Common Core)	60	65	67	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%	65%	75%	85%
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	30%	40%	50%	90%	94%	98%

Appendix B

Element-Measure-Question Structure

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

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

Academic Press

How much do YOU agree with the following statements?

S q4a I'm learning a lot in my classes at this school to prepare me for the next level or grade.

S q4g My classes at this school really make me think critically.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

In how many of your classes ...

S q5a are you challenged?

S q5b do your teachers ask difficult questions on tests?

S q5c do your teachers ask difficult questions in class?

S q5d do you work in small groups?

S q5e do your teachers want students to become better thinkers, not just memorize things?
1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

How many students in your classes...

*T q22a feel challenged?

*T q22c have to work hard to do well?

*T q22e respond to challenging test questions?

*T q22g respond to challenging questions in class?

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.

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 q18a building students' knowledge through content-rich non-fiction.

T q18b reading and writing experiences grounded in evidence from text, both literary and informational.

T q18c students to interact with complex grade-level text.

T q18d 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 q19a focusing deeply on the concepts emphasized in the standards to help students build strong foundations for learning.

T q19b 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 q19c 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, this school year, do YOU feel the following statement is 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 q21a build on each other's ideas during class discussions?
 T q21b use data or text references to support their ideas?
 T q21c show that they respect each other's ideas?
 T q21d provide constructive feedback to their peers/teachers?
 T q21e 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.

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 In general, my teachers treat students from different cultures or backgrounds equally.
 S q1i I feel that my teachers respect my culture/background.
 S q1j In general, my teachers make their lessons relevant to my everyday life experiences.
 S q1k In general, my teachers present positive images of people from a variety of races, ethnicities, cultures, and backgrounds.
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 receive support around how to incorporate students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds in my practice.
 T q2b use my students' prior knowledge to make my lessons relevant to their everyday life.
 T q2c modify instructional activities and materials to meet the developmental needs and learning interests of all my students.
 T q2d adapt instruction to ensure it represents all cultures/backgrounds positively.
 T q2e design appropriate instruction that is matched to students' need (e.g. English language learners (ELLs) proficiency and students with disabilities).
 T q2f apply my knowledge of parents' various cultural backgrounds when collaborating with them regarding their child's educational progress.
 T q2g develop appropriate Individualized Education Programs for my students with disabilities.
 T q2h distinguish linguistic/cultural differences from learning difficulties.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know

Innovation and Collective responsibility

How many teachers at this school...

- T q1a help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom?
 T q1b are actively trying to improve their teaching?
 T q1c take responsibility for improving the school?
 T q1d are eager to try new ideas?
 T q1e feel responsible that all students learn?
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	q9d	teachers design instructional programs (e.g. lessons, units) together.
T	q9e	teachers make a conscious effort to coordinate their teaching with instruction at other grade levels.
T	q9a	the principal/school leader, teachers, and staff collaborate to make this school run effectively.

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

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 would recommend this school to parents/guardians seeking a place for their child.
T	q4h	I would recommend this school to other teachers as a place to work.

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 YOU feel most 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*	q22b	listen carefully when the teacher gives directions?
T*	q22d	follow the rules in class?
T*	q22f	pay attention when they are supposed to?
T*	q22h	do their work when they are supposed to?
T*	q22i	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. How much do YOU agree with the following statements?

S	q9a	This school provides guidance for the application process for high school.
S	q9b	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 talk to me about what I plan to do after high school.
- S q10b encourage me to continue my education after high school.
- S q10c provide me with information about the college application process.
- S q10d help me plan for how to meet my future career goals.

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 q11a help me consider which colleges to apply to.
- S q11b show me options for how to pay for college (scholarship, grants, loans, work study programs, etc.).

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = N/A

Peer support for academic work

In how many of your classes at this school do YOU feel most 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

Personal attention and support

In how many of your classes, this school year, do YOU feel the following statement is 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 support me when I am upset.

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

Preventing bullying

How often are the following things true?

- S q8a At this school students harass, bully, or intimidate other students.
- S q8b At this school students harass, bully, or intimidate each other because of their race, religion, ethnicity, national origin, or citizenship/immigration status.
- S q8c At this school students harass, bully, or intimidate each other because of their gender, gender identity, gender expression, or sexual orientation.
- S q8d At this school students harass, bully, or intimidate each other because of other differences, like disability or weight.
- S q8e At this school students harass, bully, or intimidate each other online (through mobile phones, social media, email, or other forms of electronic communication).

