DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 167 CS 212 406

TITLE Chapter 1 English Instructional Services Program

Student Outcome Data 1988-89 End-of-Year Report.

Evaluation Section Report. OREA Report.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY.

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

PUB DATE May 90 NOTE 240p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Reports -

Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MFC1/PC10 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; *English Instruction; High

Schools; *Instructional Effectiveness: *Program

Effectiveness; Public Schools; *Remedial Instruction;

Remedial Programs

IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1;

New York (New York); Remedial Intervention

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effectiveness of the Chapter 1-funded English Instructional Services (EIS) Program which provided remediation in reading and writing to eligible New York City high school students. Subjects, 23,442 students from 100 high schools and programs, received remedial instruction in reading and/or writing for either a single term or the full 1988-1989 school year. Four instructional approaches were used to teach the subjects: model A used a supplementary laboratory setting and related workbook materials; model B used reduced class sizes; model C was interdisciplinary and integrated remedial reading and writing with the basic curriculum; and model D had two variations--reduced class size and team teaching. The evaluation criteria that 70% of the students in the reading and writing programs show improvement was met by the writing students but not by the reading students. Students in models A and C met the program objectives while students in the other models did not. (Five tables of data are included; 14 appendixes of data are attached.) (RS)



OREA Report

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

CHAPTER 1
ENGLISH INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCOME DATA
1988-89
END-OF-YEAR REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

212 hus

HOBERT TOBIAS

O THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Ciffice of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (FRIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Robert Tobias, Director John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator

May, 1990

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

CHAPTER 1
ENGLISH INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM
STUDENT OUTCOME DATA
1988-89
END-OF-YEAR REPORT

Prepared by the OREA High School Evaluation Unit

Dolores M. Mei Evaluation Manager

Eleanor Zak
Evaluation Associate

Cynthia Briolotta
Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Division of Strategic Flanning/Research and Development
Robin Willner, Executive Director





NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gwendolyn C. Baker President

Irene H. Impellizzeri Vice President

Carol A. Gresser Westina L. Matthews Michael J. Petrides Luis O. Reyes Ninfa Segarra Members

Joseph A. Fernandez Chancellor

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A Nestfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278

7/3/90



SUMMARY

Three programs funded by Chapter 1 provide remediation in reading and writing to high school students: English Instructional Services (E.I.S.), College Bound and College Discovery and Development. Overall, 23,442 students from 100 high schools and programs were reported to have participated in these programs during the 1988-89 school year. Attendance averaged 79.5 percent for full-year students and 71.7 percent for students served one-half year. Sixty-eight percent of full-year reading students and 66.8 percent of half-year reading students met the evaluation objective, falling short of the evaluation criterion of 70 percent. Writing students surpassed their objective. Only 64 percent of Model B students and 62 percent of Model D students passed their English class. Therefore, students did not meet the program evaluation objective of a 70 percent pass rate in their English class.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Although many students enrolled in the reading/writing programs received both reading and writing instruction, some students needed remediation in only one or the other area. Additionally students may receive a full year of instruction in reading and/or writing (full-year students) or a single term (half-year students) depending on the extent of their skills deficiencies. Four instructional approaches are used to teach reading and writing in the E.I.S. program. Model A uses a supplementary laboratory setting and related workbook materials. Model B, which is funded by only P.C.E.N., consists of a reduced class size that may not exceed 25 students. Model C uses an interdisciplinary approach and integrates remedial reading and writing with the basic curriculum and Model D has two variations of reducing student to teacher ratio--reduced class size and team teaching.

PROGRAM GOALS

The primary goals of the reading/writing programs are that 70 percent of the students receiving remediation in reading show improvement in their reading test scores as measured by the Degrees of Reading Power Test, or Regents Compentency Test in Reading from the pretest to the posttest. Seventy percent of writing students should show improvement in their writing test scores from the pretest to the posttest as well.



The three programs also receive funds from New York State under the Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (P.C.3.N.) program. A separate report presents program outcomes for students receiving services through this funding source. In addition, separate reports are available for the College Bound and College Discovery and Development programs.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, student outcomes in writing were very positive. Although the majority of students did not meet reading evaluation objectives, their performance was consistent with that reported in previous years' programs. When broken down by model, full-year students in Model A met the evaluation objectives while students in Models B, C, and D did not. Half-year students in Models A and B met the evaluation objective while students in Models C and D did not make the necessary N.C.E. gains.



ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<u>Page</u>
I.	Overview	v	1
II.	Overall	Results	6
Append	dices		
A.	Results	Manhattan Superintendency	16
В.	Results	Manhattan School-by-School	17
c.	Results	Bronx Superintendency	33
D.	Results	Bronx School-by-School	34
E.	Results	BASIS Superintendency	49
F.	Results	BASIS School-by-School	50
G.	Results	Brooklyn Superintendency	61
н.	Results	Brooklyn School-by-School	62
I.	Results	Queens Superintendency	81
J.	Results	Queens School-by-School	82
ĸ.	Results	Alternative H.S.	100
L.	Results	Alternative School-by-School	101
М.	Schools	- College Discovery and Development Program	121
N.	Schools	- College Bound Program	122



iii

List of Tables

Table				Page
1	Overall Stu	ident Outcomes	in Reading and	Writing 7
2	M iel A Stu	dent Outcomes	in Reading and	Writing 9
3	Model B Stu	dent Outcomes	in Reading and	Writing 10
4	Model C Stu	ndent Outcomes	in Reading and	Writing 11
5	Model D Stu	dent Outcomes	in Reading and	Writing 12



iv

I. OVERVIEW

PURPOSE AND CONTENT OF REPORT

Three programs funded by Chapter 1 provide remediation in reading and writing to high school students:

- The English Instructional Services (E.I.S.) program provides remediation in reading and writing to students in Chapter 1 targeted high schools or high schools receiving optional assignment funds.
- The College Bound program is designed to improve the reading, writing, and mathematics skills of high school students to prepare them to enter college. The program includes intensive support services offered in conjunction with remedial classes in 22 high schools.
- College Discovery and Development, affiliated with the City University of New York, is a basic skills program providing reading, writing and/or mathematics instruction. The program is funded by Chapter 1 in three schools and through tax-levy funds in three additional high schools.

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) evaluates each of these programs annually.* This report presents attendance data plus program results for all three programs combined, as well as summary statistics in attendance, reading, and writing by superintendency and by school.**

Although many students who are enrolled in these programs received both reading and writing instruction, some students needed remediation in only one or the other area. For this reason, reading and writing performance results are reported



^{*}The E.I.S. program also receives funds from New York State under the Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (P.C.E.N.) program. A separate report presents program outcomes for students receiving services through this funding source. In addition, separate reports are available for the College Bound and College Discovery and Development programs.

^{**}A list of schools participating in the Chapter 1 funded College Bound and Development Programs appears in an Appendix.

separately. Additionally, students enrolled in these programs may have received a full year or a single term of instruction, depending on the extent of their skills deficiencies.

Consequently, the performance results of full-year and half-year students are reported separately.

SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT

Chapter 1 regulations now require schools to conduct an Annual Review of Effectiveness. Full-year students receiving services in the schools' "priority" area (either reading or mathematics) must show improvement in test scores as a result of receiving those services. If they do not, the school is identified as "in need of improvement" and must develop and implement a Chapter 1 Program Improvement Plan in that area.

Priority area is determined on the basis of the number of students receiving Chapter 1 services. For example, if the percentage of students who participate in reading classes is five percent higher than the percentage of students taking part in math classes, then reading is the school's priority area. On the other hand, if the percentage of students who receive math instruction is five percent higher than the percentage of students taking part in reading, than math is the priority area in that school. Schools having less than a five percent difference in the number of students receiving reading and math instruction are considered to have two areas of concentration.

No schools were found to be in need of improvement on the basis of reading scores.



INSTRUCTIONAL MODELS

Four instructional approaches were used to teach reading and writing in Chapter 1 programs. Model A uses a supplementary laboratory setting and related workbook materials. Model C is interdisciplinary and integrates remedial reading and writing with the basic curriculum. Model D has two variations -- reduced class size and team teaching. Students in this Model receive instruction in a split funded (Chapter 1 and tax-levy) mainstream English class. Model B, which provides reduced size English classes, and is funded by P.C.E.N. is also discussed in this report because several students were reported as being served by Model B even though, according to the reimbursable program's proposal these classes should have been funded only by P.C.E.N. This conflict may be the result of miscommunication between teachers and administrators or between administrators and the central Board of Education or incorrect entry of data by teachers/administrators.

TESTING

Citywide tests are used to measure the overall progress of New York City high school students. These tests are also utilized as the evaluation instruments for students in the Chapter 1 reading and writing program.

Reading

Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) The Degrees of Reading



Power (D.R.P.) test is used to assess reading progress in the ninth and tenth grades.* The D.R.P. test that ninth and tenth grade students in the three programs took in spring 1938 served as a pretest and the spring 1959 test served as a posttest.

Regents Competency Test (R.C.T.). The Regents competency
Test (R.C.T.) in reading serves as the evaluation instrument for
the E.I.S., College Bound, and College Discovery and Development
reading students in the eleventh and twelfth grades.** However,
because students do not take the test at regularized intervals,
the usual pretest and posttest comparisons cannot be made. OREA
can only report outcomes for those 11th or 12th grade students
who failed the test sometime in the winter, spring, or summer of
1988 and subsequently passed it in the winter, spring, or summer
of 1989.

Measurement of program objectives. Reading performance on the D.R.P. is examined by evaluating pretest and postcest Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.s). R.C.T. scores have been converted



^{*}The D.R.P. is a criterion-referenced test of reading comprehension which considers a student's ability in relation to the difficulty of text items. D.R.P. scores indicate the level of text difficulty a student can read independently or for enjoyment (independent level), the level a student can read with assistance (instructional level), and the level a student is unlikely to comprehend (frustration level).

^{**}The R.C.T. in reading is a test of minimal competency required for all New York State students in order to receive a high school diploma. According to State Education Department (S.E.D.) guidelines, the reading R.C.T. can be given to students beginning in the spring of their eleventh grade. Thereafter, students can take the test up to three times a year (summer, winter, spring) until they pass it, although they are under no obligation to take it each year.

to D.R.P. units and then to N.C.E.s.*

The evaluation objectives of the E.I.S., College Bound, and College Discovery and Development programs stipulate that 70 percent of the students show a gain in reading scores from the pretest to the posttest. In addition, at least 70 percent of the students enrolled in Model B and Model D English classes m pass the mainstream course at the end of the program year. Writing

Writing performance for full and half-year students is evaluated by a holistic assessment of students' writing samples before and after program participation. Trained reading/writing teachers evaluate student writing samples using a scale that considers the overall adequacy of the paper as well as the student's adherence to the topic, word choice and usage, and other criteria.



^{*}A normal curve equivalent (N.C.E.) score is similar to a percentile rank, but is based on an equal-interval scale ranging from 1 to 99, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21. Because N.C.E. scores are equally spaced, arithmetic and statistical calculations such as averages are meaningful, and comparisons of these scores can be made across different achievement tests. A gain in an N.C.E. score from pretest to posttest indicates that a student's performance is better than what would be expected by normal chance and growth.

II. OVERALL RESULTS

Overall, 23,442 students from 100 high schools and programs were reported to have participated in the E.I.S., College Bound or College Discovery and Development programs in reading and/or writing during the 1988-89 school year. Attendance averaged 79.5 percent for full-year students and 71.7 percent for half-year students.

There were 10,391 full-year students in the programs, 3,696 were in ninth grade, 3,364 were in tenth grade, 2,225 were in the eleventh grade, and 1,096 were in the twelfth grade.* Of the 13,051 half-year students participating in the reading/writing programs, 3,607 were ninth grade students, 4,162 were in tenth grade, 3,470 were eleventh grade students, and 1,510 were in twelfth grade. The results of the programs for both full and half-year students are summarized overall and by grade in Table 1.

READING RESULTS

Full-Year Students

In the 1988-89 school year 10,391 full-year reading students participated in the programs. Fifty-five percent (5,778) had valid reading scores.** Findings can only be reported for



^{*}Grade information for an additional 299 full-year students and 6,224 half-year students was missing.

^{**} The small percentage of students with valid reading data is due to missing test scores. Test scores are obtained from central data files, which are themselves incomplete.

Table 1
CHAPTER 1 FUNDED TROGRAMS 1988-1989
STUDENT OUTCOMES 1N READING AND WRITING

STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST Scope	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
HALF YEAR	9TH	3607	3443	67.1	1365	36.2	39.3	63.7%	2130	72.9%
	10TH	4162	4023	71.8	1526	39.0	43.3	66.2%	2789	80.7%
	11TH	3470	3364	73 6	1128	39.2	43.6	67 1%	2317	84.2%
	12TH	1510	1472	77.9	207	25.8	35.8	90.8%	924	86.7%
	MISSING	302	0		0				0	
TOTAL		13051	12592	71 7	4226	37.5	41.7	66.8%	8160	80.3%
FULL YEAR	9TH	3696	3420	76.6	2186	34 4	38.5	67.2%	3288	87.0%
	10TH	3364	3199	79.8	2106	37.3	42.3	71.1x	2977	88.6%
7	11TH	2225	2139	80.9	1321	40.1	43.3	61.8%	1875	89.4%
	12TH	1096	1052	85.2	165	25.6	35.2	84.8%	1011	86 . 7×
	MISSING	10	0		0				0	
TOTAL		10391	9810	79.5	5778	36.5	40.9	67.9x	9151	88.0x
TOTAL		23442	22112	75.2	10004	36.9	41.3	67.4%	17311	84.4%

students with both pretest and posttest scores since program effectiveness is determined by changes in scores from the pretest to the posttest. To meet the reading objective, 70 percent of these students must demonstrate an N.C.E. gain. Sixty-eight percent of the full-year students with valid scores made the necessary N.C.E. gain. This percentage comes close to meeting the evaluation objective.

Analyses of reading outcomes by instructional Model, shown in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 indicate differences among Models in meeting evaluation objectives. Seventy-four percent of full-year reading students in laboratory (Model A) classrooms met the evaluation objective as compared with 68.8 percent of students in reduced size (Model B) classes, 48.6 percent of full-year students in interdisciplinary (Model C) classes and 65.5 percent of full year students in Model D.

In terms of course completion, 62.1 percent of Model B full-year students were expected to pass their paired content-area English class. Among Model D students the percent passing was 65.5 percent. Thus, overall Model B and D full-year students did not meet the course completion objective.

Half-Year Students

A total of 13,051 half-year reading students participated in the reading/writing programs during the 1988-89 school year.

Only 32 percent of these students had valid reading scores.

Sixty-seven percent of these students made the necessary N.C.E. gains. This falls slightly short of the evaluation objective.

Reading outcomes for half-year students, when broken down by



Table 2
CHAPTER 1 FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

MODEL OF Instruction	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
LAB (MODEL A)	HALF YEAR	9TH	1898	1819	64.2	7 3 6	34.6	38.0	65.5%	1112	72.7%
		1 O T H	1974	1918	67.7	772	35 5	40.6	68.8%	1318	79.7%
		11TH	1835	1766	72 8	680	36 6	42.0	71.9%	1235	83.4%
		12TH	626	612	7 5 2	162	25.4	35.2	89.5%	449	88.6%
		MISSING	151	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		6484	6115	68 9	2350	34.8	39.8	70.1%	4114	79.9%
	FULL YEAR	9TH	1828	1700	74.4	989	31.8	37.4	73.1%	1618	88.6%
		10TH	1449	1370	76.8	814	32.6	38.5	73.3%	1312	92.1%
v		11TH	813	770	75 2	416	31.1	37.0	74.5%	699	90.4%
		12TH	214	201	80 5	8.3	23.7	34.5	81.9%	196	92 3%
		MISSING	1	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		4305	4041	75.7	2302	31.7	37.6	73 8x	3825	90.3%
TOTAL			10789	10156	71.6	46 52	33.3	38.7	71.9%	7939	84.9%

Table 3
CHAPTER 1 FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

MODEL OF INSTRUCTION MODEL B	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TLST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
REDUCED CLASS SIZE	HALF YEAR	9TH	289	282	61.7	106	34.4	38.2	71.7%	180	62.2%
		10TH	250	242	76.1	90	36.2	41.6	67.8%	201	80.1%
		11TH	254	252	76.8	96	35 8	40.2	71.9%	218	84.4%
		12TH	128	126	81.4	11	26.6	37.5	90.9%	117	76.1%
		MISSING	∠7	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		948	902	72.6	303	35.1	39.8	71.3%	716	76.3%
	FULL YEAR	9TH	412	386	76.9	251	36.2	39.8	67.7%	396	86.1%
		10TH	236	217	80.7	131	34.2	39.9	71.0%	224	91.5%
1 0		11TH	90	80	76.8	35	32.3	38.1	68.6%	89	91.0%
		12TH	62	54	73.0	3	30.3	38.3	66.7%	81	88.5%
	TOTAL		800	737	77.7	420	35 2	39.7	68.8%	770	88.4%
TOTAL			1748	1639	74.9	723	35.2	39.7	69.8%	1486	82.6%

Table 4
CHAPTER 1 FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989
STUDENT OUTCOMES IN READING AND WRITING

	MODEL OF INSTRUCTION MODEL C	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING	
	INTERDISCIPL INARY	HALF YEAR	9TH	125	118	72.2	66	39.9	42.1	57.6%	113	65.5%	
			10TH	74	73	78 O	50	37 5	39.5	54.0%	63	96.8%	
			11TH	2	2	68 4	1	27.0	37.0	100.0%	1	100.0%	
			MISSING	1	0		0				0		
		TOTAL		202	193	74.4	117	38.8	40.9	56.4%	177	76.8%	
		FULL YEAR	9TH	110	102	77.0	68	29.3	30.0	48.5%	108	81.5%	
			10TH	5	2	46.9	2	25.5	24 5	50.0%	5	80.0%	
		TOTAL		115	104	76.4	70	29.2	29.9	48.6%	113	81.4%	
_	TOTAL			317	297	75 1	187	35.2	36.8	53.5%	290	78.6%	

Table 5
CHAFTER 1 FUNDED PROGRAMS 1988-1989
STUDENT OUTCOMES 1N READING AND WRITING

MODEL OF INSTRUCTION	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MODEL D	HALF YEAR	9TH	803	770	70.0	263	38 7	40.9	60 5%	537	78.2%
		10TH	1033	1004	74.4	215	42.6	45.3	60.9%	835	80.7%
		11TH	808	795	70.5	128	42.1	44.3	54.7%	687	86.0%
		12TH	206	198	77.8	17	26.9	36 . 4	100 0%	159	89 9%
		MISSING	110	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		2960	2767	72 3	623	40 4	43.0	60.5%	2218	82.4%
	FULL YEAR	9 T H	702	615	75.4	443	35 4	38.2	60.7%	619	85.6%
12		10TH	489	453	77.8	286	37.7	42.0	68.2%	444	87.8%
8		11TH	195	175	80.7	115	36 0	41.5	70.4%	189	91.0%
		12TH	125	116	81 9	39	25.9	33.8	84.6%	117	97 . 4%
		MISSING	9	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		1520	1359	77.5	883	35.8	39.7	65.5%	1369	88.1%
TOTAL			4480	4126	74.0	1506	37.7	41.0	63.4%	3587	84.6%

Model showed differences in students' gains. Seventy percent of the students in Model A and 71.3 percent of the students in Model B met the evaluation objective, while only 56.4 percent of the students in Model C and 60.5 percent of students in Model D met the necessary N.C.E. gains.

Comparison of Outcomes

There were differences in reading performance between full and half-year students in the same grade. Generally, students in the eleventh and twelfth grades performed better than those in the ninth and tenth grades regardless of the length of program participation. This finding may be related to the fact that students in the upper grades are those who have persisted in school, and are thus, in general, a higher scoring group than students in the lower grades which include potential dropouts. Half-year students in Model B (64.6 percent) and Model D (55.6 percent) classes fell short of meeting the course completion objective of 70 percent passing.

With the exception of the Queens and Alternative High School Superintendency, there was no difference in gains between half and full-year students. The percent of full-year students that improved in reading by superintendency, ranged from a low of 63.5 percent to a high of 76.5 percent.

WRITING RESULTS

Eighty-eight percent of the full-year and 62.5 percent of the half-year students had valid writing scores. To meet the evaluation objective, 70 percent of the full and half-year students had to demonstrate improvement in their writing as



measured by teachers' holistic assessments. Eighty-eight percent of the full-year and 80.3 percent of the half-year students met the writing evaluation objective. Thus, the program surpassed its evaluation goal for both full-year and half-year students.

Students' writing performance varied across instructional Models. Eighty percent of the half-year students met the writing evaluation objective in Model A, 76.3 percent in Model B, 76.8 percent in Model C classes, and 82.4 percent in Model D. The results were even more positive among full-year writing students where 90.3 percent of Model A, 88.4 percent of Model B, and 81.4 percent or Model C and 88.1 percent of Model D full-year writing students met the evaluation objective.

Students' writing performance varied according to grade. Seventy-three percent of half-year students in ninth grade met the writing objective, while 86.7 percent of twelfth graders achieved writing gains. Eighty-seven percent of full-year students in ninth grade met writing objectives, while 88.6 percent of tenth grade students, 89.4 percent of eleventh grade students and 86.7 percent of twelfth grade students met the evaluation objective. It is likely that improved writing performance, as students progress from ninth through twelfth grade, results from increased experience and skill.

Overall, student outcomes in writing were very positive.

Almost all groups of half and null-year students met the writing evaluation objective. The four instructional models appear to have had a similar impact on students' writing improvement.

The following tables showing total student outcomes, are



organized by superintendency followed by student outcomes individual high schools in that superintendency.





SUPERINTENDENCY	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVEE IN Writing
MANHATTAN	HALF YEAR	9TH	526	508	67.7	243	39.0	41.2	59.3%	337	69.7×
		10TH	844	832	70.2	428	39.7	43.6	66.4%	528	75.4%
		11TH	537	524	76.3	232	40 5	43.8	62.1%	354	82.2%
		12TH	361	346	81.2	64	25.5	34.3	85.9%	217	88.9%
		MISSING	38	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		2306	2210	72 8	967	38.8	42.4	64.8%	1436	77.8%
	FULL YEAR	9TH	524	504	73.8	300	36.3	39.5	58.7%	453	85.0x
L		10TH	656	629	78.0	433	38.2	42.5	68 1%	575	88.3%
16		11TH	485	467	83.7	319	42.5	44.9	58.6%	403	90.3%
		12TH	279	273	86.2	45	26.0	36 . 4	86.7%	255	93.7%
	TOTAL		1944	1873	79.5	1097	38.4	42.1	63.5%	1686	88.7%
TOTAL			4250	4083	75.9	2064	38.6	42.3	64.1%	3122	83.7%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING		# WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
MANHATTAN	HUMANITIES	HALF YEAR	9TH	3	2	95.3	1	27.0	17.0	0.0	3	66.7%
			1 O T H	3	3	37.2	0				0	
			11TH	2	2	98 2	1	19.0	13.0	0.0	0	
			MISSING	8	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		16	7	71.2	2	23.0	15.0	0.0	3	66.7%
		FULL YEAR	9 T H	5	4	73.6	4	32.0	49.2	100.0%	2	100.0%
			1 O T H	25	21	84.3	16	32.9	41.4	81.3%	17	76.5x
			11TH	18	17	87.7	13	35.8	40.8	76.9%	13	92.3%
17			12TH	4	3	82.2	2	24.5	30.5	50.0%	3	66.7%
		TOTAL		52	45	84.5	35	33.4	41.5	80.0%	35	82.9%
	TOTAL			68	52	82.7	37	32.8	40.1	75.7%	38	81.6%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF Students	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID	TEST	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	SEWARD PARK	HALF YEAR	9TH	15	15	67.5	4	28.5	36 . 5	75.0%	8	62.5%
			10TH	53	52	85.5	34	43.3	47.0	70.6%	37	86 . 5%
	•		11TH	94	93	86.7	19	33.1	38.3	68.4%	71	80.3%
			12TH	56	54	87 8	5	19.0	28.4	80.0%	29	82.8%
			MISSING	7	0		0				O	
		TOTAL		225	214	85.3	62	37.2	42.2	71.0%	145	81.4%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	20	18	84.6	5	40.8	36.4	20.0%	16	50 . 0 %
ш			10TH	85	83	87.6	60	38.5	44.6	80.0%	77	94.8%
18			11TH	7 7	76	90.2	54	38.6	41.6	59.3%	69	88.4%
			12TH	64	62	93.0	9	19.7	36.7	88.9%	62	90.3%
		TOTAL		246	239	89.6	128	37.3	42.4	69.5%	224	88.4%
	TOTAL			471	453	87.6	190	37.3	42.4	70.0%	369	85.6%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00F	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	WASHINGTON IRVING	HALF YEAR	9TH	12	12	63.4	2	31.5	31.5	50.0%	3	100.0%
			10TH	18	18	79.6	10	34.1	38.4	90.0%	7	100.0%
		•	11TH	8	8	87.1	5	51.2	49.2	0 0	2	100.0%
			12TH	5	5	91 7	2	24.5	43.0	100.0%	3	100.0%
		TOTAL		43	43	77.9	19	37.3	41.0	63.2%	15	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	32	32	76.5	25	40.4	40.6	52.0%	24	75.8x
			1 0TH	35	35	84.9	31	39.8	45.0	71.0%	30	100.0%
ь			11TH	45	45	90.3	39	42.6	45.7	64.1%	42	100.0%
19			12TH	45	45	92.7	3	27 . 7	35.0	100.0%	45	100.0%
		TOTAL		157	157	87.0	98	40.7	43.8	64.3%	141	99.3%
	TOTAL			200	200	85.0	117	40.1	43.4	64.1%	156	99.4%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	GEORGE WASHINGTON	HALF YEAR	9TH	41	40	82.3	20	38.0	40.1	55.0%	17	88.2%
			10TH	65	65	85.7	39	43.1	49.5	74.4%	55	80.0%
			11TH	62	58	85.0	33	48.7	49.9	51.5%	33	87.9%
			12TH	58	57	84.2	0				43	95.3 x
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		227	220	84.5	92	44.0	47 . 6	62.0%	148	87.2%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	17	17	80.0	13	36 . 7	36 . 2	30.8%	12	83.3×
N			10TH	3	2	59.4	0				3	66.7x
20		TOTAL		20	19	77.8	13	36 . 7	36 . 2	30.8%	15	80.0x
	TOTAL			247	239	84.0	105	43.1	46 . 2	58.1%	163	86.5x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID PRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	LOUIS D. BR	ANDEIS HALF YEAR	9TH	96	88	66.2	33	36 . 5	38.3	57.6%	63	46 . 0%
			10TH	105	102	66.1	31	39.4	43.0	67.7%	51	72.5%
			11TH	27	25	71.3	11	40.3	42.0	54.5%	11	90.9%
			12TH	42	41	69.6	14	25.0	34.0	85.7%	19	89.5%
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		272	250	67.2	89	36 . 2	39.7	65.2x	144	64.6x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	81	75	65.1	42	33.4	34.7	59.5%	67	77.6x
21			10TH	49	49	74.9	29	36.4	41.4	72.4%	40	85.0x
_			2.1 TH	56	56	83.1	29	44.9	48 . 3	62.1%	48	10 0 .0%
			12TH	47	46	81.0	8	25.2	39.4	100.0%	42	100.0%
		TOTAL		233	226	74.9	108	36 . 7	40.5	66.7%	197	89.3x
	TOTAL			505	482	70.8	197	36.5	40.2	66.0%	341	78.9%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VAL1D ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	JULIA RICHMAN	HALF YEAR	9TH	122	120	49 8	40	36.9	37.4	50.0%	67	56 . 7×
			19TH	131	131	61.4	54	40.5	43.9	66.7%	97	66.0 %
			11TH	91	90	70.1	34	37 . 5	44.2	76.5%	74	70.3×
			12TH	45	43	82.6	9	28.4	36.6	88.9%	44	90.9%
			MISSING	4	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		393	384	67.2	137	37.9	41.6	65.7%	282	68.8×
		FULL YEAR	9TH	138	137	67.6	64	34.4	36.1	50.0x	120	80.0x
8 8			10TH	100	97	71.3	58	37.9	38.3	50.0x	91	91.2x
N			11TH	50	48	*3.3	22	38.7	40.0	63.6%	40	92.5x
			12TH	7	6	80.2	6	30.3	37.3	83.3%	7	100.0%
		TOTAL		295	288	70.9	150	36.2	7.6	53.3x	258	86.4%
	TOTAL			688	672	65.9	287	37.0	39.5	59 . 2%	540	77 . 2 x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X MHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	MARTIN LUTHER KING	HALF YEAR	9TH	100	98	73.8	62	41.9	45.2	61 3%	85	71.8%
			10TH	70	67	77 1	34	46.0	48.5	55.9%	36	41 .7x
			11TH	53	50	84 2	22	44.0	46.2	63.6%	25	72.0%
			12TH	57	52	88 7	6	18.8	28.7	83.3%	20	80.0%
			MISSING	5	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		285	267	79 4	124	42.3	45.5	61.5%	166	66 . 3%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	61	58	69.4	28	33.6	38.4	67.9%	50	82.0x
ა ა			10TH	56	54	79.5	31	41.4	44.0	58.1%	45	64.4%
ω			11TH	71	67	86.0	51	52.1	50 7	37 . 3%	34	58.8%
			12TH	21	21	87.1	1	41.0	44 0	100 0%	10	50.0x
		TOTAL		209	200	79 6	111	44.3	45 7	51 4%	139	68.3x
	TOTAL			494	467	79.5	235	43.2	45.6	56 6%	305	67 . 2 %



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING		X WHO IMPROVED IH WRITING
MANHATTAN	MURRY BERGTRAUM	HALF YEAR	9TH	21	20	66.2	9	51.1	53.2	55.6%	13	84.6%
			10TH	48	47	64.9	26	41.7	42.5	50.0%	33	78.8%
	,		11TH	30	30	77.2	17	41.0	43.9	82.4%	24	87 . 5x
			12TH	20	19	72.9	1	32.0	58.0	100.0%	12	91.7%
			MISSING	6	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		125	116	69.6	53	42.9	45.0	62.3%	82	84.1%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	53	49	72.8	31	36 . 4	36.4	45.2%	48	91.7x
N			10TH	111	101	78.5	80	36 . 7	40.2	65.0%	103	86.4%
2 4			11TH	78	71	84.8	58	40.0	44.3	67 . 2%	74	93.2%
			12TH	39	38	80.3	9	29.8	39.7	88.9x	35	97.1x
		TOTAL		281	259	79.4	178	37.4	40.8	63 5x	260	90.8x
	TOTAL			406	375	76.4	231	38.7	41.8	63.2x	342	89.2x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUOENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENOANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	PARK WEST	HALF YEAR	9 T H	21	21	70.7	13	36 . 1	43.2	69.2%	13	100.0x
	,		10TH	107	107	61.3	76	36.0	40.0	65.8%	53	88.7x
			11TH	57	57	75 1	31	40.3	40.4	38.7%	44	95.5x
			12TH	17	17	91.4	8	20.1	27.6	87.5%	14	92.9x
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		203	202	68.7	128	36.1	39.6	60.9%	124	92.7%
		FULL YEAR	9 T H	17	17	86.2	14	44.1	48.3	71.4%	17	10 0.0 x
N 5			10TH	58	58	75.7	37	43.5	48.6	78.4%	46	91.3x
			11TH	39	39	87.1	26	52.7	52.0	42.3%	35	91.4x
			12TH	37	37	88.9	1	34.0	40.0	100.0%	3 7	100.0x
		TOTAL		151	151	83.1	78	46.5	49.6	65.4%	135	94.8x
	TOTAL			354	353	74.9	206	40.0	43.4	62.6%	259	93.8x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED In Writing
MANHATTAN	A. PHILIP RANDOLPH	HALF YEAR	9TH	3	3	86.3	3	42.0	40.7	33.3%	3	100. 0 %
			10TH	9	8	90.1	4	36 . 0	45.0	75.0%	8	100. 0 %
			11TH	3	3	92.5	0				2	100.0%
			12TH	1	1	100.0	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		16	15	90.5	7	38.6	43.1	57.1%	14	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	25	24	95.9	22	33.5	45.0	77.3%	25	100.0%
			10TH	15	13	96.2	10	39.4	50.5	7 0 .0%	15	100.0%
2			11TH	5	4	95.8	2	39.5	40.5	50.0%	5	100.0x
			12TH	3	3	91.5	1	19.0	37.0	100.0%	3	100.0%
		TOTAL		48	44	95.7	35	35.1	46.1	74.3%	48	100.0%
	TOTAL			64	59	94.4	42	35.7	45.6	71.4%	62	10 0 .0%

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
MANHATTAN	FASHION INDUSTRIES	HALF YEAR	9TH	4	4	8¢.1	3	21.0	27.3	100.0%	3	100.0%
			10TH	50	48	56 . 0	30	34.5	38.3	70.0%	28	64.3x
			11TH	41	41	42 0	11	33.5	41.1	81.8%	15	93.3x
			12TH	16	16	65.9	5	28.6	38.4	100.0%	11	90.9%
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		113	109	53.4	49	32.9	38.3	77.6%	57	78.9%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	9	, 8	74.2	6	32.2	35.2	66.7%	8	87 . 5x
27			10TH	71	71	70.6	57	35.9	39.5	63.2%	67	92.5 x
•			11TH	37	35	57.1	19	30.3	35.4	73.7%	34	91.2x
			12TH	6	6	66.4	3	19.0	21.0	33.3%	5	80.0x
		TOTAL		123	120	66.7	85	33.8	37.6	64.7%	114	91.2x
	TOTAL			236	229	60.4	134	33.4	37.9	69.4%	171	87.1x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST Score	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCURE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	CHELSEA	HALF YEAR	9TH	32	30	85.4	22	36 . 1	36.9	72.7%	28	82.1%
			10TH	22	22	84 4	0				17	70.6%
			11TH	7	6	74.5	2	40.0	39.0	50 0%	4	50.0%
			12TH	17	14	67 3	3	30.7	33.7	33.3%	7	71.4%
		TOTAL		78	72	80.7	27	35.8	36 . 7	66.7%	56	75.0%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	1	1	75.6	I	30.0	26.0	0.0	1	100.0%
			10TH	2	2	65.3	0				1	0.0
N 80			IITH	1	1	46.7	0				1	0.0
			12TH	1	1	74.4	1	24.0	26 . 0	100 0%	1	100.0%
		TOTAL		5	5	65.4	2	27 . 0	2 6 . 0	50.0%	4	50.0x
	TOTAL			83	77	79.7	29	35.2	35.9	65 5x	60	73. 3 %

SUPERINTEN D ENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	NORMAN THOMAS	HALF YEAR	9TH	26	26	71.0	16	43.1	43.8	56 . 3%	8	87 . 5%
			10TH	83	82	77.6	47	4i.3	44.6	66.0%	43	81.4%
			11TH	46	45	79 4	, 35	40.7	44.5	68.6%	37	81.1%
			12TH	47	17	72 4	5	28.8	38.6	100.0%	5	60.0%
		TOTAL		172	170	76.5	103	40 8	44.1	67.0%	93	80.6%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	24	23	88.0	17	39.5	43.9	58.8%	23	91.3%
			10TH	24	22	73.2	11	38.3	45.8	81.8%	20	90.0%
29			11TH	4	4	87.9	3	26 . 3	30.0	66.7%	4	100.0%
		TOTAL		52	49	81 4	31	37.8	43 3	67.7x	47	91.5%
	TOTAL			224	219	77.6	134	40.1	43.9	67.2%	140	84.3%

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHG IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	HS GRAPHIC COMM ARTS	HALF YEAR	9TH	12	11	62.7	5	36 . 4	33.6	60.0%	7	100.0%
			10TH	59	59	69.2	27	31.9	36 . 7	63.0%	46	82.6%
			11TH	7	7	66.3	4	2 5 .2	33.2	50. ũ%	4	100.0%
			12TH	5	5	82.5	1	30.0	23.0	0.0	5	100.0%
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		85	82	68.9	37	31.7	35.6	59 . 5 %	62	87.1%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	1	1	32.8	0				0	
30			10TH	4	3	74.8	1	37.0	43.0	100.0%	4	75.0%
			12TH	1	1	78.3	0				1	100.0%
		TJTAL		6	5	67.1	1	37.0	43.0	100.0%	5	80.0%
	TOTAL			91	87	68.8	38	31.9	35.8	60.5%	67	86.6%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	TEST	X WHO IMPROVED IN KEADING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
MANHATTAN	ART AND DESIGN	HALF YEAR	9TH	18	18	88.1	10	46.0	49.4	60.0%	16	93.8%
			10TH	18	18	80.6	15	45.2	51.8	66.7%	17	88.2%
			11TH	8	8	78.1	7	40.4	46 . 0	85.7%	7	100 0%
			12TH	5	5	83.8	5	33.2	41.0	100.0%	4	100.0%
		TOTAL		49	49	83.2	37	42.9	48.6	73.0%	44	93.2%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	40	40	83.2	28	41.4	48.3	82.1%	40	95.0x
			10TH	15	15	80.9	10	37.6	45.5	90.0%	15	93.3%
3 1			11TH	4	4	78.3	3	43.0	44.7	66.7%	4	75.0%
			12TH	4	4	34.7	1	32.0	37.0	190.0%	4	50.0x
		TOTAL		63	63	79.3	42	40.4	47 . 1	83.3%	63	90.5x
	TOTAL			112	112	81.0	79	41.6	47 . 8	78 5×	107	91.6%



59

SUPERINTENDENC	Y SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF Students	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE			POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WRITING	% WHO IMPROVED In Writing
MANHATTAN	MABEL D. BACON	HALF YEAR	11TH	1	1	90.6	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		1	1	90.6	0				1	100.0%
	TOTAL			1	1	90.6	0				1	100.0%
TOTAL				4250	4083	75.9	2064	38.6	42.3	64.1%	3122	83.7%

32



61

SUPERINTENDENCY	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	♥ WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST Score	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
BRONX	HALF YEAR	9TH	1109	1060	66.8	477	35.9	39.0	62.3%	691	69. 0%
		10TH	1025	994	72.2	475	38.8	43.0	64.4%	660	81.8%
		11TH	690	670	75.6	321	39.3	44.8	72.0%	421	86.9%
		12TH	343	338	79.1	39	25.4	37.7	97.4%	198	87.4%
		MISSING	107	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		3274	3062	71.8	1312	37.5	41.8	66.5%	1970	79.0%
	FULL YEAR	9TH	1128	1015	75.6	699	33.7	37.8	68.1×	1012	85. 5 x
t.s		10TH	744	697	82.8	468	38.1	43.1	70.3%	6 3 6	89.2%
ယ ယ		11TH	500	472	83.7	341	39.5	43.4	63.0%	442	90.3%
		12TH	293	281	87.7	46	25.7	34.6	87.0%	267	82.8%
		MISSING	9	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		2674	2465	80.6	1554	36 . 1	40.5	68.2%	2357	87.1%
TCTAL			5948	5527	75.7	2866	36 . 7	41.1	67.4%	4327	83.4%

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	MORRIS	HALF YE	AR 9TH	125	122	56.2	40	35.0	36 . 3	70.0%	76	51.3x
			10TH	113	108	61.4	31	37.5	42.1	64.5%	52	57 . 7×
			11TH	8 5	8 3	68 1	45	41.6	45.5	62.2%	52	82.7%
			12TH	37	37	64.4	1	24.0	37.D	100.0%	4	50. 0 %
			MISSING	3	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		363	350	61.5	117	38.1	41.4	65.8%	184	62.0%
		FULL YEA	AR 9TH	222	216	74.1	148	38.7	41.4	59.5x	220	83.2x
3 4			10TH	48	43	68.7	29	38.8	40.8	65.5%	43	55.8x
			11TH	46	46	76.1	31	43.0	44.5	54.8%	40	72.5x
			12TH	44	43	86.3	3	27 . 7	36 . 3	100 0%	43	58.lx
		TOTAL		360	348	75.2	211	39.2	41.7	60 2%	346	75.4x
	TOTAL			723	698	68.3	328	38.8	41.6	62.2%	530	70.8%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENOANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENOANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	WILLIAM H. TAFT	HALF YEAR	9TH	91	82	57.3	22	32.4	32.2	45.5%	60	60.0x
			10TH	71	68	70.0	19	32.9	37.7	68.4%	37	89.2x
			11TH	90	90	77.1	38	38.5	45.3	84.2%	52	90.4x
			12TH	41	41	76.3	7	25.3	38.7	85.7%	30	100.0%
			MISSING	10	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		303	281	69.5	86	34.6	39.8	70.9%	179	81.6%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	129	119	76.3	69	27.8	29.1	53.6×	123	84.6%
ယ ဟ			10TH	94	87	78.6	55	32.1	36.7	70.9%	84	97.6×
			11TH	27	26	77.4	13	21.4	32.0	84.6%	27	85.2x
			12TH	38	37	82.6	8	28.2	35.4	75.0x	34	97.1×
		TOTAL		288	269	78.0	145	28.9	32.6	64.1%	268	90.3×
	TOTAL			591	550	73.7	231	31.0	35.3	66.7x	447	86.8×



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN FERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVEI IN WRITING
BRONX	CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS	HALF YEAR	9TH	2	2	82.1	1	24.0	34.0	100.0%	1	100.0%
	•		10TH	3	3	93.3	1	31.0	37.0	100.0%	2	100.0%
		TOTAL		5	5	88 8	2	27.5	35.5	100.0%	3	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	91H	5	5	88.1	2	34.5	40.5	100.0%	4	100.0%
			10TH	24	24	86.5	12	33.4	38.4	66.7%	21	90.5%
			11TH	5	4	90.8	2	30.0	33.0	50.0%	5	80.0%
			12TH	1	1	97.8	0				1	100.0%
3 6		TOTAL		35	34	87.6	16	33.1	38.0	68.8%	31	90.3x
	TOTAL			40	39	87.7	18	32.5	37.7	72.2%	34	91.2%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRA DE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	JAMES MONROE	HALF YEAR	9 TH	93	91	69.1	36	38.4	39.8	50.0%	69	60.9x
			10TH	61	56	73 6	28	40.9	45.4	64.3%	45	82.2%
			11TH	45	41	78 6	25	37.4	41.2	60.0%	25	72. 0 %
			12TH	27	26	74.9	2	27 . 5	35.5	100.0%	18	94.4%
			MISSING	3	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		229	214	72.8	91	38.6	41.8	58.2%	157	72.6%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	28	25	68.1	13	36 . 4	39.3	61.5x	22	68.2x
37			10TH	7	6	73.8	3	42.7	39.3	66.7%	t.	100.0x
			11TH	6	6	68.5	1	17.0	47.0	100.0x	5	100.0%
			12TH	ì	1	47.2	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		42	38	68.5	17	36.4		64.7x	34	79.4x
	TOTAL			271	252	72.2	108	38.3	41.5	59.3x	191	73.8%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING		% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	EVANDER CHILDS	HALF YEAR	91 H	85	80	78.7	20	34.3	35.7	60.0%	56	66.1%
			10TH	112	105	84.1	41	41.5	48.5	73.2%	72	86.1%
			11TH	54	50	86.0	23	41.5	45.3	73.9%	31	77.4%
			12TH	36	36	94.1	0				9	88.9%
			MISSING	6	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		293	271	84.2	84	39.8	44.6	70.2%	168	78.0%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	119	102	87.5	49	31.4	36.8	77.6x	109	89.0%
သ 8			107H	167	154	89.7	88	42.4	49.7	80.7%	152	90.1%
			11TH	94	90	90.1	75	50.8	51.7	42.7%	91	84.6%
			12TH	56	56	94.6	າ				51	76.5%
		TOTAL		4 36	402	89.9	212	42.8	47.4	66.5x	403	86.8x
	TOTAL			7 29	673	87.6	296	42.0	46 . 6	67.6×	571	84.2%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE		# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	WALTON	HALF YEAR	9TH	42	40	62.7	17	33.9	37.0	76.5%	18	77.8%
			101H	42	40	68.9	12	37.3	44.2	91.7%	17	88 . 2x
			11TH	30	30	79.5	12	38.3	45.1	91 7%	17	54.1%
			12TH	15	14	79.7	1	10.0	48.0	100.0%	11	81.8%
		TOTAL		129	124	70.6	42	35.6	41.6	85.7%	63	85.7%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	85	75	79.5	68	36.4	41.7	79.4%	68	86.8x
			10TH	84	81	87.2	66	3 7.6	41.2	62.1%	77	94.8%
3 9			11TH	63	59	90.5	53	41.6	44.4	60.4%	57	96.5x
			12TH	43	43	88.9	7	28.0	57.6	100.0%	43	81.4%
		TOTAL		275	258	86.0	194	3 7 . 9	42.1	69 12	245	90.6×
	TOTAL			404	382	81.0	236	37 5	42.0	72 Ox	308	89.6%

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	CRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	THEODORE ROOSEVELT	HALF YEAR	9TH	224	213	68.6	84	36 . 1	39.4	61.9%	142	66.9%
			10TH	110	110	73.1	44	39.1	42.0	52.3%	87	67.8%
			11TH	53	52	75 8	14	34.4	35.4	42.9%	41	82.9%
			12TH	25	24	85.5	2	20.5	32.0	100.0%	19	78.9%
			MISSING	59	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		471	399	71.8	144	36.7	39.7	57.6%	289	70.2x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	177	135	75.2	98	31.8	34.9	61.2%	154	74.0%
40			10TH	41	36	77.2	17	27.8	36 . 2	76.5%	39	76.9%
			11TH	51	39	85.1	30	26 9	35.6	83.3%	49	89.8%
			12TH	27	26	87.0	12	24.2	31.5	91.7%	27	96.3x
			MISSING	9	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		305	236	78.5	157	29.9	34.9	69.4%	269	79.6%
	TOTAL			776	635	74.3	301	33.1	37 2	63.8%	558	74.7%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH0 0 L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALIO READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
BRONX	DEWITT CLINTON	HALF YEAR	9TH	112	109	72.1	84	35.5	37.7	61.9%	63	82.5%
			10TH	128	127	72.4	73	38.1	38.5	49.3%	95	93.7%
			11TH	80	79	70.2	23	41.2	48.7	60.9%	48	95.8%
			12TH	26	25	83.0	3	32.7	42.0	100.0%	19	94.7%
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		348	340	72.6	183	37 . 2	39.5	57 . 4%	225	91.1%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	28	28	75.6	23	32.6	37.2	73.9%	23	91.3%
41			10TH	47	45	79.5	38	36 . 5	38.5	57.9%	47	72.3%
			11TH	49	48	83.8	27	40.1	42.3	63.0%	45	95.6%
			12TH	2	2	73.6	0				2	50.0x
		TOTAL		126	123	80.2	88	36 . 6	39.3	63.6X	117	84.6x
	TOTAL			474	46 3	74.6	271	37.0	39.4	59.4%	342	88.9×

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	ADLAI E. STEVENSON	HALF YEAR	9TH	113	110	58 7	67	35.0	41.1	67.2%	82	64.6x
	,		10TH	187	185	74.6	130	40.2	45.4	68.5%	145	79.3%
			11TH	112	109	76.6	64	42.1	47.0	70.3%	71	85.9x
			12TH	62	61	83 3	6	27 . 5	42.5	100.0%	50	78.9%
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		475	46 5	72.5	267	39.1	44.7	69.3%	348	77. 0 %
		FULL YEAR	9TH	93	85	71.9	62	31.9	37.4	74.2%	89	89.9x
4 2			10TH	21	21	75.5	11	34.9	41.8	72.7x	21	95.2x
			11TH	11	11	76.2	6	29.5	40.7	83.3%	10	90.0%
			12TH	3	3	85.7	0				3	33.3%
		TOTAL		128	120	73.2	79	32.1	38.3	74.7x	123	89.4%
	TOTAL			603	585	72.6	346	37.5	43.2	70.5%	471	80.3%



81

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL		STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMEER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALTD READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPRO√ED IN READING	VALID WRITING	% MHO IMPROVĖ IN WRIT[NG
BRONA	HARRY S. T	RUMAN	HALF YEAR	11TH	1	1	95.3	0				1	100.0%
		•	TOTAL		1	1	95.3	0				1	100. 0 %
	TOTAL				1	1	95 3	0				1	100. 0 %

3

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# HITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCDRE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BPDNX	SOUTH BRONX	HALF YEAR	9TH	32	31	75.3	16	29.7	35.7	81.3%	14	85.7x
			10TH	14	14	78.5	4	39.5	45.5	75.0%	7	100.0%
			IITH	23	23	85.8	14	33.6	47.3	100.0%	15	80.0x
			12TH	2	2	64.1	1	33.0	55.0	100.0%	0	
			MISSING	19	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		90	70	79.1	35	32.5	42.0	88.6%	36	86.1x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	25	21	52.2	8	28.6	34.2	62.5%	7	71.4%
4			10TH	23	19	81 4	14	25.3	37.6	85.7%	18	88.9%
			11TH	12	,	76.5	4	28.2	36.8	100.0%	7	100.0%
		TOTAL		60	49	68.0	26	26.8	36.5	80.8x	32	87.5%
	TOTAL			150	119	74.5	61	30.1	39 . 7	85 2x	68	86.8%



SUPERINTERJENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVEI IN WRITING
BRONX	JOHN F. KENNEDY	HALF YEAR	9TH	95	89	73.7	45	41 6	42.1	55.6%	48	97.9%
			10TH	94	90	66.9	48	41.1	45.9	72. 9 %	39	94.9%
			11TH	74	70	73.9	40	36.0	41.4	80.0%	42	90.5%
			12TH	42	42	81.4	12	23.9	32.6	100.0%	17	88.2×
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		307	291	72.8	145	38.4	42.4	71.7%	146	93.8%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	94	88	77.6	68	34.9	39.7	73.5%	84,	100.0%
4 5			10TH	133	127	83.0	107	44.5	47.7	64.5%	76	97.4x
			11TH	72	70	84.8	52	39.5	42.7	63.5%	50	96.0x
			12TH	56	48	89.4	8	22.1	30.7	75.0x	45	95.6x
		TOTAL		355	333	82.9	235	39.9	43.7	67 2 x	255	97 . 6×
	TOTAL			662	624	78.2	380	39.3	43.2	68.9x	401	96 . 3x



SUPERINTENDENCY	C SCHOOL	STATUS	GRA DE	TJTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	JANE ADDAMS	HALF YEAR	9TH	40	40	55.1	15	35.3	40.4	53.3%	17	58.8%
			10TH	41	41	72.7	26	35.8	40.8	69.2%	29	86.2%
			11TH	27	27	66.2	17	45.3	48.9	70.6%	16	100.9%
			12TH	20	20	69.1	3	29.7	38.3	100.0%	13	92.3%
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		129	128	65.3	61	38.0	42.9	67 . 2%	75	84.0%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	75	75	69.2	54	31.0	38.7	79.6%	63	93.7%
46			10TH	46	46	83.0	28	30.3	40.0	89.3x	43	100.0%
			11TH	58	58	76 . 5	44	33.2	40.2	79.5%	52	98.1%
			12TH	10	10	72.2	3	25.3	42.7	100.0%	10	90.0%
		TOTAL		189	189	75.0	129	31.4	39.6	82.2%	168	96.4%
	TOTAL			318	317	71.0	190	33.6	40.6	77.4%	243	92.6%

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BRONX	SAMUEL GOMPERS	HALF YEAR	9TH	30	29	78.6	19	35.7	45.1	73.7%	27	88.9%
			10TH	19	17	54 4	9	33.1	36.0	44.4%	13	92.3%
			11TH	3	2	70.0	1	36.0	44.0	100.0%	1	100. 0 %
		TOTAL		52	48	69 7	29	34.9	42.2	. 5%	41	90.2%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	3	3	74.1	3	32.7	37.3	100.0%	3	100. 0 %
			10TH	1	1	75.0	0				1	100. 0 %
		TOTAL		4	4	74.3	3	32.7	37.3	100.0%	4	100.0%
47	TOTAL			56	52	70.0	32	34.7	41.7	68.8×	45	91.1%



SUPERINTENDENC	Y SCHOOL		STATUS	GRA DE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE		POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING		% WHO IMPROVE D IN WRITING
BRONX	GRACE H.	DODGE	HALF YEAR	9TH	25	22	76.4	11	39.1	41 9	54.5%	18	83.3%
				10TH	30	30	78.7	9	22.6	27.4	55.6%	20	85.0%
				11TH	13	13	87 2	5	19.4	33.8	80 0%	9	100.0%
				12TH	10	10	62.7	1	13.0	37.0	100.0%	8	100.0%
				MISSING	1	0		0				0	
			TOTAL		79	75	77.4	26	28.6	35 .2	61.5%	55	89.1%
			FULL YEAR	9TH	45	38	75.7	34	33.3	37.3	73. 5 %	43	86.0%
4 8				10TH	8	7	89.9	0				8	100.0%
				11TH	6	6	90.7	3	20.7	26.0	66.7%	4	100.0%
				12TH	12	11	87	5	27.2	37.0	80.0%	7	100.0%
			TOTAL		71	62	80.5	42	31.6	36.5	73.8%	62	90.3%
	TOTAL				150	137	78.8	68	30.5	36.0	69.1%	117	89.7%
TOTAL					5948	5 527	75.7	2866	36.7	41.1	67.4%	4327	83.4%



SUPERINTENDENCY	STATUS	GRA DE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST Score	MEAN POST- (EST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	HALF YEAR	9TH	657	608	70.8	277	36.2	40.5	70.4%	345	79.1%
		10TH	517	472	70.0	177	40 4	:3 7	58.8%	270	86.7%
		11TH '	387	375	73 0	148	36.9	40.4	66.2%	182	94.5%
		12TH	227	218	76.0	22	27 0	37 . 2	90.9%	111	92.8%
		MISSING	17	0		9				0	
	TOTAL		1805	16 3	71.7	624	37.2	41.3	66.8%	908	86.1%
	FULL YEAR	9TH	659	600	79.5	429	35.8	39.9	66 . 2%	601	90.0x
		10TH	591	554	79.6	395	39.8	43.4	67.8%	523	88.3%
4 9		11TH	387	378	80.6	234	41 7	43 9	56.8%	300	89.0%
		12TH	158	154	87 7	12	28 2	37.1	100.0x	150	89.3%
	TOTAL		1795	1686	80.5	1070	38.5	42 0	65 1×	1574	89.2x
TOTAL			3600	3359	76.1	1694	38.0	41 8	65.8x	2482	88.1x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID PRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
BASIS	LAFAYETTE	HALF YEAR	9TH	9	9	74.0	4	31.0	36.5	100.0%	9	77.8%
			10TH	26	26	75.1	18	31.3	39.9	77.8%	16	81.3%
			11TH	22	22	62 1	8	34.9	42.1	75.0%	17	94.1%
			12TH	23	23	75.2	0				19	100.0%
		TOTAL		80	80	71.5	30	32.2	40.1	80.0%	61	90.2x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	2	2	64.2	1	33.0	41.0	100.0%	2	50.0x
4-			10TH	7	7	81.9	7	37.6	37.4	57.1%	7	100.0%
50			11TH	4	4	88.6	2	42.5	46.5	100.0%	4	100.0x
			12TH	9	8	80.3	1	32.0	37.0	100.Cx	9	100.0x
		TOTAL		22	21	80.9	11	37 . 5	39.4	72.7x	22	95.5x
	TOTAL			102	101	73.4	41	33.6	39.9	78.0x	83	91.6x

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF Students	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MLAN PRE- TEST 3CORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCURE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	ABRAHAM LINCOLN	HALF YEAR	9TH	12	12	44.8	2	37.5	36 . 5	50.0%	3	100.0%
			10TH	18	18	63.0	5	30.8	48.2	100.0%	11	72.7%
			11TH	15	15	69.6	5	32.0	34.8	60.0%	10	90.0%
			12TH	4	4	72.6	2	34.0	49.5	100.0%	3	66.7%
		TOTAL		49	49	61.4	14	32.6	41.9	78.6%	27	81.5%
		FULL YEAR	9 T H	28	25	60.2	15	30.4	39.7	86.7%	17	76.5%
			10TH	32	30	72.4	25	30.8	38.6	80.0%	30	86.7%
51			11TH	35	33	78.0	27	32.1	41.7	85.2%	34	91.2x
			12TH	4	3	75.2	1	30.0	41.0	100.0x	4	100.0%
		TOTAL		99	91	71.2	68	31.2	40.1	83.8x	85	87.1x
	TOTAL			148	140	67.7	82	31.5	40.4	82.9x	112	85.7x

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	BOYS AND GIRLS	HALF YEAR	9TH	177	168	76.3	81	35.5	41 . 4	76.5%	135	65.9%
			10TH	105	101	72.7	48	38.1	41.9	60.4%	62	91.9%
			11TH	69	68	73.3	28	34.7	39 . 6	67.9%	16	93.8%
			12TH	31	29	74.8	3	31.7	39 . 7	100.0%	2	100.0%
			MISSING	8	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		390	366	74.6	160	36.1	41 . 2	70.6%	215	75.8%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	192	170	82.6	130	34.5	39.4	68.5%	185	85.9%
5 N			10TH	113	104	79.9	76	40.5	44.6	75.0%	81	97.5%
			11TH	99	96	80.9	79	45.3	66.1	54.4%	17	82.4X
			12TH	76	76	88.8	4	30.2	58 . 0	100.0%	71	78.9x
		TOTAL		480	446	82.7	289	39.0	42.6	66.8%	354	87.0x
	TOTAL			870	812	79.0	449	37.9	42 . 1	68.2%	569	82.8%



. 102

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERLENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE TES! SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
BASIS	JOHN JAY	HALF YEAR	9TH	J2	32	63.7	10	34.9	44.5	90.0%	15	80.0%
			10TH	125	123	61.2	27	39.8	39.9	51.9%	68	86.8%
			11TH	131	131	72 9	65	37.1	40.5	12.3%	84	94.0%
			12TH	55	55	72.4	6	27.2	33.3	66.7%	33	97.0x
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		345	341	67.7	108	37.0	40.3	68.5x	200	91.0x
		FULL YEAR	91H	40	40	84.2	2 5	36 . 9	38.8	56 . 0×	37	91.9%
<u>ပ</u> ာ ယ			10TH	112	112	76.8	65	36.8	41.9	67.7%	104	91.3%
-			11TH	76	76	79.4	54	40.4	41.7	51.9x	74	86.5x
			12TH	30	30	89.4	2	18.5	24.5	100.0%	29	100.0%
		TOTAL		258	258	80.2	146	38.8	41.1	60.3%	244	91.0x
	TOTAL			603	599	73.1	254	38.0	40.7	63.8%	444	91.0%

SUPERINTENDENC	Y SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID PEADING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	EASTERN DISTRICT	HALF YEAR	9 T H	331	110	67.0	47	36.0	38 . 4	59.6%	46	91.3%
	,		10TH	92	60	74.4	19	45.4	47.5	57 . 9%	29	89.7%
			11TH	66	58	78.7	17	39.4	43.9	70.6%	16	100.0%
			12TH	43	40	78.9	6	22.8	36 .0	100.0%	16	87 . 5x
		TOTAL		333	268	72.9	89	37.8	41.2	64.0%	107	91.6%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	146	127	76.3	74	35.3	39.1	66.2%	121	81.0%
			10TH	172	159	83.0	99	39.1	43.4	69.7%	158	75.9%
5 4			11TH	153	149	82.2	61	43.6	44.7	50.8%	152	90.1%
			12TH	31	30	87.9	2	30.0	44.0	100.0%	30	96 . 7×
		TOTAL		502	465	81.2	236	3 9.0	42.4	64.0%	461	83.3%
	TOTAL			835	733	78.2	325	38.7	42.1	64.0%	568	84.9%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MF 1N PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPRCVED IN Writing
BASIS	FORT HAMILTON	HALF YEAR	9TH	40	40	72 9	23	36 . 8	39.7	56 . 5%	26	80.6%
		•	10TH	10	10	84 6	4	51.2	45.2	0.0	9	100.02
			11TH	8	8	89 :	1	19.0	19.0	0.0	8	100.0%
			12TH	18	18	84.4	1	27.0	41.0	100.0%	17	82.4x
		TOTAL		76	76	78.9	29	37.9	39.8	48.3%	60	86.7x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	3	3	86.9	2	26 . 5	37.0	100.0%	3	100.02
			10TH	3	3	91.3	2	32.5	36 . 5	50.0%	3	100.02
<u> </u>			11TH	2	2	96.9	2	25.0	47.0	100.0%	2	100.0x
			12TH	5	5	85.0	1	26.0	44.0	100.0%	5	100.0x
		TOTAL		13	13	88.7	7	27.7	40.7	85.7x	13	100.0x
	TOTAL			87	89	80.3	36	35.9	39.9	55.Ex	73	89.0x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	GEORGE WESTINGHOUSE	HALF YEAR	9TH	23	20	75.8	18	38.2	41.4	66.7%	14	78.6x
			101H	11	10	80.4	7	39.4	42.7	57.1%	7	71.4x
			11TH	1	1	31.8	0				0	
			121H	1	1	68.2	1	23.0	36.0	100.0%	0	
		TUTAL		36	32	75.7	?6	38.0	41.5	65.4%	21	76.2x
		FULL YEAR	91H	48	46	83.0	38	41.9	42.7	55.3x	46	97.8x
			101H	12	10	64.6	6	40.8	40.8	66.7%	9,	77.8x
5 6			11TH	4	4	49.3	1	15.0	22.0	100.0x	3	66.7×
			121H	1	1	75.6	0				1	100.0x
		TOTAL		65	61	77.7	45	41.2	42.0	57.8%	59	93.2%
	TOTAL			101	93	77.0	71	40.0	41.8	60.6%	80	88.8x



110

SUPERINTENDENC	Y SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	AUTOMOTIVE TRADES	HALF YEAR	9TH	75	71	71.8	46	42.0	45.4	65.2%	56	96 . 4%
			10TH	61	56	78.4	39	46 . 8	49.4	59.0%	54	87.0%
			11TH	38	37	58.8	23	39.6	39.7	43.5%	29	93.1%
			12TH	20	19	78.2	3	27.0	36.0	100.0%	20	100.0%
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		195	183	71.9	111	42.8	45.4	59 . 5%	159	93.1%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	125	118	82.6	98	38.4	41.9	61.2%	125	100.0x
57			10TH	91	83	80.3	78	42.8	43.8	57 . 7x	91	98.9%
			12TH	1	1	77.8	1	32.0	34.0	100.0%	1	100.0%
		TOTAL		217	202	81.6	177	40.3	42.7	59.9%	217	99.5%
	TOTAL			412	385	77.0	288	41.2	43.7	59.7%	376	96.8%

SUPERINTENDENCY	r school	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	HARRY VAN ARSDALE	HALF YEAR	9TH	30	. 28	73.9	24	36 . 6	40.9	75.0%	22	72.7%
			10TH	7	7	68.8	3	44.3	37.3	0.0	4	25.0x
		TOTAL		37	35	72.4	27	37 . 4	40.5	66.7%	26	65.4%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	1	1	87.2	0				1	100.0x
			10TH	34	34	21 .9	29	42.8	47.8	65.5%	27	85.2x
		TOTAL		35	35	82.1	29	42.8	47.8	65.5%	28	85.7x
<u></u> ა	TOTAL			72	70	77.2	56	40.2	44.3	66.1%	54	75. 9 %



SUPERINTENDENCY	r SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	SARAH J. HALE	HALF YEAR	9TH	128	118	68.2	22	26.2	31.3	81.8%	19	94.7%
			10TH	60	60	67.0	7	32.7	38.6	57 . 1×	9	88.9%
			11TH	33	33	85.3	0				1	100.0%
			12TH	29	28	74. 7	0				0	
			MISSING	6	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		256	239	71.0	29	27.8	33.0	75.9%	29	93.1%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	73	68	74.2	46	31.7	36.9	76.1%	63	96.8x
59			10TH	12	9	77.2	8	42.5	47.6	62.5x	10	100.0%
			12TH	1	0		0				0	:
		TOTAL		86	7 7	74.6	54	33.3	38.5	74.1x	73	97 . 3x
	TOTAL			342	316	71.9	83	31.4	36.6	74.7%	102	96.1%



115

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BASIS	PORT RICHMOND	HALF YEAR	10TH	1	1	78.8	0				1	100.0%
	•		11TH	4	2	60.0	1	34 0	42.0	190.0%	1	100.0%
			12TH	3	1	64 7	0				1	0.0
		TOTAL		8	4	65.9	1	34.0	42.0	100.0%	3	66.7%
		FULL YEAR	91H	1	0		0				1	100.0%
			10TH	3	3	66.9	0				3	66.7%
			11TH	14	14	77.5	8	40.0	40.1	37 . 5x	14	92.9%
60		TOTAL		18	17	75.6	8	40.0	40.1	37 . 5x	18	88.9%
	TOTAL			26	21	73.8	9	39.3	40.3	44.4%	21	85.7x
TOTAL				3600	3359	76.1	1694	38.0	41.8	65.8x	2482	88.1x

SUPERINTENDENCY	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF Students	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE .	MEAN PRE- TEST Score	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
BROOKLYN	HALF YEAR	9TH	739	7 06	65.2	277	34.2	37.4	66.1%	436	71.6%
		10TH	647	624	74.2	285	37 . 5	43 5	75.8x	463	81.9%
		11TH .	482	465	74.8	229	39.1	44.3	69.9%	329	91.2%
		12TH	279	273	76.2	48	24.7	35.4	91.7%	183	91.3%
		MISSING	35	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		2182	2068	71.5	839	36.1	41.2	71.9%	1411	82.1x
	FULL YEAR	9TH	831	779	78.4	463	33.6	38.3	71.3%	743	87.2%
•		10TH	721	690	81.5	476	34.0	40.3	76.3%	670 '	85.7%
61		11TH	407	397	80.8	265	38.6	41.9	64.5%	360	89.7x
		12TH	188	182	84.0	36	24.5	32.8	72.2x	175	76.6%
		MISSING	1	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		2148	2048	80.4	1240	34.6	39.7	71.8x	1948	86 . 2x
TOTAL			4330	4116	75.9	2079	35.2	40.3	71.8%	3359	84.5%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN . PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID READING	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	* WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED I'N WRITING
BROOKLYN	MI DHOOD	FULL YEAR	10TH	1	1	90.0	0				1	100.0%
			11TH	1	1	92.8	1	27.0	17.0	0.0	1	100.0%
		TOTAL		2	2	91.4	1	27.0	17.0	0.0	2	100.0%
	TOTAL			2	2	91.4	1	27.0	17.0	0.0	2	100.0%





SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRA DE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST Score	X WHO IMPROVED IN READING	* WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
BROOKLYN	SAMUEL J. TILDEN	HALF YEAR	9TH	62	58	82.6	10	27 . 3	37 . 5	90.0x	39	79. 5 %
			10TH	101	95	78.2	55	35.1	42.9	80.0%	66	77.3%
			11TH	57	55	81.0	25	39.2	44.7	84.0%	45	95.3%
			12TH	¥ U	18	90.9	5	23.4	37.2	100.0%	18	100.0%
			MISSING	6	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		244	226	81.0	65	34.6	42.3	84.6%	166	84.9%
		FULL YFAR	9TH	72	70	91.3	29	28.8	35.4	79.3x	72	91.7%
63			10TH	109	109	85.3	68	29.6	37.0	85.3%	103	96 . 1×
			11TH	19	19	79.2	12	28.6	37 . 1	100.0%	17	100.0%
			12TH	4	3	82.2	0				4	75.0x
		TOTAL		204	201	86.8	109	29.3	36.6	85.3%	196	94.4x
	TOTAL			448	427	83.7	174	31.3	38.7	85.1x	362	90.1%

SUPER INTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	JAMES MADISON	HALF YEAR	9TH	10	9	67.3	5	35.0	30.6	60.0%	7	71.4%
			10TH	7	7	52.9	1	43.0	50.0	100.0%	4	75.0%
			11TH	10	10	85.0	9	32.8	43.8	88.9%	10	90.0%
			12TH	1	1	82.4	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		28	27	70.7	15	34.2	39 . 8	80.0%	22	81.8%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	29	29	78.3	22	31.1	41.4	95. 5 %	27	92.6x
			10TH	17	16	84.7	12	32.8	40.3	83.3%	16	87.5%
64			11TH	10	10	80.7	10	36.2	40.9	70.0%	10	90.0%
		TOTAL		56	55	80.6	44	32.7	41.0	86.4%	53	90.6×
	TOTAL			84	82	77.3	59	33.1	40.7	84.7%	75	88.0%



126

SUPERINTENDENCY	' SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	THOMAS JEFFERSON	HALF YEAR	9 TH	140	131	61.3	67	38.1	37.6	53.7%	69	72.5x
			10TH	31	30	68.5	19	34.5	38.5	73.7%	15	86.7%
			11TH	54	51	68.3	32	38.7	43.9	65.6%	28	85.7x
			12TH	34	33	81.6	7	24.6	33.1	100.0%	28	96 . 4x
			MISSING	11	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		270	245	66.4	125	36.9	39.1	62.4x	140	81.4x
_		FULL YEAR	9TH	121	103	70.2	75	33.4	36.3	66.7×	96	77 . 1 x
65			10TH	21	20	65.6	9	32.4	31.3	44.4x	16	62.5x
			11TH	20	20	70.8	16	34.9	39.3	68.8x	19	89.5x
			12TH	20	20	71.6	5	28.6	29.0	60.0%	17	100.0%
		TOTAL		182	163	69.9	105	33.3	36.0	64.8%	148	79.7%
	TOTAL			452	408	67.8	230	35.3	37.7	63.5%	288	80.6x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	PROSPECT HEIGHTS	HALF YEAR	9 TH	61	57	59.8	29	27.9	30.5	55.2%	34	97.1%
	•		1 OTH	39	39	74.4	17	41.5	46 . 8	88.2%	30	83.3%
			11TH	24	24	78 8	9	44.8	43.6	55 6×	7	85.7×
			127N	29	29	80.4	0				3	100.0%
		TOTAL		153	149	70 7	55	34.9	37 . 7	65.5x	74	90.5x
		FULL YEAR	9 TH	50	47	82.9	39	35.9	41.5	76.9x	46	82.6x
_			10TH	82	81	85.6	59	41.8	48.1	84.7×	67	71.6%
6			11TH	66	66	91.2	48	47.3	51.1	72.9%	63	73.0x
	•		12TH	34	34	89.6	0				33	84.8%
		101,1		232	228	87.2	146	42.0	47.3	78.8%	209	76.6x
	TOTAL			385	577	80.7	201	40 . 1	44.7	75.1×	283	80.2x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID HRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN Writing
BROOKLYN	NEW UTRECHT	HALF YEAR	9TH	44	42	73.5	14	38.1	44.4	71.4%	30	96.7×
	•		10TH	77	74	64.1	16	37.2	45.1	75.0%	56	94.6%
			11TH	75	71	65.4	15	34.5	41.4	80.0%	48	100.0%
			12TH	43	42	71.8	9	23.3	32.8	88.9%	34	100.0%
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		241	229	67.6	54	34.4	41.8	77.8%	168	97.6%
-		FULL YEAR	9TH	17	16	72.8	8	35.6	39.1	75.0x	16 ,	100.0%
67			10TH	29	28	74.8	18	32.4	39.9	72.2x	28	100.0%
			11TH	47	45	71.3	24	40.3	71.1	50. 0 ×	41	100.0%
			12TH	8	7	85.4	1	34.0	40.0	100.0%	8	100.02
		TOTAL		101	96	73.6	51	36.6	40.4	62.7x	93	100.0%
	TOTAL			342	325	69.4	105	35.5	41.1	70.5x	261	98.5x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT E ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- S TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WRIT1NG	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	ERASMUS HALL	MALF YEAR	9TH	79	79	57.8	20	30.3	34.6	65.0x	40	72.5x
			10TH	32	30	67.3	10	29.8	35.1	80.0%	19	84.2%
			11TH	17	17	81.1	8	25.6	33.6	87.5%	15	100.0x
			12TH	12	11	86.7	1	27.0	33.0	100.0%	12	91.7x
			MISSING	3	0		0				0	!
		TOTAL		143	1 37	65.1	39	29.1	34.5	74.4%	86	82.6x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	146	142	74.0	60	25.2	31.9	80.0%	129	86.8x
68			10TH	77	75	80.1	30	24.0	32.1	80.0x	73	93.2%
			11TH	30	35	79.8	20	22.2	30.0	85.0x	35	97.1%
			12TH	11	9	86.8	8	18.2	24.4	62.5x	11	100.0%
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		273	261	77.0	118	23 9	31.1	79.7x	248	90.7x
	TOTAL			416	398	72.9	157	25.2	32.0	78.3%	334	88.6x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALIO ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	GEORGE W. WINGATE	HALF YEAR	9TH	85	79	63.7	21	29.6	30.6	52.4%	58	43.1%
			10TH	88	84	80.2	45	48.2	52.0	73.3%	68	73.5%
			11TH	46	40	79.5	16	32.0	40.5	87.5%	27	74.1x
			12TH	29	26	68.1	1	13.0	19.0	100.0%	5	40.0x
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		250	229	73.0	83	40.0	44.0	71.1%	158	61.4x
•		FULL YEAR	9TH	169	153	79.6	94	34.0	36.7	6 6 . 0%	162	79.6x
69			10TH	1 37	125	85.8	102	33. u	39.4	72.5%	134	88.8x
			11TH	97	95	83.3	71	40.3	42.9	60.6%	80	86.3x
			12TH	46	46	85.6	5	30.6	37.8	80.0%	40	62.5x
		TOTAL		449	419	83.0	272	35.2	39.3	67.3x	416	82.2x
	TOTAL			699	648	79.4	355	36.3	40.4	68.2x	574	76.5x



. 135

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST Score	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	BUSHWICK	HALF YEAR	9TH	48	47	44.9	5	38.6	36.6	40.0%	36	16.7%
			10TH	19	18	57.7	7	40.0	42.6	57.1%	12	41.7%
			11TH	17	17	51.4	4	42.8	54.7	100.0%	4	75.0x
			12TH	10	10	59.4	0				3	66.7%
			HISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		95	92	50.2	16	40.2	43.7	62.5x	55	29.1%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	67	67	85.4	43	45.2	46.6	48.8%	53	100.0x
70			10TH	72	72	74.6	54	42.4	47.2	66.7%	66	48.5x
•			11TH	48	5	73.9	21	49.5	48.9	38.1%	34	97.1x
			12TH	35	35	86.0	2	33.0	31.5	50.0x	35	48.6×
		TUTAL		222	222	79.5	120	44.5	47 . 0	55.0x	188	71.8×
	TOTAL			317	314	70.9	136	44.0	46.6	55.9%	243	62.1x

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	SHEEPSHEAD BAY	HALF YEAR	9TH	13	13	67.8	6	38.5	43.0	66.7%	8	75.0x
			10TH	16	16	81.0	12	37.3	51.4	100.0%	14	85.7x
			11TH	13	13	71 8	5	27.4	36.6	100.0%	7	85.7x
			12TH	17	17	75.0	3	27.3	37.7	100.0%	13	92.3x
		TOTAL		59	59	74.3	26	34.5	4°.0	92.3%	42	85.7x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	7	6	73 6	3	34.7	39.7	100.0%	6	83.3×
			10TH	6	6	87.0	4	32.0	42.7	100.0%	6	100. 0 %
71			11TH	7	7	87.4	5	38.2	40.6	80.0%	7	100.0%
			12TH	2	2	67.5	2	25.5	36 . 5	100.0%	2	50. 0 %
		TOTAL		22	21	81.5	14	33.9	40.4	92.9x	21	90.5x
	TOTAL			81	80	76 . 2	40	34.3	43.4	92.5x	63	87.3×





SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALIO ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	CANARSIE	HALF YEAR	R 9TH	10	9	65.8	4	38.0	42.7	100.0%	5	80.0x
	•		1014	16	16	70.1	7	33.1	38.5	71.4%	13	76.9%
			11 TH	8	8	71 6	6	34.0	37.7	83.3%	6	83.3x
			12TH	6	6	74.6	3	20.0	38.3	100.0%	6	66.7x
		TOTAL		40	39	70.1	20	32.4	39.0	85.0%	30	76.7 x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	17	16	78.1	7	37.3	43.1	85.7%	15	80. 0 %
			10TH	21	19	77.3	16	31.5	39.6	93.8%	19	94.7X
72			11711	10	10	77.3	9	32.0	32.4	55.6x	10	80.0x
		TOTAL		48	45	77.6	32	32.9	38.3	81.3%	44	86.4X
	TOTAL			88	84	74.1	52	32.7	38.6	82.7X	74	82.4X



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	F.D. ROOSEVELT	HALF YEAR	9TH	61	61	71.2	29	32.9	36.9	79.3%	37	81.1%
	•		10TK	30	29	61.3	9	34.7	39.6	66.7%	12	91.7%
			11TH	13	13	78.7	8	39.0	47.5	75.0%	11	90.9x
			12TH	12	12	88.0	1	10.0	24.0	100.0%	11	100.0%
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		117	115	71.3	47	33.8	38.9	76.6%	71	87.3x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	24	23	77.6	15	34.2	38.4	53.3x	23	100.0%
73			10TH	20	20	73.6	9	30.2	40.6	88.9%	18	94.4%
			11TH	6	6	85.3	5	37.2	36.8	40.0%	6	100.0%
		TOTAL		50	49	76.9	29	33.5	38.8	62.1%	47	97 . 9x
	TOTAL			167	164	73.0	76	33.7	38.9	71.1%	118	91.5x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	SOUTH SHORE	HALF YEAR	9TH	15	14	58.7	8	37.4	43.0	87.5%	9	66.7%
			10TH	25	22	72.2	8	41.6	48.5	62.5%	19	78.9%
			11TH	47	45	8 5.0	32	45.5	47 . 1	46.9%	44	97.7%
			12TH	12	12	70.3	1	36.0	49.0	100.0%	7	100.0%
			MISSING	9	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		1 08	93	76.1	49	43.3	46 . 7	57.1%	79	89.9%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	6	5	79.8	3	22.3	29.0	100.0%	6	100.0%
74			10TH	5	4	82.1	3	39.0	42.3	66.7×	5	100.0%
			11TH	6	4	89.9	4	30.2	35.2	75. 0 %	6	83.3%
			12TH	3	2	97.2	3	21.0	29.0	66.7%	2	100.0%
		TOTAL		20	15	85.4	13	28.3	34.0	76.9×	19	94.7%
	TOTAL			1 28	108	77.4	62	40.2	44.0	61.3%	98	90.8%



. 145

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	X WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	EDWARD R. MURROW	HALF YEAR	9TH	7	4	85.8	3	30.3	37 . 3	66.7%	4	75.0x
		TOTAL		7	4	85.8	3	30.3	37 . 3	66.7%	4	75.0x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	10	9	87.0	7	29.1	39.4	71.4%	10	100.0x
			10TH	2	1	100.0	0				2	100.0x
		TOTAL		12	10	88.3	7	29.1	39.4	71.4%	12	100.0x
	TOTAL			19	14	87.6	10	29.5	38.8	70.0%	16	93.8x

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	× WHO- IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	JOHN DEWEY	HALF YEAR	9TH	51	50	70.9	25	37.6	40.1	64.0%	22	90.9%
			10TH	49	48	79.7	37	35.9	41 1	73.0%	32	93.8%
		TOTAL		100	98	75 2	62	36.5	40.7	69.4%	54	92.6%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	44	44	72.5	25	31.6	40.4	80.0%	35	91.4%
			10TH	38	37	81.4	31	33.3	40.3	71.0%	34	97.1%
		TOTAL		82	81	76.5	56	32.6	40.3	75.0%	69	94.2%
7	TOTAL			182	179	75.8	118	34.7	40.5	72.0%	123	93.5x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	.TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED In Writing
BRDOKLYN	CLARA BARTON	HALF YEAR	9TH	32	32	62.8	16	37.7	44.7	81.3%	19	89.5x
			10TH	31	31	77.7	19	37.3	44.2	68.4%	28	89.3%
			11TH	23	23	55.8	10	36.2	44.2	70.0%	12	91.7%
			12TH	44	44	68.7	12	28.7	36.5	75.0%	31	83.9x
		TOTAL		1 30	130	67.1	57	35.4	42.7	73.7%	90	87.8%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	42	40	78.7	28	40.1	44.1	75.0%	38	100.0%
			10TH	37	34	79.6	33	32.2	36.0	63.6%	36	91.7%
77			11TH	8	8	72.8	5	30.4	32.0	40.0x	7	85.7%
			12TH	19	19	75. 5	6	20.8	37.0	66.7%	17	94.1%
		TOTAL		106	101	77. 9	72	34.2	39 O	66.7x	98	94.9%
	TOTAL			236	231	71.8	129	34.8	40.6	69.8x	188	91.5%



SUPERINTENDENC	Y SCH 00 L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	EAST NEW YORK	HALF YEAR	9TH	1	1	43.2	0				1.	0.0
			10TH	40	40	80.7	19	31.3	36 . 5	73.7%	36	69.4%
			11TH	39	39	85.1	20	34.3	39.8	70.0%	35	82.9%
			12TH	4	4	90.0	0				4	50.0×
		TOTAL		84	84	82.7	39	32.8	38 . 2	71.8%	76	73.7%
		FULL YEAR	10TH	25	22	77.5	12	32.3	38.0	83.3%	25	84.0x
			117H	15	14	86.5	10	30.6	38.9	70.0×	15	100.0%
78			12TH	3	2	98.6	1	24.0	45.0	100.0%	3	100.0%
~		TOTAL		43	38	81.9	23	31.2	38.7	78.3%	43	90.7%
	TOTAL			127	122	82.5	62	32.2	38 . 4	74.2%	119	79.8%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCÉ	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		POST-	% %HO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	PAUL ROBESON	HALF YEAR	10TH	25	24	86.8	23	32.7	40.4	78.3%	21	81.0%
		•	111H	27	27	78.1	25	5 2.7	53.1	44.0%	23	100.0%
		TOTAL		52	51	82.2	48	43.1	47.0	60.4%	44	90.9%
	TOTAL			52	51	82. 2	48	43.1	47.0	60.4%	44	90.9%



SU PE RINTEN D ENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WRITING	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
BROOKLYN	WILLIAM H. MAXWELL	HALF YEAR	9 T H	20	20	90.0	15	29.8	40.6	93.3%	18	100.0%
			10TH	21	21	80.7	11	31.5	38.2	81.8%	18	100.0%
			11TH	12	12	80.5	5	30.2	43.4	100.0%	9	77.8%
			12TH	8	8	91.3	5	22.6	38.6	100.0%	7	100.0%
		TOTAL		61	61	85.1	36	29.4	40.0	91.7%	52	96.2%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	10	9	78.0	5	27.0	29.6	60.0%	9	10 0 .0x
			10TH	22	20	85.5	16	36.8	40.4	75.0%	21	95.2 x
8 0			11TH	9	9	79.4	4	29.3	31.8	75. 0 %	9	100.0x
			12TH	3	3	93.1	3	25.7	41.0	100.0%	3	100.0%
		TOTAL		44	41	83.1	28	31.6	37.3	75.0×	42	97.6 %
	TOTAL			105	102	84.3	64	30.4	38.8	84.4%	94	96.8%
TOTAL				4330	41 16	75.9	2079	35.2	40.3	71.8%	3359	84.5%

SUPERINTENDENCY	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH Valid Attendance	ITAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	HALF YEAR	9TH	256	241	57 . 5	71	36 . 1	39.3	60.6%	106	76.4%
		10TH	318	297	68.4	131	38.6	43.5	66.4%	162	80.9%
		11TH	263	258	71.*	131	41.6	44.4	61.8%	171	84.8%
		12TH	198	19∪	74.7	33	27.8	36.6	90.9%	136	80.9x
		MISSING	45	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		1080	992	67.9	366	38.2	42.4	65.8%	575	81.2x
	FULL YEAR	9 T H	491	464	76.2	284	33.3	37.8	67.6%	419	89.5%
8		10TH	502	486	77.3	318	36.9	42.6	73.3%	426	92.0%
μ		11TH	235	230	78.8	137	38.0	42.2	65.7%	207	90.3x
		12TH	142	133	81.8	25	25.6	36.2	88.0%	128	93.8%
	TOTAL		1370	1313	77.6	764	35.4	40.6	70.3%	1180	91.0x
TOTAL			2450	2305	73.4	1130	36.3	41.2	68.8%	1755	87.8x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH0 0 L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	FRANKLIN K. LANE	HALF YEAR	9TH	155	147	52.6	36	38.0	40.0	55.6%	60	78.3x
			10TH	118	111	66.3	32	39.6	44.9	78.1%	44	77 . 3 %
			11TH	80	79	68 1	21	37 . 2	37.8	57.1%	42	90.5x
			12TH	72	72	76.5	19	28.9	38.1	94.7%	30	79.5x
			MISSING	25	0		0				0	Ì
		TOTAL		450	409	63.5	108	36 . 7	40.7	69.4%	185	81.1%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	242	228	73.7	140	35.0	36.6	55.0x	191	83.2x
8 2			10TH	172	163	75.0	81	36 . 7	42.1	69.1%	125	88.8x
			11TH	97	96	78.9	55	39.3	43.0	63.6%	81	90.1x
			12TH	40	37	82.8	14	23.5	32.9	78.6x	34	97.1%
		TOTAL		551	524	75.7	290	35.7	39.2	61 7%	431	87 . 2x
	TOTAL			1001	933	70.3	398	36 . 0	39.6	63.8%	616	85.4x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	AUGUST MARTIN	HALF YEAR	9TH	13	11	61.8	6	27 . 2	38.8	100.0%	5	100.0%
			10TH	9	9	70.8	6	39.7	42.7	66 . 7%	7	100.0%
			11TH	2	2	44.1	1	2 2.0	36 . 0	100.0%	1	100.0%
		TOTAL		24	22	63.9	13	32.5	40.4	84.6%	13	100. 0 %
		FULL YEAR	9 T H	52	46	83 1	39	33.2	37.9	71.8%	51	100.0%
			10TH	3	3	75.0	3	30 .3	35.7	100.0%	3	100. 0 %
			11TH	4	4	82.2	4	36.5	38.2	25.0%	4 ,	75.0x
8 သ		TOTAL		59	53	82.5	46	33.3	37 . 8	69.6x	58	98.3x
	TOTAL			83	75	77.1	59	33.2	38.3	72.9%	71	98.6x

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE		POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	BENJAMIN CARDOZO	HALF YEAR	10TH	6	6	68.4	4	30.2	41.5	100.0%	4	75.0%
			11TH	15	15	73.3	7	40.4	45.9	85.7%	8	87.5%
			12TH	5	5	79.8	0				4	100.0%
		TOTAL		26	26	73.4	11	36.7	44.3	70.9%	16	87.5%
	TOTAL			26	26	73.4	11	36.7	44.3	99. 9 %	16	87.5%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TG(AL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE		TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WRITING	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	SPRINGFIELD GARDENS	FULL YEAR	10TH	1	1	75.0	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		1	1	7 5. 0	0				1	100.0%
	TOTAL			1	1	75. 0	0				1	100.0%

α



SUPERINTENDENCY	f School	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING		% WHO IMPROVED In Writing
QUEENS	JOHN BOWNE	HALF YEA	R 9TH	1	1	65.9	0			1	0.0
		TOTAL		1	1	65.9	0			1	0.0
	TOTAL			1	1	65.9	0			1	0.0



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE		POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	FOREST HILLS	HALF YEAR	9 T H	4	3	93.3	2	23.5	36 . 0	100.0%	4	75.0x
			10TH	25	24	84.4	10	42.4	43.0	50.0%	18	94.4%
			11TH	18	18	86 1	9	53.2	55.2	33.3%	14	100.0%
			12TH	12	12	86.8	4	25.0	36.0	100.0%	10	100.0%
			MISSING	4	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		6 3	57	85.9	25	42.0	45.7	56 . Ox	46	95.7x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	2	2	45.0	0				1	100.0%
87			10TH	30	28	84.4	21	32.3	42.3	85.7x	26	96.2%
			11TH	14	14	80 8	11	33.5	41.1	90.9%	12	91.7%
			12TH	2	2	91.9	?	19 5	40.5	100 0%	2	100.0%
		TOTAL		48	46	81.9	34	32.0	41 8	88 2x	41	95.1x
	TOTAL			111	103	84.1	59	36.2	43 5	74 6x	87	95.4%



SUPERINTENDENCY QUEENS		STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID READING	PRE- TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	VALID WRITING	% WHO IMPROVEI IN WRITING
40CEN3	WILLIAM C. BRYANT	HALF YEAR TOTAL	11TH	1	1	81.1	0				1	100.0x
		TUTAL		1	1	81.1	0				1	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	11TH	1	1	81.1	0				1	100. 0 %
Ŧ	TOTAL	TOTAL		1	1	81.1	0				1	100.0%
	TOTAL			2	2	81.1	0				2	100.0%



SUPERINTENDENCY	Y SCHCOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% NHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	NEWTOWN	HALF YEAR	9TH	1	1	45.9	0				0	
		TOTAL		1	1	45.9	0				0	
		FULL YEAR	9TH	2	2	87.5	0				2	50 . 0 %
			10TH	1	1	74.4	9				1	100.0%
			11TH	3	3	65.9	1	17.0	27.0	100.0%	3	100.0%
			12TH	1	1	85.0	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		7	7	76.0	1	17.0	27.0	100.0%	7	85.7%
æ	TOTAL			8	8	72.3	1	17.0	27.0	100.0%	7	85.7%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	VALID	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	FLUSHING	HALF YEAR	10TH	1	1	94.1	0			1	100.0%
	•	TOTAL		1	1	94.1	0			1	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	101H	1	1	88.3	0			1	100.0%
		TOTAL		1	1	88.3	0			1	100.0%
	TOTAL			2	2	91.2	0			2	100.0%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QL' ZENS	JAMAICA	HALF YEAR	9TH	6	6	39.6	2	25.0	20.5	50.0%	1	100.0%
			10TH	24	24	78.3	13	29.3	40.)	84.6%	20	95.0%
			11TH	54	52	79.0	41	44.2	45.7	51.2%	43	100.0%
			12TH	23	23	74.7	6	26.5	33.7	83.3%	18	100.0%
			MISSING	1 I	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		118	105	75.6	62	38.7	42.5	61.3%	82	98.8%
		FULL YEAR	9™H	18	17	62.5	6	29.2	36.2	83 Kx	14	85.7x
9]			107H	51	50	76.7	41	34.1	40.9	78.0%	44	100.0%
			11TH	13	12	77.0	11	28.2	33.8	63.6%	13	100.0%
			12TH	5	3	65.0	I	25.0	41.0	100.0%	5	100.0%
		TOTAL		87	82	73.4	59	32.4	39.1	76 . 3x	76	97.4x
	TOTAL			205	187	74.6	121	31.6	40.9	68.6%	158	98.1%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID READING	TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING		% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	JOHN ADAMS	HALF YEAR	1 OTH	1	1	88.2	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		1	1	88 2	0				1	100.0%
	TOTAL			1	1	88 2	0				1	100.0%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	* WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	GROVER CLEVELAND	HALF YEAR	9TH	48	44	63.9	12	36 . 3	38.7	58.3%	12	100.0%
			10TH	22	21	66.6	7	35.4	40.6	57.1%	5	100.0%
			11TH	1	1	75 8	0				1	100.0%
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		72	66	65.0	19	36.0	39.4	57 . 9%	18	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	80	78	74.6	46	29.4	34.5	73.9%	66	97.0%
			10TH	33	32	76.8	27	30.6	36.6	85.2%	28	100.0x
93			11TH	2	1	62.8	2	23.5	34.0	50.0x	2	100. 0 %
_		TOTAL		115	111	75.2	75	29.7	35.2	77.3x	96	97. 9 %
	TOTAL			187	177	71.4	94	31.0	36.1	73.4x	114	98.2x

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	ANDREW JACKSON	HALF YEAR	10TH	22	22	87.5	16	46.4	50.2	62.5%	15	100.0%
			11TH	19	19	79.5	5	48.8	48.6	20.0%	9	100.0%
			12TH	10	10	ύ4.6	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		51	51	80.1	21	47.0	49.8	52.4%	25	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	10TH	49	49	88.8	44	47.1	49.2	56.8%	44	100.0%
			11TH	58	58	83.6	29	46 . 5	47.8	58.6%	52	100.0%
			12TH	59	57	78.6	4	31.5	42.3	100.0%	52	86 . 5x
94		TOTAL		166	164	83.4	77	46 . 1	48.3	59.7%	148	95 3%
	TOTAL			217	215	82.6	98	46.3	48.6	58.2%	173	96.0%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID READING	PRE- TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVEI IN WRITING
QUEENS	BAYSIDE	HALF YEAR	9TH	2	2	86 8	1	25.0	38.0	100.0%	2	Ι 00 . 0 χ
			10TH	13	13	63.3	3	35.7	41.7	66.7%	5	100.0%
			11TH	12	12	75.1	11	38.0	45.1	90.9%	8	87.5%
			12TH	15	14	71.9	2	2 2	36.5	100.0%	12	91.7%
		TOTAL		42	41	70 8	17	35.0	43.I	88.2%	27	92.6%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	6	5	97.2	4	29.7	39.0	100.0%	5	130. 0 %
			10TH	37	37	69.2	7	38.1	42.7	85.7%	31	96.8%
9 5			11TH	9	9	78.3	5	41.0	49.0	100.0%	7	100.0%
			12TH	22	20	86.6	4	30.0	38.7	100.0%	21	100.0%
		TOTAL		74	71	77.2	20	35.5	42.7	95.0x	64	98.4%
	TOTAL			116	112	74.9	37	35.3	42.9	91.9%	91	96.7%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID	TEST	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	VALID WRITING	% WHO IMPROVEĎ IN Writing
QUEENS	HILLCREST	HALF YEAR	10TH	1	1	88.2	0				1	100.0%
	٠	TOTAL		1	1	88.2	0				1	100.0%
	TOTAL			1	1	88.2	0				1	100.0%

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	QUEENS	HALF YEAR	9TH	19	19	76.0	10	39.0	42.1	60.0%	17	41.2%
			10TH	32	32	51 7	18	35.7	39.8	55.6%	23	26.1%
			11TH	58	57	63.0	35	38.7	43.2	77.1%	43	53.5x
			12TH	17	17	50.3	2	32.0	33.5	50.0%	14	28.6%
			MISSING	4	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		130	125	60.4	65	37.7	41.8	67.7%	97	41 . 2x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	32	30	77.8	12	35.7	39.2	66.7%	32	78.1x
97			10TH	47	45	68.1	30	34.9	39 0	63.3%	47	63.8%
			11TH	24	22	65.3	15	29.8	34 7	£6 7%	22	54 . 5%
		TOTAL		103	97	70.5	57	33.7	37 9	64 9%	101	66.3%
	TOTAL			233	222	€4 8	122	35.8	40.0	66 4%	198	54.0%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH OO l	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	AVIATION	HALF YEAR	10TH	11	11	61.4	6	48.0	53.7	66.7%	7	100.0%
			11TH	1	1	85 9	0				1	100.0%
			12TH	44	43	80 7	0				38	81.6x
		TOTAL		56	55	76.9	6	48.0	53.7	66.7%	46	84.8%
		FULL YEAR	10TH	22	21	80.1	18	41.3	47.6	61.I%	20	95.0%
			13 TH	3	3	91.5	1	41.0	42.0	100.0%	3	100.0%
			12TH	13	13	87.4	0				13	100.0%
9 8		TOTAL		38	37	83.6	19	41.3	47.3	63.2%	36	97 . 2x
	TOTAL			94	92	79.6	25	42.9	48.8	64.0%	82	90.2%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE		VALID READING	PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
QUEENS	THOMAS A. EDISON	HALF YEAR	9TH	7	7	57 . 2	2	41.5	39.0	0.0	4	100.0%
			10TH	33	21	59.7	16	37.3	39.4	50.0%	11	90.9%
			11TH	2	1	58.9	1	58.0	45.0	0.0	0	
		TOTAL		42	29	59.0	19	38.8	39.7	42.1%	15	93.3%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	57	56	85.0	37	31.9	46.3	97 . 3x	57	100.0%
			10TH	55	55	83.6	46	35.2	43.5	87.0%	55	100.0x
			11TH	7	7	79.9	3	38.3	50.7	66 . 7%	7	100.0x
99		TOTAL		119	118	84.0	86	33.9	44.9	90.7x	119	100.0%
	TOTAL			161	147	79.1	105	34.8	44.0	81.9%	134	99.3x
TOTAL				2450	2305	73.4	1130	36.3	41.2	68.8%	1755	87.8%



SUPERINT ENDENCY	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH Valid Attendance	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE · TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVEI IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	HALF YEAR	9Tł.	309	309	71.3	19	36.1	33.2	36.8%	209	80.9%
		10TH	797	790	73.4	25	38.1	37.2	40.0%	705	80.6%
		11TH	1105	1067	71.2	63	34.5	40.2	65.1%	858	78.7%
		12TH	95	94	76.6	1	23.0	24.0	100.0%	77	68.8%
		MISSING	60	0		0				0	
	TOTAL		2 366	2260	72.2	108	35.5	38.1	54.6%	1849	79.2X
	FULL YEAR	9TH	58	54	65.5	11	33.0	39.5	90.9%	55	80.0%
ы		10TH	148	141	73.2	15	34.7	38.3	53.3%	145	91.7%
100		11TH	208	192	70.7	24	29.3	37.4	83.3%	160	84.4%
		12TH	36	29	62.6	1	19.0	45.0	100.0%	36	80.6×
	TOTAL		450	416	70.3	51	31.5	38.3	76 . 5 %	396	86.1%
TOTAL			2816	2676	71.9	159	34.2	38 2	61.6%	2245	80.4x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	PARK EAST H.S.	HALF YEAR	9TH	22	2 2	43.9	5	38.2	37.6	20.0%	7	71.4%
			10TH	39	39	59.1	16	34.5	35.8	43.8%	21	90.5%
			11TH	19	19	66.5	12	35.0	41.2	75.0%	15	86.7%
			12TH	4	4	50.3	0				2	50.C%
		TOTAL		84	84	56 . 4	33	35.2	38.0	51.5x	45	84.4%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	19	19	59.6	8	34.5	41.1	100.0%	16	87.5%
			10TH	27	27	66.0	13	34.5	58.5	53.8%	25	92.0%
101			111H	10	10	71.0	6	23.8	34.7	130.0%	10	90.0%
P			12TH	1	1	86.1	1	19.0	45.0	100.0%	1	100.0%
		TOTAL		57	57	65.1	28	31.6	38.6	78.6%	52	90.4%
	TOTAL			141	141	59.9	61	33.6	38.3	63.9x	97	87.6%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALIO ATTENDANCE				TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	UPPER MAN. OUTREACH	HALF YEAR	11TH	89	89	73.8	14	34.6	48.5	78.6%	48	77.1%
	•	TOTAL		٤9	89	73.8	14	34.6	48.5	78.6%	48	77.1×
		FULL YEAR	11TH	23	23	74 5	4	30.0	47 . 7	100.0%	16	81.3%
		TO AL		23	23	74.5	4	30.0	47 . 7	100.0%	16	81.3%
	TOTAL			112	112	73 9	18	33.6	48.3	83.3%	64	78.1%



SUPERINTENDENCY	C SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		TEST	X WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	LOWER MAN. OUTREACH	HALF YEAR	11TH	125	122	60.6	6	38.7	39.7	50 0%	80	80.0x
		TOTAL		125	122	60 6	6	38.7	39.7	50.0x	80	80.0%
		FULL YEAR	11TH	37	35	59 1	7	29.0	33.7	71.4%	37	89.2%
		TOTAL		37	35	59.1	7	29.0	33.7	71.4%	37	89.2x
	TOTAL			162	157	60.3	13	33.5	36.5	61.5%	117	82.9x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO 1MPRCVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	AUX. SERVICES	HALF YEAR	9TH	118	118	81.5	1	27.0	38.0	100.0%	107	85.0x
			10TH	332	329	73.2	0				316	91.5x
			11TH	385	382	71.2	2	37 . 0	34.5	50.0x	372	85.8%
			12TH	37	37	80.2	0				34	38.2x
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		873	866	73.7	3	33.7	35.7	66.7%	829	85.9x
		FULL YEAR	9TH	5	5	83.6	0				5	100.0x
10			10TH	12	12	72.6	0				12	100.0%
04			11TH	25	25	71.6	0				25	84.0%
			12TH	23	23	59.8	0				23	78.3x
		TOTAL		65	65	68.5	0				65	86.2%
	TOTAL			938	931	73.4	3	33.7	35.7	66.7×	894	85.9%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE		TEST	POST - TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	SATELLITE ACADEMY	HALF YEAR	91H	27	27	85.8	1	15.0	13.0	0.0	0	
			10TH	25	24	84.0	5	39.8	30.4	20.0%	0	
			11TH	18	18	89.7	2	52.5	52.5	50.0%	0	
			12TH	7	7	87.5	0				0	1
		TOTAL		77	76	86.3	8	39.9	33.7	25.0%	0	
	TOTAL			77	76	86.3	8	39.9	33.7	25.0%	0	



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	BRONX OUTREACH	HALF YEAR	11TH	80	73	75.4	0			80	50.0%
		TOTAL		80	73	75.4	0			80	50. 0 %
		FULL YEAR	11TH	12	12	72.3	0			12	91.7%
		TOTAL		12	12	72.3	0			12	91.7x
	TOTAL			92	85	75.0	0			92	55.4%



SUPERINTENDENCY	r school	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED In Writing
ALT/SPEC PGMS	AUX. SERVICES	HALF YEAR	9TH	33	33	69.9	0				32	75.0%
			10TH	59	58	81.2	0				59	67 . 8x
			111H	26	26	85.6	0				26	65.4%
			12TH	10	10	87.6	1	23.0	24.0	100.0%	10	90.0x
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		129	127	79 7	1	23.0	24.0	100.0%	127	70.9%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	1	1	73.3	0				1	0.0
107			10TH	1	1	71.1	0				1	100.0%
7		TOTAL		2	2	72.2	0				2	50.0x
	TOTAL			131	129	79.6	1	23.0	24.0	100.0%	129	70.5%



SUPERINTENDENCY	r SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	LITERACY CENTER	HALF YEAR	9TH	14	14	74.6	0				0	
	,	TOTAL		14	14	74.6	0				0	
	TOTAL			14	14	74 6	0				0	

SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID RFADING SCURE	TEST	TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WRITING	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	BX. OFF-SITE ED. SER	HALF YETR	MISSING	42	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		42	0		0				0	
	TOTAL			42	0		0				0	



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00t	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED In Writing
ALT/SPEC PGMS	AUX. SERVICE	HALF YEAR	9TH	7	7	70.0	0				7	57 . 1%
			10TH	139	137	81 9	1	60.0	62.0	100.0%	123	56.1%
			11TH	22	22	79.1	·				22	77.3x
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		169	166	81.0	1	60.0	62.0	100.0%	152	59.2%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	8	8	75.9	0				8	100.0%
			10TH	38	36	74.2	0				38	84.2%
110			11TH	6	6	85.3	0				6	66.7%
>		TOTAL		52	50	75.8	0				52	84.6%
	TOTAL			221	216	79.8	1	60.0	62.0	100.0%	204	65.7%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL		STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH JALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID		TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	BED. STUY.	OUTREACH	HALF YEAR	11TH	125	106	71.3	8	34.6	38.5	62.5%	33	6.1x
				MISSING	9	0		0				0	
			TOTAL		1:4	106	71 3	8	34.6	38 . 5	62.5%	33	6 . 1x
			FUL! YEAR	11TH	45	39	78.0	0				10	40.0×
			TOTAL		45	39	78.0	0				10	40.0x
	TOTAL				179	145	73.1	8	34.6	38.5	62.5x	43	14.0x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE		# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID READING	TEST	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	BUSHWICH OUTREACH	HALF YEAR	10TH	79	79	63.3	0				79	75.9%
			11TH	52	51	74.9	8	28.2	31.9	50.0%	51	98.0%
		TOTAL		131	130	67.8	8	28.2	31.9	50.0%	130	84.6%
		FULL YFAR	10TH	22	22	77.4	0				22	100.0%
		TOTAL		22	22	77.4	0				22	100.0%
	TOTAL			153	152	69.2	8	28.2	31.9	50.9%	152	86.8%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH 00 L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID READING	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WRITING	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	PACIFIC H.S.	HALF YEAR	11TH	1	1	57.9	0			0	
		TOTAL		1	1	57 9	0			0	
	TOTAL			1	1	57.9	0			0	



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	MEAN POST- TEST SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	H.S. RFDIRECTION	HALF YEAR	9 T H	39	39	60.8	6	41.2	29.5	16.7%	16	43.8%
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,		10TH	16	16	59.2	1	29. 0	28.0	0.0	7	0.0
			11TH	4	4	71.5	1	44.0	46.0	100.0%	0	
			1218	1	1	89.4	0				0	
		TOTAL		60	60	61.6	8	40.0	31.4	25.0x	23	30.4%
		FULL YEAR	9 T H	15	14	66.7	1	20.0	38.0	100.0%	15	46.7×
			10TH	7	6	61.2	1	50.0	52.0	100.0%	7 ,	85.7×
1			11TH	3	3	79.3	0				3	100.0%
14			12TH	1	1	68.9	0				1	100.0%
		TOTAL		26	24	67.0	2	35.0	45.0	100.0x	26	65.4x
	TOTAL			86	84	63.1	10	39.0	34.1	40.0x	49	49.0x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALIO ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		MEAN POST- TEST GCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALIO WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	STREET ACADE	MY HALF YEAR	9TH	2	2	44.1	0				2	100.0%
		•	10TH	6	6	39.6	0				3	100.0%
			11TH	5	4	94.1	2	21.0	41.0	100.0%	5	100.0%
			MISSING	3	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		16	12	58.5	2	21.0	41.0	100.0%	10	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	6	6	52.8	1	29.0	27.0	0.0	6	100.0%
			10TH	6	6	42.5	1	22.0	22.0	0.0	5	100.0%
115			11TH	2	2	66.4	1	36.0	42.0	100.0%	2	100.0%
		TOTAL		14	14	50.3	3	29.0	30.3	33.3%	13	100.0%
	TOTAL			30	26	54.1	5	25.8	34.6	60.0x	23	100.0%



SUPERINTENDENC	Y SCHOOL	STATUS	GRAFE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS		MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	WITH VALID READING SCORE	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	WRITING	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	LITERACY ACADEMY	HALF YEAR	11TH	13	13	93.0	0			12	66.7%
		TOTAL		13	13	93.0	0			12	66.7%
	TOTAL			13	13	93.0	0			12	66.7%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE		POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	TEEN AID H.S.	HALF YEAR	9TH	17	17	46.3	5	37.2	40.4	80.0%	8	100.0%
			10TH	9	9	64.4	2	56.0	57.5	50.0%	5	100.0%
			11TH	7	7	61.5	1	56 . 0	47.0	0.0	6	100.0%
			12TH	11	11	72.5	0				6	83.3%
			MISSING	2	0		0				0	
		TOTAL		46	44	59.0	8	44.2	45.5	62.5%	25	96.0%
	TOTAL			46	44	59.0	8	44.2	45.5	62.5x	25	96. 0 %



SUPERINTEMDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	VALID WRITING	% WHO 1MPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	AUX. SERVICES	HALF YEAP	9 T H	28	28	67.1	0				28	100.0%
			10TH	75	75	72 .7	0				74	100.0%
			11TH	79	79	66.0	0				77	100.0%
			12TH	25	24	69 1	0				25	100.0%
		TOTAL		207	206	68.9	0				204	100.0%
		FULL YEAR	9 T H	1	1	55.6	0				1	100.0%
			1 O T H	31	31	84.1	0				31	100.0%
118			11TH	7	7	77.8	0				7	100.0%
ω			12TH	4	4	71.8	0				4	100.0%
		TOTAL		43	43	81.2	0				43	100.0%
	TOTAL			250	249	71.1	0				247	100.0%



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCH00L	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	VALID READING		TEST	X WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	X WHO IMPROVED. IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	QUEENS OUTREACH	HALF YEAR	11TH	42	38	67.6	1	26.0	22.0	0.0	18	83.3%
		TOTAL		42	38	67.6	1	26.0	22.0	0.0	18	83.3%
		FULL YEAR	11TH	31	30	65.5	3	18.0	22.3	100.0%	25	84.0x
		TOTAL		31	30	65.5	3	18.0	22.3	100.0x	25	84.0x
	TOTAL			73	68	66.7	4	20.0	22.2	75.0x	43	83.7x



SUPERINTENDENCY	SCHOOL	STATUS	GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	# WITH VALID ATTENDANCE	MEAN PERCENT ATTENDANCE	# WITH VALID READING SCORE	MEAN PRE- TEST SCORE	POST-	% WHO IMPROVED IN READING	# WITH VALID WRITING SCORE	% WHO IMPROVED IN WRITING
ALT/SPEC PGMS	MIDDLE COLLEGE H.S	HALF YEAR	9TH	2	2	77.9	1	20.0	13.0	0.0	2	0.0
ALT/ SILC TORIS			10TH	18	18	79.6	0				18	50.0%
			11TH	13	13	73.8	6	30.8	31.7	66.7%	13	38 . 5%
			MISSING	1	0		0				0	ļ
		TOTAL		34	33	77.2	7	29.3	29 . 0	57 . 1x	33	42.4%
		FULL YEAR	9TH	3	0		1	38.0	41.0	100.0%	3	100.0%
			10TH	4	0		0				4	25.0%
ь			11TH	7	0		3	49.3	52 . 0	33.3%	7	100.0%
120			12TH	7	0		0				7	71.4%
		TOTAL		21	0		4	46.5	49.2	50.0%	21	76.2 x
	TOTAL			55	33	77.2	11	35.5	36 . 4	54.5%	54	55.6%
TOTAL	70771			2816	26 76	71.9	159	34.2	38.2	61.6%	2245	80.4%



College Discovery and Development Program

Reading and Writing

Thomas Jefferson Franklin D. Roosevelt Seward Park

College Bound Program

Reading and Writing

Boys and Girls
Louis D. Brandeis
Bushwick
Evander Childs
Dewitt Clinton
Eastern District
George Washington
Andrew Jackson
John Jay
Julia Richmond
John F. Kennedy

Martin Luther King Franklin K. Lane James Monroe Morris Park West Prospect Heights Adlai E. Stevenson William H. Taft Walton Washington Irving George W. Wingate