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

Safety

How much do YOU agree with the following statements?

- S q4h 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... outside around this school.

- S q7a

- 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* q26a outside around this school.
- T* q26b traveling between home and this school.
- T* q26c in the hallways, bathrooms, locker rooms, and cafeteria of this school.
- T* q26d in my class(es).

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

How much do you agree with the following statement?

- T* q7 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 q23a help students develop the skills they need to complete challenging coursework despite obstacles?
- T q23b tell their students they believe they can achieve high academic standards?
- T q23c teach critical thinking skills to students?
- T q23d teach students how to advocate for themselves?
- T q23e teach students the organizational skills needed to be prepared for their next level?
- T q23f recognize disruptive behavior as social-emotional learning opportunities?
- T q23g 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 q23h have access to school-based supports to assist in behavioral/emotional escalations?

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 leadership

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

- P q2c The principal/school leader encourages feedback from parents/guardians and the community through regular meetings with parent/guardian 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 participates in instructional planning with teams of teachers.

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. The principal/assistant principal(s) at this school...

- T q13a sets clear expectations for teachers about implementing what they have learned in professional development.
- T q13b carefully tracks student academic progress.
- T q13c knows what's going on in my classroom.
- T q13d provides teachers with formative feedback to improve practice.
- T q13e provides teachers with the support to implement formative feedback.

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 q9b once we start a new program, we follow up to make sure that it's working.
- T q9c it is clear how all of the programs offered are connected to our school's instructional vision.
- T q9f curriculum, instruction, and learning materials are well coordinated across the different grade levels 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 q10e 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 q14a Hiring new professional personnel.
- T q14b Planning how discretionary school funds should be used.
- T q14c Selecting instructional materials used in classrooms.
- T q14d Developing instructional materials.
- T q14e 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.

Outreach to parents

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

- T q10a parents/guardians are offered opportunities to visit their child's classroom, such as observing instruction, participating in an activity with their child, etc.
- T q10b teachers understand families' problems and concerns.
- T q10c teachers work closely with families to meet students' needs.
- T q10d 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 me about how I can help my child learn.
- P q1b My child's school offers me opportunities to visit my child's classroom, such as observing instruction, participating in an activity with my child, etc.
- P q1c My child's school offers me the opportunity to volunteer time to support this school (for example, helping in classrooms, helping with school-wide events, etc.)
- P q1d I am greeted warmly when I call or visit the school.
- P q1e Teachers work closely with me to meet my child's needs.
- P q1f I feel well-informed by the communications I receive from my child's school.
- P q1i 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

Parent involvement in school

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

- P q4a communicated with your child's teacher about your child's performance?
- P q4b seen your child's projects, artwork, homework, tests, or quizzes?

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

During the school year, how likely are you to...

- P q6a attend a general school meeting or school event (open house, back to school night, play, dance, sports event, or science fair)?
- P q6b go to a regularly scheduled parent-teacher conference with your child's teacher?

1 = Very unlikely, 2 = Somewhat unlikely, 3 = Somewhat likely, 4 = Very likely

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 q1j I feel respected by my child's principal/school leader.
- P q1k 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 q1l The principal/school leader is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly.
- P q2b 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 q1g I feel respected by my child's teachers.
- P q1h 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

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

- P q2a 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

Student-teacher trust

How much do YOU agree with the following statements?

- S q4b There is at least one adult in the school that I can confide in.
 S q4c My teachers will always listen to students' ideas.
 S q4d My teachers always do what they say they will do.
 S q4e My teachers treat me with respect.
 S q4f 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-principal trust

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

- T q5a I feel respected by the principal/school leader at this school.
 T q5b The principal/school leader at this school is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly.
 T q5c The principal/school leader has confidence in the expertise of the teachers at this school.
 T q5d 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 q5e At this school, it's OK to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with the principal/school leader.
 T q5f The principal/school leader takes a personal interest in the professional development of teachers.
 T q5g The principal/school leader looks out for the personal welfare of the staff members.
 T q5h The principal/school leader places the needs of children ahead of personal interests.
 T q5i The principal and assistant principal function as a cohesive unit.
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 q4c Teachers in this school trust each other.
 T q4d It's OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with other teachers.
 T q4e Teachers respect other teachers who take the lead in school improvement efforts.
 T q4f I feel respected by other teachers at this school.
 T q4g Teachers at this school respect their colleagues' specific expertise.
1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree