DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 357 UD 031 851

TITLE	Futures Denied: Concentrated Failure in the New York City Public School System.
INSTITUTION	Industrial Areas Foundation-Metro New York.; Public Education Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Mar 97
NOTE	43p.; A report of Parents Organized To Win Education Reform (POWER).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Centralization; Democracy; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; High School Graduates; Low Achievement; Organizational Change; Public Schools; *School District Autonomy; School Restructuring; State Legislation; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	New York City Board of Education; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

In December 1996 the New York State Legislature enacted sweeping changes in the structure and governance of the New York City public school system. The legislature and the Governor have shifted over one million school children, their parents, and their teachers back to a centralized, hierarchical system, in which one person, the chancellor, embodies accountability. The law makes clear the power of the chancellor to intervene in any school or district that consistently fails to achieve educational results and standards approved by the city board or the State Board of Regents. Community school boards have been deprived of any real power. They have the right to employ a superintendent selected by the chancellor. Representative democracy has been effectively removed as a form of school governance. As New Yorkers and others consider these reform strategies and the "ownership" of the city's schools, they need information about current performance and spending. This report outlines core problems in New York City's schools. While the city schools' performance is by no means the worst in the country, it has been resistant to improvement over the years. The high school graduation rate and the achievement of the city's graduates are lower than they should be. In many neighborhoods, performance is poor, and failing schools tend to cluster in identifiable neighborhoods, denying equal opportunities to many of the city's children. District profiles in this report describe the high incidence of failing schools in eight New York communities. Three appendixes list the lowest performing elementary and middle schools in the city and present selected district profiles. (Contains 11 tables.) (SLD)

FUTURES DENIED:

CONCENTRATED FAILURE IN THE NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

A Report Of

Parents Organized to Win Education Reform:

Industrial Areas Foundation-Metro NY
and
Public Education Association

March, 1997

Who Are
Parents Organized to Win Education Reform?

Parents Organized to Win Education Reform is a joint project of Industrial Areas Foundation-Metro New York and the Public Education Association. The project has been funded for a multi-year period by the Donors' Education Collaborative, a consortium of 19 leading New York City foundations which have pooled resources to jointly fund four New York City based projects of educational advocacy and renewal. In this first year of the project, staff from the IAF-Metro, PEA and a third partner, the Parents Center at Teachers College, Columbia University, are working at community organizing and training among public school parents in the Bronx, East Brooklyn and Upper Manhattan. This paper, the project's first publication, describes the educational conditions in the communities in which these organizations are working. By the end of this school year, project participants will have identified and ratified a set of proposed solutions to the problems described in this report.

The Industrial Areas Foundation is the largest and oldest institution for community organizing in the United States. For 50 years, IAF's mission has been to train people to organize themselves and their organizations, to take responsibility for solving the problems in their communities, and to renew the interest of citizens in public life. IAF organizations are not based around single issues or causes. They have broad agendas for change which are based on what local people have chosen as their priorities.

The Industrial Areas Foundation-Metro New York organization is comprised of nine independent organizations. They represent over 300 congregations and other religious institutions and over 250,000 families in the metropolitan area. IAF-Metro includes Harlem Initiatives Together, Queens Citizens Organization, East Harlem Partnership for Change, South Bronx Churches, Interfaith Community Organization of Jersey City (Hudson County, NJ), Brooklyn Interfaith for Action, West-Siders Together, Central Brooklyn Churches and Long Island CAN.

The Public Education Association is an independent, not for profit, civic organization dedicated to securing excellent public education for all New York City children. It is PEA's firm and sustained belief that effective public education is a right of every child and essential in a democratic society. PEA seeks to improve New York City schools and the quality of public school education through advocacy, public information, monitoring and research. Founded as part of the progressive political reform movement in 1895, PEA holds a unique charter from the New York State Board of Regents that empowers it to "study the conditions of the public schools and to comment upon them."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

In the early hours of December 18, 1996, the New York State Legislature enacted sweeping changes in the structure and governance of New York City's public school system, the nation's largest. Urged on by editorial boards and business groups, New York's Legislature and Governor have shifted over one million school children, their parents and teachers back to a centralized, hierarchical school system, in which one person, the chancellor, embodies accountability. Under the new rules, which mirror the status quo of the system as of 1968, the chancellor selects[1] community superintendents as middle level managers. The chancellor and superintendents have the newly established power to cause the transfer or removal of principals for persistent educational failure.[2] The law is silent on the accountability of teachers, the system's primary level of contact with students. The law also makes clear the power of the chancellor to intervene in any district or school which is persistently failing to achieve educational results and standards approved by the city board or established by the State Board of Regents.[3]

Under the new rules, community school boards have been effectively gutted of any real power. They now have the right to employ a superintendent selected by the chancellor.[4] This new arrangement applies equally to the dozen or so school boards that have remained free of corruption and malfeasance over the last 27 years and to the dozen or so boards that so completely prostituted representative democracy as to discredit it as a legitimate form of governance in New York's intellectual and political circles.

Parents are given an advisory[5] role under the new rules. Starting in 1999, they get an equal number of seats as school staff on local school councils that will be allowed to give advice regarding the school's budget, which in turn can be reviewed, modified or approved by the community superintendent,[6] who is appointed by the chancellor.

In January,1997, Governor Pataki announced his intention to seek legislation that would allow the establishment of charter schools in New York State. Charter schools are public schools that exist outside of the control of the local board of education. Under the Pataki proposal, charters to operate public schools would be awarded by either the New York City Board of Education, the New York State Board of Regents or the Boards of Trustees of SUNY and CUNY. The schools would then be governed by the charter that would be drawn up between them and the enabling entity.

---

1 An Act To Amend The Education Law, 12/17/96 (S. 1), page 16, line 1.
2 Ibid, page 15, line 18.
3 Ibid, page 16, line 9.
4 Ibid, page 13, line 55.
5 Ibid, page 13, line 55.
6 Ibid, page 9, line 34.

Finally, a privately sponsored scholarship initiative was recently announced in New York City. This program, a possible precursor to a publicly funded school voucher program, provides funds to individual families and allows them to seek placement for their child in private schools.

These three reforms, two enacted and one proposed, speak to the important issue of control of public education in New York City. The New York City Chancellor and Board of Education have just been given direct control of the city's 1,100 schools. How should they use that power? Should they retain monopoly power or should the power to establish and operate public schools be shared among alternative institutions, as the charter school approach would allow? Should parents be given direct control over the public resources that are raised in their children's names as the voucher approach would allow? These are important questions and they will be debated fully in New York in the coming months. This paper's purpose is to define the "education problem" in New York City. It is the hope of those observing these changes that the debate about solutions focuses on the core problems outlined in the this paper.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The public education "problem" in New York City has two distinct aspects. First, the overall performance of the school system, accounting for both good and bad schools, is mediocre at best, and has not improved for quite some time. Second, school failure is highly concentrated in specific neighborhoods, denying hundreds of thousands of youngsters any meaningful hope for educational opportunity. Depending on where people live in the city, they find a different school system. One, on the East and West Side of Manhattan, and in many neighborhoods in Queens, Staten Island, and parts of Brooklyn, struggles mightily against many constraints and often succeeds. The other, in the Bronx, Upper Manhattan, the Lower East Side of Manhattan and Eastern Brooklyn, has been failing for quite some time, continuing to this day.

The following paper presents school system data on performance and spending which demonstrates:

- While New York City's performance on standardized tests is by no means the worst among large cities in the country, it has been resistant to improvement over time. Over the last decade and a half, spending has gone up and gone down, chancellors have come and gone, but student achievement has remained largely the same.

- In the most important areas of school system performance, the high school graduation rate and the achievement of high school graduates, the system's performance is much, much lower than it needs to be, given the demands of the modern labor market. Reflecting the reality of these demands, the State Board of Regents has imposed tougher graduation standards for students entering high school now. However, unless achievement improves, graduation rates will tumble from their current mediocre levels.

- The citywide statistics mask the biggest failing of the school system. Student performance varies greatly from neighborhood to neighborhood and failing schools tend to cluster in certain clearly identifiable neighborhoods, denying basic educational opportunity to children in a large geographic swath of the city. Most of the Bronx, the eastern half of Brooklyn, and Upper Manhattan form a 14-district educational "dead zone" from which few young lives emerge at full potential. For example, in five school districts in the Bronx almost six out of every ten Black or Hispanic students are in a school that is at or near the bottom of the city's rankings. In Manhattan, combining three school districts in Upper Manhattan with one on the Lower East Side, that ratio is four out of every ten.

- In those 14 school districts, only 29 percent of the youngsters are reading at or above grade level, compared to 48 percent in the other 18 school districts.

- This failure has been known about for a long time. For at least 12 years, the State Education Department has been identifying the failure, and pressuring the New York City system to do something about it, but most efforts to-date have failed.

- The performance of failing high schools in New York City is most disheartening. The 25 high schools with the lowest graduation rates in the city, enrolling over 53,000 students, all have four year graduation rates below 40 percent. Generally, fewer than four percent of their students take and pass Regents level examinations. In most cases, fewer than 15 percent of their students take the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT). Presumably these students are the best 15 percent of the entire student population and their average scores are generally 300 or lower in the verbal section and 350 or lower in the math section. (In both SAT's, scores range from 200 to 800, with 800 representing the highest score.)

In a number of clearly identifiable neighborhoods in New York City, the cumulative failure of each level of the public school system is restricting thousands of youngsters to a life of poverty and dependence. District profiles presented in this report describe the high incidence of failing schools in eight of these communities and the linkage between failing elementary, junior high and high schools. On the Lower East Side, in Harlem and Washington Heights, in a large block of the South and West Bronx, and in the Eastern half of Brooklyn, including Bushwick and East New York, educational opportunity is rare. In these communities, the school system spends hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars and produces a concentration of failing schools. The high schools that take in a large segment of the youngsters so ill-served by the local school districts in these communities all have four year graduation rates of between 25 and 35 percent. The attainment of Regents Diplomas is less than five percent in these high schools and average SAT scores are at the absolute bottom of the scale. In these communities, the futures of children are denied by a system that tracks them into a sequence of failing schools.

I. Bottom Line Indicators of the New York City School System's Performance

Public education in New York City is an expensive proposition. Currently, spending per pupil averages $7,600 per year. That figure is lower than it was four years ago, but it is 44 percent higher than it was 12 years ago. The recent decrease in annual per pupil spending has been driven by enrollment increases of over 65,000 since 1993. Total spending in the system is higher than it ever has been, at over $8.5 billion, but it is being spread over a larger student population. Table 1 displays enrollment and spending patterns over the last dozen years.

Table 1
Budget and Enrollment
of the New York City Public School System[1]

Fiscal Year	Total Budget (Thousands)	Student Enrollment	Budget Per Pupil
1997	$8,568,890	na	na
1996	$8,028,297	1,057,344	$7,593
1995	$8,372,000	1,034,235	$8,095
1994	$7,896,418	1,015,756	$7,774
1993	$7,371,147	994,531	$7,412
1992	$7,083,834	972,146	$7,287
1991	$7,067,027	955,016	$7,400
1990	$6,723,310	939,638	$7,155
1989	$6,279,241	937,248	$6,700
1988	$5,661,432	939,142	$6,023
1987	$5,370,553	939,142	$5,719
1986	$4,939,188	936,231	$5,276

The overall cost of the system masks some major differences in the cost of educating various categories of students. For example, in 1994, when overall spending was $7,774 per pupil, the cost of educating a student in general education classes was $6,500, while special education was costing over $20,400 per pupil.[2] In the eight years between 1986 and 1994, per pupil spending in special education rose by 83 percent, compared to a 35 percent increase in general education spending.[3] The overall cost of educating a student who is scheduled to graduate in 1997, after four years in high school, eight years in elementary and junior high school and one year in kindergarten, is over $88,000, assuming that the student spent his or her entire 13-year career in general education. For this investment, the school system produces a large proportion of students who lack the skills necessary to earn a high school diploma.

[1] Chancellor's Budget Request and Adopted Budget of the City of New York, various years.

[2] Chancellor's Budget Request, 1996.

[3] Computed from data in the Chancellor's Budget Request, various years.

Table 2 presents data on student performance in the basic skills areas. The data on reading achievement over the last ten years reflects two precipitous drops in the reported scores associated with changes in the test in 1989 and again in 1996. In both cases, reported achievement dropped reflecting the more up to date norms of the test in use compared to previous years. From 1989 through 1995, reading achievement in the city school system remained fairly constant averaging 47 percent at or above grade level. The school system's research office reported that had the new test been used in 1995, 42.1 percent of the students would have scored at or above grade level.[4] The fact that 41.6 percent actually scored at or above grade level in 1996 indicates that achievement actually declined from 1995 to 1996, independent of the change in the test.

Table 2
New York City Public School System
Pupil Achievement in Reading and Mathematics
Based on Annual Citywide Examinations in Elementary, Middle and Junior High Schools

	Percent at or Above Grade Level	
Year	Reading	Mathematics
1996	41.6	58.5
1995	47.5	53.3
1994	47.5	49.9
1993	48.6	49.2
1992	47.2	58.4
1991	49.3	60.6
1990	47.3	55.7
1989	47.3	54.4
1988	63.6	56.7
1987	62.7	53.8

Overall, citywide achievement in the basic skill of reading is low, compared to up to date national norms. The "expected" score for a school system as large as New York's would be 50 percent at or above grade level. With only 41.6 percent at or above grade level, the city school system is well below that level. Furthermore, to the extent that comparisons can be drawn across the last ten years, it seems accurate to conclude that the reading achievement levels of city students has been stagnant for that time period and may have even declined slightly.

In mathematics, the picture is a slightly brighter. Using a test that was updated in 1993, the city's students have, on a citywide basis, shown improvement over the last years, such that 58.5 percent are now scoring at or above national norms, where 50 percent would be the expected score for New York's large system.

[4] *Preliminary Citywide Test Results in Reading*, memo of the Division of Educational Research, New York City Public School System, June, 1996.

In order to measure performance of students and schools against a higher standard than grade level, which is defined as the "nationwide average", the New York State Education Department has identified "mastery" levels on state exams in the basic skill areas. The State Education Department defines the mastery level on its exams as the score which indicates that the student has mastered the skills or subject matter of that grade level. In other words, a student scoring above the sixth grade mastery level is one who can "independently read the textbooks typically used to deliver instruction in the sixth grade." By this standard, achievement in New York City's public schools is far from where it needs to be. Data displayed in Table 3 indicate that only 33 percent of the city's sixth graders have attained the "mastery" point on their reading test, and 28 percent have attained this level in mathematics.

Table 3
Percentage of Public School Students
Scoring Above Mastery Level
Grade 3 and 6, Reading and Math,
New York City and Rest of State

	% Attaining Mastery Level		
Examination:	New York City	Rest of State	Total
Grade 3 Reading	18.7%	39.5%	32.1%
Grade 6 Reading	33.4%	60.5%	51.2%
Grade 3 Math	14.6%	33.3%	26.8%
Grade 6 Math	28.8%	54.9%	45.5%

Graduation Rates and Academic Performance of High School Graduates

Table 4 presents graduation and dropout rates for the last ten classes to enter ninth grade. A number of trends are clear. First, fewer than half of the high school students in New York City successfully complete high school within the traditional four year period. This rate is currently at 48.2 percent and has only varied between 44.3 percent and 50.9 percent in the last ten years. Confronted with a graduation rate of crisis proportions in 1986, the system has made no progress towards significantly improving performance in the intervening ten years.

Second, the percentage of students dropping out after four years has declined from 24.9 to 18.1 percent which indicates the system is doing a better job of inducing students to either stay in school or to return after having dropped out. This is a mixed blessing. The extra years of schooling add significant costs to the system's budget and also exacerbate the overcrowding in the high school buildings. If the students successfully complete their education, however, the cost is justified.

Table 4
New York City Public School System
System Wide Dropout and Graduation Rates[5]

	Four Year Results			Seven Year Results	
Students Entering Ninth Grade In:	Graduates	Dropouts	Still In School	Graduates	Dropouts
	Percent of Students in the Entering Class:				
1991	48.2	18.1	33.7	na	na
1990	50.7	18.3	31.0	na	na
1989	49.7	18.4	31.9	na	na
1988	50.6	19.1	30.2	69.7	30.3
1987	50.9	20.5	28.6	na	na
1986	44.4	22.7	32.8	67.1	32.9
1985	45.1	24.8	30.1	66.6	33.3
1984	46.5	24.1	29.4	67.6	32.4
1983	44.3	25.3	30.3	65.9	34.1
1982	46.7	24.9	28.4	66.9	33.1

Many of the students who remain in school after four years, about 63 percent, do successfully complete their education within seven years. Yet the ultimate graduation rate of the New York City public school system is low–69.7 percent in the latest available figures. While the seven year graduation rate did improve from 66.9 percent seven years ago, the trends are not encouraging. The improvement is slight and it is not at all clear that it will continue. The improvement seems most aligned with what happened to students in their first four years of high school, where the graduation rate improved *by a higher percentage than did the seven year rate.* Further, the four year graduation rate peaked with the 1987 students, suggesting that the seven year rate may follow its lead and dip once again.

Third, the seven year graduation rate, while accurate, does place the best possible light on the situation. It includes as successful completions all students who earn either a high school diploma or a General Equivalency Diploma (GED). The school system no longer separates the GED recipients from the diploma recipients in its reporting, but in the earlier reports, over 11 percent of all "graduates" were listed as GED recipients.[6] (For the students who entered high school in 1991, ten percent of the four year "graduates" were actually GED recipients.[7]) The Board of Education does not have control over the definition of a high school diploma; that is the purview of the New York State Board of Regents. (It is, however, Board of Education policy to lump together GED recipients with high school diploma recipients under the heading "successful school completers" in public reports.)

[5] NYC Board of Education, Office of Educational Research, Annual Dropout Reports.

[6] NYC Board of Education, Office of Educational Research, "The Cohort Report for the Class of 1989."

[7] NYC Board of Education, Office of Educational Research, "The Cohort Report for the Class of 1995", pg 8.

New York State's requirements for a high school diploma will be made tougher in the next few years. Under the current rules, students are required to demonstrate *minimum competence* in core subjects before they can be awarded a diploma. For most students, this requirement was met by passing a Regents Competency Test (RCT) in the subject. Higher achieving students were able to demonstrate competency by passing either their subject area Regents examination or by attaining a certain score on the SAT. In the future, all students will be required to demonstrate academic ability on the Regents examinations. One reason behind the change in policy comes from the observation that the existence of the "lower" track meant that some students were not even being exposed to the the subject matter reserved for Regents courses. Three sets of data that pertain to the quality of a high school diploma in the New York public schools are presented and discussed below.

Regents Diplomas have, for generations of New York State students, signified that the student had taken a rigorous sequence of academic classes and passed Regents exams in each of them. In the past, this diploma was considered the path to college and was attainable to only the top layer of students. With the decline in employment prospects for low-skilled individuals, the Regents Diploma has come to represent the necessary achievement of most, if not all students. Data compiled by the State Education Department indicates that New York City lags behind all other types of school districts in the state in terms of Regents Diploma attainment. Oddly enough, New York City leads almost all types of districts in terms of the percentage of high school graduates going to college. These data are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Attainment of Regents Diplomas & College Attendance Rates
New York City and State[8]
1993-94

Type of School	Type of Diploma			Percent Attending College	
	Regents	Regents Honors	Other	4- Year	2-Year
	% of All Graduates				
Public					
NYC - Public	16.2	4.2	79.5	58.3	21.7
Other Large Cities	17.2	2.9	79.9	41.6	26.1
Small Cities	33.1	8.5	58.4	39.6	36.8
Suburban	40.0	9.0	51.0	51.2	30.5
Rural	35.7	7.6	56.7	32.7	35.9
Non-Public					
NYC	27.1	4.3	68.6	73.9	8.7
Rest of State	34.0	8.1	57.9	71.7	17.7

8 "Report to the Governor and Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools," February 1996, NY State Education Department.

While attainment of a Regents Diploma requires students to take and pass a sequence of courses over their high school career, all students are free to take single Regents level courses. In fact, students entering high school in 1999 will only be able to attain a high school diploma of any type by taking and passing Regents exams in each of the following areas: English, math, social studies and science. Data compiled by the State Education Department and displayed in Table 6 reveal that only one-fifth of New York City's public high school students currently pass Regents English. In math, the figure is less than 30 percent, in science it is less than 17 percent and in social studies, less than 30 percent. These figures are for individual exams. No data is available to determine the percentage of students who pass exams in all four subject areas, but it is obviously less than 17 percent.

Table 6
Percentage of Students Taking and Passing Regents Examinations
Public Schools: New York City and Rest of State[9]

	% of Average Enrollment Passing	
Examination	New York City	Rest of State
Comprehensive English	20.0%	56.8%
Any Foreign Language	29.5%	50.9%
Sequential Math I	29.5%	59.7%
Sequential Math II	23.0%	53.6%
Sequential Math III	16.1%	38.5%
Biology	16.9%	53.5%
Chemistry	15.1%	37.9%
Earth Science	10.1%	54.5%
Physics	9.9%	22.9%
Global Studies	29.5%	59.4%
U.S. History & Government	17.0%	56.3%

A final profile of the graduating class for the entire New York City public school system is presented on the following page. This data reflects the full range of performance in the city, including the middle class districts in eastern Queens, Staten Island and parts of Brooklyn and Manhattan, as well as the districts that house large numbers of failing schools. The investment of over $88,000 per pupil yields a graduating class in which 52 percent of the pupils actually earn a high school diploma, some after six or seven years in high school, at higher cost levels. Only 11 percent of the class will have earned a Regents Diploma, the traditional indicator of preparedness for college. These figures are low, and they have been difficult for the system to improve upon. Yet, as New York State's higher graduation standards are implemented, these figures will be even more difficult for the system to match under current policies and procedures.

[9] "Report to the Governor and the Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools," February 1996, NY State Education Department.

A Profile of a New York City Public School Graduating Class

for Students Who Entered Kindergarten in 1982 and Finished 13 Years of Schooling in 1995

Total cost of 13 years of public schooling: $88,000

Outcomes after four years of high school:

48.2% "successfully complete high school", of those:
- 10.6% earn Regents Diploma
- 32.8% earn a regular diploma
- 4.8% earn a General Equivalency Diploma

28% of the class takes the SAT:
- 368 average Verbal score
- 433 average Math score

33% of the class returns to high school for a 5th, 6th or 7th year at a cost of at least $7,600 per year

About 2/3 of those returning will successfully complete high school

When All is Done:

Up to $105,000 will have been spent on each child's public education

30 % of the students will have dropped out
11% will have earned a Regents Diploma
52% will have earned a regular diploma
7% will have earned a GED

II. Schools Under Registration Review and Other Failing Schools

In 1985, the New York State Education Department began measuring the performance of all of the state's schools against minimum performance standards. Those schools that failed to meet minimum standards in a particular outcome area (reading, mathematics, student attendance, or graduation/dropout rates) were required to develop an improvement plan to address the shortcomings within a reasonable amount of time. In that year, 404 schools were identified as being *in need of assistance* across the entire state; 393 of these were in New York City. In 1989, the State Education Department began to identify a subset of these schools that were failing to make sufficient improvement. This group consisted of 39 New York City schools, including IS 111, which were labeled *Schools Under Registration Review (SURR)*, indicating that they would lose their state registration to operate as schools unless they made the necessary improvements. The other 354 schools had not necessarily improved sufficiently, but the State Education Department chose to focus attention on the 39 schools that were extremely low performing and stagnant. The SURR list grew to include some 67 schools by late 1993. In 1994 and 1995, the state undertook a review of its procedures regarding these schools. By 1995, 13 of the SURR schools made sufficient improvement to be taken off the list, but an additional 29 schools fell onto it. In 1996, 83 schools in New York City were under registration review, some for as long as seven years.

In 1996, a new New York State Education Commissioner, Richard Mills, and New York City School's Chancellor, Rudolph Crew, were installed. They spent much of the winter and spring of 1996 circling each other regarding the disposition of the 16 SURR schools that had been on the list the longest. Three improved and were taken off the list. By end of the school year, nine of the schools had been placed under the direct control of the chancellor's office and four were implementing corrective action without being placed under the chancellor's control.

In mid-1996, State Commissioner Mills also announced that a new, more streamlined process of identification and action would be implemented. In November, Chancellor Crew was directed by the state commissioner to take "corrective action" in 42 schools, in addition to the 13 that had been identified in 1995.

Unfortunately, as state and city officials have spent more than a decade refining their lists and terminology to describe failing schools, students have been forced to continue to attend these schools and have their futures compromised in the process.

The depth and scope of the failure in these schools is numbing. The 83 schools that were under registration review in 1995-96 enrolled 84,256 students, including 18,158 who had just entered them in September, 1995. Since they were first identified as SURR schools, these 83 schools had "served" 146,657 students. Each year, the school system spent at least $659 million in these failing schools. The students forced to attend these schools were overwhelmingly from

minority groups. Fifty-eight percent were Hispanic and 39 percent were Black. Academic performance in these schools is negligible and student performance is without consequence. Only 32 percent of the students in these 83 schools read at grade level and only 26 percent are able to do grade level mathematics. Yet, over 96 percent of the students in these schools are promoted from one grade to the next at the end of the year.

Low Performing Elementary and Middle Schools in New York City

Table 7 compares the performance of the elementary and junior high SURR schools to statewide averages on the Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) tests used by the State Education Department (SED). The SED does not use "grade level" as a performance criteria on its tests. In the elementary and junior high schools, students are described as being above or below the "State Reference Point," which is a minimal level of achievement. For example, a third grader who is not above the third grade reference point would be unable to read and understand the following paragraph at the end of third grade:

> Bears are big. They need a lot of food. Bears eat meat. They eat bugs. They eat berries. They eat honey. They eat fish, too. Bears feed in the spring. They feed in the summer. They feed in the fall. Bears look for food then. They fish.

In schools under registration review, 59 percent of the third graders can not read that passage. Fifty-three percent of sixth graders fall below a similarly low criterion in the sixth grade. Math scores tend to be higher than reading scores in both SURR and non-SURR schools, though SURR schools lag far behind the performance of non-SURR schools in this area.

The data for individual schools is even more disheartening. Table 8 displays the enrollment and percentage of students reading or doing math above grade level for all elementary and junior high schools that were under registration review in 1995-96. Thirty-one of these schools have fewer than 25 percent of their students reading at or above grade level and 21 have fewer than 25 percent of their students doing math at grade level.

Table 7
Comparison of Student Performance
in SURR Schools to Statewide Averages

	Percent Above the State Reference Point	
PEP Tests:	SURR Schools	All Public Schools
Grade 3 Reading	41%	80%
Grade 6 Reading	47%	84%
Grade 5 Writing	66%	91%
Grade 3 Math	80%	95%
Grade 6 Math	64%	92%

Table 8
Elementary and Junior High Schools
Under Registration Review

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
1	15	272	2	19.3	18.1
1	22	692	1	29.7	27.2
1	60	527	1	31.5	31.1
1	64	335	2	24.1	23.1
3	54	1,073	6	34.8	28.3
4	7	450	1	47.2	40.2
4	117	354	6	36.0	31.2
4	121	406	7	29.0	28.7
5	43	1,014	4	26.1	25.7
5	123	961	6	29.5	33.2
5	154	682	7	23.0	19.3
5	161	971	2	37.6	28.3
5	200	1,016	1	25.6	20.6
6	28	1,421	2	21.5	24.7
6	128	1,578	4	38.4	22.9
7	27	630	7	45.4	19.3
7	40	587	4	42.6	26.5
7	43	515	1	13.2	19.0
7	65	802	7	37.7	23.2
7	156	900	2	16.1	23.9
7	157	683	7	23.2	25.7
7	183	612	2	30.8	24.9
8	48	1,155	2	36.7	27.7
8	52	578	2	47.7	24.5
8	62	795	7	48.2	32.3
8	74	849	3	31.4	25.8
8	93	855	4	59.9	35.7
8	130	581	1	25.0	25.7
9	4	647	6	29.4	23.3
9	22	1,447	2	13.4	14.7
9	28	1,160	4	41.4	43.4
9	63	877	7	39.6	23.5
9	64	873	7	25.3	25.2
9	82	1,086	2	38.3	40.0
9	104	1,073	4	16.9	23.5
9	109	916	2	37.5	12.9
9	114	990	7	22.4	20.1
9	117	955	7	37.0	25.6
9	147	1,416	6	32.4	20.6
9	148	769	6	na	na
9	235	414	7	20.8	25.7
10	26	1,176	3	53.8	52.9
10	46	2,002	1	35.7	28.6

Table 8
Elementary and Junior High
Schools Under Registration Review
(continued)

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
10	79	1,200	2	31.5	26.5
10	91	1,027	4	na	na
10	115	830	3	50.0	22.3
10	122	1,188	7	na	na
10	137	779	6	28.4	22.8
10	205	946	2	38.7	28.1
10	291	635	1	13.6	17.9
12	57	513	7	32.9	25.8
12	77	1,857	2	30.7	16.5
12	193	776	7	36.5	21.2
13	117	565	6	50.6	40.1
15	136	933	6	23.5	9.1
16	26	624	1	39.5	27.0
16	57	823	7	35.9	26.3
16	304	590	7	22.7	26.9
16	324	967	4	27.9	28.0
17	92	1,195	7	20.6	22.4
17	191	977	1	40.4	30.3
17	320	1,518	2	37.9	37.0
18	219	1,467	4	15.8	19.5
19	224	830	1	22.2	25.2
19	328	779	1	23.3	31.5
23	150	527	2	na	na
23	263	607	6	28.3	26.6
23	284	947	3	18.9	23
24	143	1,503	4	na	na
27	105	965	1	na	na
27	197	999	4	na	na
27	215	981	1	na	na
28	8	855	6	na	na
32	106	584	1	43.0	24.4
32	111	1,163	7	18.4	19.5
32	274	1,166	7	19.5	26.9
32	291	1,106	6	25.8	16.0

A further aspect of the problem, and one that is most important to the families living in the neighborhoods that are being so ill-served by SURR schools, is that the failing schools tend to be highly concentrated in certain local neighborhoods and local school districts. This concentration of failure is lost in the endless debate over the generation and regeneration of various lists of failing schools. For families in many communities there are no options to the failing schools within the public school system. Of the 77 elementary and junior high schools that were under registration review in 1995-96, 68 were located in 14 of the city's 32 school districts. In total, these 14 school districts housed 358 schools, including 126 of the 150 lowest ranked elementary schools in New York City and 42 of the 50 lowest ranked junior high schools. (A complete list of the 150 lowest ranked elementary schools and 50 lowest ranked middle schools is presented in the appendix to this report.) Thus, almost half, 47 percent, of the schools in these 14 school districts are at the bottom of the rankings in New York City. At the same time, only 19 of these 358 schools ranked in either the 150 highest elementary schools or the 50 highest ranked junior high schools. In these 14 districts, approximately 29 percent of the youngsters read at or above grade level compared to 48 percent in the rest of the city. In many individual schools, the scores were much lower. Table 9 presents the distribution of schools in these 14 school districts.

Table 9
Concentration of Failing Schools in
14 Local School Districts

District	SURR Schools	Total Schools	Elementary Schools In Top 150	Elementary Schools In Bottom 150	Middle Schools In Top 50	Middle Schools In Bottom 50
1-Lower East Side	4	21	0	8	0	1
4-East Harlem	3	47	2	10	3	11
5-Harlem	5	19	0	8	1	3
6-Washington Heights	2	24	2	7	2	0
7-South Bronx	7	22	1	11	0	4
8-East Bronx	6	28	2	8	0	3
9-West Bronx	13	33	0	15	0	5
10-Riverdale/So. Bronx	9	35	2	16	0	2
12-Tremont	3	24	0	13	0	4
16	4	16	1	6	0	2
17	3	26	2	2	0	1
19-East New York	2	28	0	9	0	1
23-Brownsville	3	18	0	6	0	2
32-Bushwick	4	17	0	7	1	3
14 District Total	68	358	12	126	7	42

The geographic concentration of these districts produces alarming statistical results for Black and Hispanic youngsters in large areas of the city. For example, in five school districts in the

Bronx, almost six out of every ten Black or Hispanic youngsters is in a school that is at or near the bottom of the city's rankings. In the four school districts in Upper Manhattan and the Lower East Side, that ratio is four out of every ten.

Low Performing High Schools In New York City

Table 10 compares the performance of the high schools under registration review to statewide averages on the indicators used by the State Education Department. There are currently two series of tests administered in high schools in New York State. The Regents Competency Tests or RCT's test for basic academic competency. The Regents exams test for a higher level of achievement. In the next five years, the State Education Department will be phasing out the competency tests and requiring all students to take Regents examinations in order to earn a high school diploma. The following are typical of questions on recent Regents examinations:

Examples of Questions on Regents Examinations

GLOBAL STUDIES
An example of an essay question worth 15 points on the January, 1995, Global Studies exam:

Newspaper headlines often highlight important historical events.

Headlines
'Europeans Sign Treaty of Versailles'
'United States Drops Atomic Bomb over Hiroshima'
'China Enacts One-Child Policy'
'Shah Pahlevi Flees Iran'
'Shining Path Movement Gains Strength In Peru'
'Rwanda Torn by Ethnic Strife'
'Neo-Nazis Attack Turkish Workers In Germany'

Select three headlines from the list and for each one selected:
- *Explain one cause of the event mentioned in the headline.*
- *Describe one effect that this event had on the nation/region in which it occurred. [Do not discuss the effects these events had on the United States.]*

A multiple choice question on the same exam:

The Green Revolution is an attempt to:
1) establish economic goals and priorities in socialist nations
2) replace aging party leaders in Communist nations with young, progressive intellectuals
3) bridge the income gap between the working poor and the upper classes in developed nations
4) increase agricultural productivity through scientific research

49 percent of all New York State's high school students take and pass the Global Studies Regents Exam. In high schools under registration review, only 11 percent of the students take and pass this exam.

COMPREHENSIVE ENGLISH

Examples of multiple choice questions worth .5 point each on the June, 1995, Comprehensive English exam:

In the space provided write the number of the word or phrase that most nearly expresses the meaning of the word printed in heavy black type.

jurisdiction

1) policy
2) decision
3) protection
4) authority

incoherent

1) dull
2) lacking clarity
3) biased
4) hard to believe

calamity

1) dejection
2) misfortune
3) disbelief
4) poverty

An example of a composition question worth 30 points on the same exam:

Write a well-organized composition of about 250 words on one of the following topics:

Ethics for the computer age
Good losers, graceful winners
Art attack
A tale for my grandchildren
Women in the military
It's your turn

44 percent of high school students in New York State take and pass this exam. In high schools under registration review, only 8 percent do.

SEQUENTIAL MATHEMATICS I

Examples of short answer questions, worth 2 points each, on the June, 1994, Sequential Mathematics I examination:

Solve for x: $6(x - 2) - 4x = 16$

Find the number of degrees in the measure of the base angle of an isoceles triangle whose vertex angle measures 70^0 .

If a fair coin is tossed three times, what is the probability of getting three tails?

Questions worth 10 points each on the same examination:

In answering these questions, clearly indicate the necessary steps, including appropriate formula substitutions, diagrams, graphs, charts, etc. Calculations that may be obtained by mental arithmetic or the calculator do not need to be shown.

Three numbers are in the ratio 3:5:7. If the largest number is multiplied by 3, the result is 26 more than the sum of the first and second numbers. Find the numbers. (Only and algebraic solution will be accepted.)

Ramos buys some pens and pencils. He buys seven more pens than pencils. Pens cost $0.45 each and pencils cost $0.40 each. If he has $10 to spend, what is the greatest number of each he can buy? (Show or explain the procedure used to obtain your answer.

49 percent of high school students in New York State take and pass this exam. In high schools under registration review, only 12 percent do.

Beginning in 1998, all students entering high school must pass all three of these examinations in order to receive a diploma. Today, no more than eight percent of students in high schools under registration review would meet that standard. Unless these schools improve dramatically, the attainment of high school diplomas will be a rare event in the communities that SURR schools serve. Even under the current, lower standards, performance is disheartening.

Table 10

Comparison of Student Performance in High Schools Under Registration Review to Statewide Averages

RCT Tests (Competency)	% Passing SURR Schools	% Passing All Public Schools
Reading	71%	88%
Writing	60%	80%
Math	39%	64%
Science	31%	63%
Global Studies	42%	53%
US History/Govt.	53%	65%

Regents Exams	% of Average Enrollment Taking & Passing Exam SURR Schools	All Public Schools
Comprehensive English	8.1%	43.6%
Foreign Language	22.7%	43.3%
Sequential Math I	11.7%	49.0%
Sequential Math II	3.5%	30.5%
Biology	4.7%	40.4%
Physics	2.1%	18.2%
Global Studies	10.5%	48.8%
US History/Govt.	7.4%	42.3%

The depth of the failure in New York City public high schools is not truly captured in a look at just the six SURR schools. Table 11 displays the most recent four year graduation rates and additional data for the high schools at the bottom of the distribution in New York City, as well as for the SURR schools. The six SURR schools are by no means the worst in this list. Twenty-five schools, enrolling over 53,000 students, at an annual cost of over $350 million, all have four year graduation rates below 40 percent. Generally, fewer than four percent of their students take and pass Regents level examinations. In most cases, fewer than 15 percent of their students take the SAT's. Presumably these are the best 15 percent of the entire student population and their average scores are generally 300 or lower in the verbal section and 350 or lower in the math section. Two additional schools that have graduation rates slightly above 40 percent have been identified by the state as being under registration review.

Table 11
Four Year Graduation Rates and SAT Scores
of Students Who Entered High School in 1991
Selected Schools[10]
Schools Under Registration Review in Italics

High School	#Students	Graduation Rate	Regents Diploma	Scholastic Aptitude Test %Taking	Verbal	Math
Manhattan Night	na	13.7%	na	na	na	na
Erasmus Hall	na	20.0%	na	na	na	na
William H. Taft	4,225	25.0%	3.5%	13.3%	286	324
Erasmus Business	658	26.6%	0.0%	na	na	na
Morris	1,775	26.7%	0.0%	12.9%	295	332
Louis D. Brandeis	2,764	28.7%	4.0%	12.6%	296	352
Park West	2,185	29.5%	1.5%	11.2%	303	350
Bushwick	2,536	30.0%	4.7%	10.6%	292	341
Theodore Roosevelt	*na*	*31.8%*	*3.7%*	*12.5%*	*290*	*354*
Walton	2,575	32.5%	1.6%	19.9%	286	340
Eastern District ##	*2,451*	*32.5%*	*0.0%*	*9.5%*	*298*	*343*
South Bronx	935	32.7%	0.0%	13.4%	283	314
George Washington	*3,722*	*32.8%*	*2.0%*	*19.0%*	*281*	*331*
Julia Richman ##	855	32.9%	3.0%	na	na	na
Harry Van Arsdale	1,801	33.9%	0.0%	na	na	na
George Wingate	2,926	34.0%	6.7%	20.4%	304	353
Samuel Gompers	1,087	35.4%	11.8%	29.1%	294	356
John Jay	3,651	35.8%	6.4%	20.6%	322	357
Seward Park	2,795	37.0%	4.8%	27.3%	279	450
Graphic Arts	1,922	37.3%	5.2%	11.4%	342	345
Adlai E. Stevenson	4,067	37.3%	8.1%	19.2%	324	358
Prospect Heights	2,363	37.3%	4.0%	14.1%	310	347
Automotive	1,424	37.5%	4.1%	3.8%	253	301
James Monroe ##	*2,100*	*37.9%*	*0.0%*	*16.4%*	*285*	*314*
Sarah J. Hale	1,774	39.3%	0.8%	7.8%	283	313
Thomas Jefferson	*na*	*41.8%*	*3.6%*	*17.7%*	*280*	*313*
Franklin K. Lane	*na*	*41.1%*	*3.6%*	*13.5%*	*333*	*399*

These schools have since been closed by the Board of Education.

On the other end of the spectrum, nine New York City high schools do have graduation rates of above 80 percent (Staten Island Technical, Townsend Harris, Bronx Science, Stuyvesant, Benjamin Cardozo, Brooklyn Technical, Talent Unlimited, Susan E. Wagner and Tottenville). These schools are all either selective in their admissions policy or located in Eastern Queens or Staten Island.

[10] NYC Board of Education, Office of Educational Research,"The Class of 1995, Four Year Longitudinal Report."

III. Futures Denied: The Cumulative Effect of School Failure

The nature of the modern American economy requires that its schools produce graduates who have a fairly high level of analytic and communication skills and the ability to adapt to a dynamic workplace. The phrase "life-long learners" is often used to describe the type of graduates that this nation's economy demands. For individual students, the stakes attached to successful school completion are high. National studies indicate that high school graduates annually earn, on average, 50 percent more than high school dropouts. The average annual income for high school dropouts is a mere $12,809, which is below the federal poverty threshold for a family of four.[11] Other studies have confirmed that high school dropouts have higher rates of unemployment, increased reliance on social services, increased probability of criminal activity and generally poorer health than high school graduates.[12] Individuals who drop out of high school incur a tremendous burden in their lives. Dropping out also incurs societal costs. In addition to the money spent on social services, income taxes forgone and other public costs, one might conclude that the money spent on these youngsters' educations has been inefficiently used.

In a number of clearly identifiable neighborhoods in New York City, the cumulative failure of each level of the public school system is restricting thousands of youngsters to a life of poverty and dependence. The appendix to this report presents district profiles which describe the high incidence of failing schools in eight school districts and the linkage between failing elementary, junior high and high schools. On the Lower East Side, in Harlem and Washington Heights, in a large block of the South and West Bronx, and in the Eastern Half of Brooklyn, including Bushwick and East New York, educational opportunity is rare. In these communities, the school system spends hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars to produce a concentration of failing schools. The high schools that take in a large segment of the youngsters so ill-served by the local school districts in these communities all have four year graduation rates of between 25 and 35 percent. The attainment of Regents diplomas is less than five percent in these high schools and average SAT scores are at the absolute bottom of the scale. In these communities, the futures of children are denied by a system that tracks them into a sequence of failing schools.

IV. Conclusion

This brief paper has used public data on school performance to clearly demonstrate that the "education crisis" in New York City and State is highly concentrated in clearly identifiable neighborhoods that cluster in the Bronx, Eastern Brooklyn and Upper Manhattan. The extent of school failure in these areas makes the promise of equal educational opportunity a crude

11 "Dreams Deferred: High School Dropouts in the United States," Educational Testing Service, 1995.
12 Rumberger, Russell "High School Dropouts: A Review of the Issues and Evidence," Review of Educational Research, 1987.

hoax to the residents of these communities. Were it not for the low performance of these schools, the performance of the school system as a whole might almost be respectable.

It should be made clear what this means. When political and educational leaders talk about solving the schools crisis in New York State and City, they have to talk about the schools in these communities. If they are not solving the problems of these neighborhoods' schools, they are not addressing the crisis. The same is true for education reformers. Money spent on reform efforts, no matter how laudable, will not make a dent in the schools crisis unless it changes the odds in favor of the children who live in these communities.

If political leaders and educational reformers have an obligation to work to improve the conditions in the schools in these communities, then the residents of the communities have an even bigger obligation. Leaving school improvement to others has not worked. The "system" has evidenced a willingness to ignore the failure in their schools. On the other hand, the recent changes in the system and other reforms that are being discussed might very well make improvement more attainable. The extent that these reforms will make a difference in these communities largely depends upon each community's ability to become informed and active.

APPENDIX

The 150 Lowest Performing Elementary Schools in New York City

Based Upon Citywide Reading Examination
Administered in May, 1995

Citywide Rank	District	School	# Students	Reading	Math
	Manhattan				
602	1	15	272	24.50%	26.20%
533	1	34	431	30.20%	34.40%
537	1	61	263	29.70%	40.40%
659	1	64	335	14.70%	13.40%
615	1	97	495	23.30%	23.60%
647	1	188	na	na	na
560	1	315	119	28.30%	22.70%
643	1	450	na	na	na
623	3	76	305	22.70%	29.50%
654	3	113	403	17.10%	17.50%
651	3	144	591	17.90%	32.80%
601	3	165	606	24.50%	45.70%
641	3	180	415	19.90%	26.70%
592	3	207	166	25.40%	28.80%
664	3	841	187	8.50%	8.50%
534	3	855	62	29.70%	35.10%
645	4	7	450	19.30%	45.40%
567	4	50	423	27.70%	43.20%
540	4	57	728	29.50%	29.90%
579	4	96	503	26.60%	26.60%
562	4	102	487	28.10%	40.50%
509	4	109	296	32.70%	40.90%
582	4	121	406	26.50%	42.60%
628	4	155	479	22.00%	33.30%
642	4	801	244	19.70%	38.80%
583	4	810	138	26.30%	26.80%
662	4	811	150	12.50%	14.10%
585	5	30	871	26.20%	40.70%
527	5	46	1,018	30.60%	50.70%
552	5	123	961	28.60%	35.70%
538	5	129	936	29.70%	34.30%
568	5	154	682	27.70%	36.70%
604	5	161	971	24.50%	47.70%
546	5	197	760	28.90%	27.10%
587	5	200	1,016	25.80%	32.90%
598	6	5	1,198	24.70%	45.10%
515	6	28	1,421	32.30%	48.20%
554	6	98	1,322	28.40%	60.60%
612	6	128	1,578	23.50%	39.60%
555	6	152	1,553	28.40%	54.70%
596	6	252	394	24.80%	33.80%
526	6	528	522	30.70%	39.50%
Manhattan Total			**24,157**		

The 150 Lowest Performing Elementary Schools in New York City

Based Upon Citywide Reading Examination
Administered in May, 1995

Citywide Rank	District	School	# Students	Reading	Math
	Bronx				
620	7	1	617	22.90%	34.10%
629	7	5	746	22.00%	34.40%
644	7	25	513	19.40%	37.20%
593	7	27	630	25.20%	25.30%
600	7	30	884	24.60%	28.50%
618	7	40	587	23.20%	37.70%
588	7	43	515	25.80%	31.40%
655	7	65	802	16.50%	30.70%
581	7	156	900	26.50%	31.50%
578	7	157	683	40.00%	38.30%
648	7	161	699	18.80%	27.30%
532	8	36	916	30.30%	43.80%
637	8	60	824	19.90%	36.70%
661	8	62	795	12.90%	37.50%
603	8	75	730	na	na
626	8	93	855	22.30%	50.00%
591	8	130	581	25.60%	37.00%
631	8	140	781	21.80%	30.40%
656	8	164	376	16.30%	24.10%
511	9	4	818	32.50%	40.50%
622	9	28	1,160	22.80%	28.40%
508	9	35	718	33.00%	53.80%
590	9	53	1,567	25.70%	36.60%
627	9	55	992	22.20%	30.40%
566	9	58	484	27.80%	32.50%
635	9	63	877	20.60%	32.40%
638	9	64	880	19.90%	36.00%
589	9	104	1,073	25.70%	23.20%
595	9	109	916	24.90%	30.80%
543	9	110	789	29.10%	58.70%
634	9	114	990	21.20%	36.50%
520	9	126	1,082	31.50%	36.90%
542	9	132	848	29.20%	30.50%
649	9	163	573	18.60%	54.20%
570	9	204	423	27.40%	32.40%
572	9	235	414	27.20%	28.80%
605	10	3	164	24.40%	32.60%
536	10	7	813	29.70%	47.50%
594	10	9	951	25.10%	44.50%
639	10	26	1,176	19.90%	29.10%
625	10	32	872	22.50%	39.50%
652	10	46	2,002	17.80%	39.20%
633	10	59	481	21.60%	30.10%

The 150 Lowest Performing Elementary Schools in New York City

Based Upon Citywide Reading Examination
Administered in May, 1995

Citywide Rank	District	School	# Students	Reading	Math
	Bronx				
575	10	79	1,200	27.00%	39.50%
574	10	85	1,234	27.00%	40.50%
529	10	86	1,918	30.40%	56.90%
584	10	91	1,027	26.30%	35.90%
606	10	122	1,188	24.40%	43.00%
608	10	159	291	24.10%	33.70%
577	10	279	973	26.90%	31.90%
663	10	291	635	9.10%	23.50%
660	10	306	1,072	14.10%	15.90%
548	11	21	668	28.90%	48.40%
518	11	41	903	31.70%	43.40%
530	11	112	603	30.30%	45.50%
632	12	6	950	21.80%	30.40%
624	12	44	619	22.50%	32.00%
561	12	50	907	28.10%	52.10%
513	12	57	485	32.30%	30.00%
616	12	66	1,043	23.30%	25.10%
613	12	67	861	23.40%	18.40%
531	12	77	1,857	30.30%	40.40%
617	12	129	474	23.20%	28.30%
599	12	134	741	24.60%	33.60%
544	12	150	750	29.10%	33.90%
611	12	198	813	23.50%	33.20%
657	12	212	87	16.10%	29.00%
545	12	214	471	29.00%	33.00%
539	12	234	491	29.50%	36.30%
Bronx Total			**56,758**		
	Brooklyn				
569	13	305	998	27.60%	34.50%
528	14	23	476	30.40%	38.00%
610	15	27	571	24.10%	26.30%
517	15	169	1,840	31.90%	48.20%
564	16	5	566	28.00%	32.40%
576	16	26	624	26.90%	19.50%
571	16	28	324	27.30%	27.60%
549	16	243	832	28.90%	29.60%
510	16	262	698	32.50%	31.00%
658	16	304	590	16.00%	25.80%
553	16	335	694	28.50%	42.80%
563	17	191	977	28.00%	27.90%
514	17	249	1,182	32.30%	60.40%
512	17	397	542	32.40%	40.20%

The 150 Lowest Performing Elementary Schools in New York City

Based Upon Citywide Reading Examination
Administered in May, 1995

Citywide Rank	District	School	# Students	Reading	Math
	Brooklyn				
521	19	7	1,003	31.40%	na
580	19	72	958	26.60%	32.10%
609	19	149	779	24.10%	33.50%
607	19	158	761	24.20%	31.90%
516	19	174	641	32.00%	36.40%
640	19	190	499	19.90%	23.40%
650	19	224	830	18.10%	19.30%
573	19	328	779	27.20%	29.70%
565	19	345	1,075	27.90%	36.80%
522	21	197	na	na	na
541	21	288	726	29.30%	26.80%
556	22	245	157	28.30%	35.70%
653	23	73	570	17.10%	14.80%
597	23	150	527	24.70%	21.50%
614	23	156	957	23.40%	32.40%
557	23	284	947	28.30%	34.80%
535	23	298	644	29.70%	23.10%
519	23	332	859	31.70%	33.70%
547	32	75	636	28.90%	40.00%
621	32	106	584	22.90%	38.40%
636	32	145	1,196	20.10%	51.60%
559	32	151	716	28.30%	54.70%
558	32	274	1,166	28.30%	37.60%
630	32	377	853	21.90%	42.70%
550	32	384	893	28.70%	51.90%
Brooklyn Total			**29,670**		
	Queens				
524	24	143	1,503	31.10%	31.50%
523	27	45	535	31.20%	45.30%
619	27	105	965	23.10%	24.10%
551	27	215	981	28.70%	29.00%
Queens Total			**3,984**		
	Staten Island				
525	31	14	653	30.90%	39.50%
586	31	31	952	46.70%	55.30%
Staten Island Total			**1605**		
646	33	333	na	na	na
Citywide Total			**116,174**		

The 50 Lowest Performing Middle Schools in New York City

Based Upon Citywide Reading Examination
Administered in May, 1995

	B	C	D	E	F	G
1						
2	Citywide					
3	Rank	District	School	# Students	Reading	Math
4		Manhattan				
5	153	1	60	527	23.30%	29.40%
6	135	2	879	100	26.40%	47.00%
7	161	3	118	620	19.80%	21.50%
8	140	3	848	141	25.80%	26.80%
9	132	3	850	129	26.90%	17.70%
10	170	3	851	119	15.10%	25.50%
11	173	3	857	76	8.50%	7.00%
12	149	3	858	32	24.20%	19.20%
13	169	4	802	320	17.20%	9.60%
14	159	4	804	163	20.30%	15.70%
15	157	4	805	158	21.10%	4.60%
16	137	4	812	57	25.90%	11.90%
17	139	4	813	115	25.80%	11.70%
18	168	4	814	158	17.50%	13.40%
19	172	4	818	169	11.60%	16.40%
20	166	4	819	176	18.20%	8.20%
21	126	4	824	na	na	na
22	174	4	831	73	8.00%	5.90%
23	175	4	833	144	7.50%	4.80%
24	165	5	43	1,014	19.00%	13.20%
25	136	5	195	1,282	26.20%	26.80%
26	145	5	275	485	25.30%	31.40%
27		Manhattan Total		6,058		
28						
29		Bronx				
30	155	7	139	787	22.90%	27.10%
31	171	7	151	565	14.70%	20.10%
32	151	7	162	733	23.60%	23.90%
33	138	7	183	705	25.80%	29.50%
34	152	8	52	578	23.50%	16.90%
35	160	8	74	849	20.10%	22.40%
36	134	8	120	335	26.50%	23.80%
37	143	9	22	1,447	25.70%	25.00%
38	150	9	82	1,086	23.90%	16.10%
39	142	9	147	1,416	25.70%	20.50%
40	167	9	148	769	17.90%	13.60%
41	130	9	229	651	27.20%	18.40%

The 50 Lowest Performing Middle Schools in New York City

Based Upon Citywide Reading Examination
Administered in May, 1995

	B	C	D	E	F	G
42						
43	Citywide					
44	Rank	District	School	# Students	Reading	Math
45		Bronx				
46	156	10	115	830	22.40%	20.60%
47	163	10	137	779	19.50%	18.40%
48	128	12	116	1,122	27.50%	30.70%
49	129	12	158	985	27.20%	24.40%
50	162	12	193	776	19.50%	15.80%
51	148	12	200	665	24.70%	18.80%
52		**Bronx Total**		**15,078**		
53						
54		Brooklyn:				
55	146	13	117	565	25.20%	22.20%
56	133	15	136	933	26.60%	28.30%
57	154	16	57	823	23.00%	18.90%
58	131	16	324	967	26.90%	22.70%
59	144	17	246	1,240	25.30%	24.70%
60	147	19	292	910	24.90%	23.40%
61	127	23	55	733	27.50%	24.30%
62	141	23	263	607	25.70%	26.10%
63	164	32	111	1,163	19.30%	23.00%
64	158	32	291	1,106	20.60%	25.80%
65	176	32	300	63	6.80%	9.00%
66		**Brooklyn Total**		**9,110**		
67						
68		**Citywide Total**		**30,246**		
69						

DISTRICT 1 - LOWER EAST SIDE, MANHATTAN

9,282	Students
$89.7M	Annual Spending
31%	Reading at Grade Level
51%	Doing Math at Grade Level

18	Elementary Schools; 8 in Bottom 150 Citywide
3	Middle/Junior High Schools; 1 in Bottom 50 Citywide
4	Schools Under Registration Review:

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
1	15	272	2	19.3	18.1
1	22	692	1	29.7	27.2
1	60	527	1	31.5	31.1
1	64	335	2	24.1	23.1

30% of District's 800 Graduates Attend Seward Park High School

Seward Park High School:

2,795	Students
37.0%	4 Year Graduation Rate
4.8%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
27.3%	11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
279	Average Verbal Score
450	Average Math Score

DISTRICT 5, HARLEM

13,212 Students
$97.9M Annual Spending
29% Reading at Grade Level
47% Doing Math at Grade Level

---

14 Elementary Schools; 8 in Bottom 150 Citywide
5 Middle/Junior High Schools; 3 in Bottom 50 Citywide
5 Schools Under Registration Review:

District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Percent At/Above Grade Level Math	Reading
5	43	1,014	4	26.1	25.7
5	123	961	6	29.5	33.2
5	154	682	7	23.0	19.3
5	161	971	2	37.6	28.3
5	200	1,016	1	25.6	20.6

29% of District's 1,036 Graduates Attend Either Graphic Communication Arts High School or Brandeis High School

Graphic Communication Arts High School:

1,922 Students
37.3% 4 Year Graduation Rate
5.2% Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
11.4% 11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
342 Average Verbal Score
345 Average Math Score

Brandeis High School:

2,764 Students
28.7% 4 Year Graduation Rate
4.0% Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
12.6% 11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
296 Average Verbal Score
352 Average Math Score

DISTRICT 6, WASHINGTON HEIGHTS

27,750	Students
$198.9M	Annual Spending
34%	Reading at Grade Level
58%	Doing Math at Grade Level

16	Elementary Schools; 7 in Bottom 150 Citywide
8	Middle/Junior High Schools; 0 in Bottom 50 Citywide
2	Schools Under Registration Review:

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
6	28	1,421	2	21.5	24.7
6	128	1,578	4	38.4	22.9

40% of District's 2,168 Graduates Attend Either George Washington High School or Brandeis High School

George Washington High School: This High School is Under Registration Review

3,722	Students
32.8%	4 Year Graduation Rate
2.0%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
19.0%	11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
281	Average Verbal Score
331	Average Math Score

Brandeis High School:

2,764	Students
28.7%	4 Year Graduation Rate
4.0%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
12.6%	11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
296	Average Verbal Score
352	Average Math Score

DISTRICT 7, SOUTH BRONX, HUNTS POINT

13,840	Students
$117.9M	Annual Spending
29%	Reading at Grade Level
45%	Doing Math at Grade Level

16	Elementary Schools; 11 in Bottom 150 Citywide
6	Middle/Junior High Schools; 4 in Bottom 50 Citywide
7	Schools Under Registration Review:

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
7	27	630	7	45.4	19.3
7	40	587	4	42.6	26.5
7	43	515	1	13.2	19.0
7	65	802	7	37.7	23.2
7	156	900	2	16.1	23.9
7	157	683	7	23.2	25.7

29% of District's 1,480 Graduates Attend Either Morris, South Bronx or Walton High Schools

Morris High School:

1,775	Students
26.7%	4 Year Graduation Rate
0.0%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
12.9%	11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
295	Average Verbal Score
332	Average Math Score

Walton High School:

2,575	Students
32.5%	4 Year Graduation Rate
1.6%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
19.9%	11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
286	Average Verbal Score
340	Average Math Score

South Bronx High School:

935	Students
32.7%	4 Year Graduation Rate
0.0%	Of Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
13.4%	Of 11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
283	Average Verbal Score
314	Average Math Score

DISTRICT 9, WEST BRONX

29,688	Students
$220.5M	Annual Spending
25%	Reading at Grade Level
43%	Doing Math at Grade Level

25	Elementary Schools; 15 in Bottom 150 Citywide
8	Middle/Junior High Schools; 5 in Bottom 50 Citywide
13	Schools Under Registration Review:

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
9	4	647	6	29.4	23.3
9	22	1,447	2	13.4	14.7
9	28	1,160	4	41.4	43.4
9	63	877	7	39.6	23.5
9	64	873	7	25.3	25.2
9	82	1,086	2	38.3	40.0
9	104	1,073	4	16.9	23.5
9	109	916	2	37.5	12.9
9	114	990	7	22.4	20.1
9	117	955	7	37.0	25.6
9	147	1,416	6	32.4	20.6
9	148	769	6	na	na
9	235	414	7	20.8	25.7

48%	of District's 2,513 Graduates Attend Either Taft, Theodore Roosevelt or Walton High Schools

Taft High School:

4,225	Students
25.0%	4 Year Graduation Rate
3.5%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
13.3	11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
286	Average Verbal Score
324	Average Math Score

Theodore Roosevelt High School:

4145	Students
31.8%	4 Year Graduation Rate
3.7%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
12.5%	11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
290	Average Verbal Score
354	Average Math Score

Walton High School:

2,575	Students
32.5%	4 Year Graduation Rate
1.6%	Of Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
19.9%	Of 11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
286	Average Verbal Score
340	Average Math Score

DISTRICT 17

26,504	Students
$185.8M	Annual Spending
31%	Reading at Grade Level
46%	Doing Math at Grade Level

21	Elementary Schools; 2 in Bottom 150 Citywide
5	Middle/Junior High Schools; 2 in Bottom 50 Citywide
3	Schools Under Registration Review:

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
17	92	1,195	7	20.6	22.4
17	191	977	1	40.4	30.3
17	320	1,518	2	37.9	37.0

23% Of District's 2,597 Graduates Attend Either Prospect Heights, Wingate or Erasmus Hall High Schools

Prospect Heights High School:

2,363	Students
37.3%	4 Year Graduation Rate
4.0%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
14.1%	11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
310	Average Verbal Score
347	Average Math Score

Erasmus Hall High School:

658	Students
26.6%	4 Year Graduation Rate
0.0%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
na	11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
na	Average Verbal Score
na	Average Math Score

Wingate High School:

2,926	Students
34.0%	4 Year Graduation Rate
6.7%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
20.4%	11th & 12th Graders Take the SAT
304	Average Verbal Score
353	Average Math Score

DISTRICT 19, EAST NEW YORK

23,915	Students
$180.3M	Annual Spending
29%	Reading at Grade Level
44%	Doing Math at Grade Level

21	Elementary Schools; 9 in Bottom 150 Citywide
7	Middle/Junior High Schools; 1 in Bottom 50 Citywide
2	Schools Under Registration Review:

				Percent At/Above Grade Level	
District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Math	Reading
19	224	830	1	22.2	25.2
19	328	779	1	23.3	31.5

27% of District's 2,050 Graduates Attend Franklin K. Lane High School

Franklin K. Lane High School: This High School is Under Registration Review

4663	Students
41.1%	4 Year Graduation Rate
3.6%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
13.5%	11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
333	Average Verbal Score
399	Average Math Score

DISTRICT 32, BUSHWICK

14,697	Students
$109.1M	Annual Spending
33%	Reading at Grade Level
51%	Doing Math at Grade Level

11	Elementary Schools; 7 in Bottom 150 Citywide
6	Middle/Junior High Schools; 3 in Bottom 50 Citywide
4	Schools Under Registration Review:

District	School	Enrollment	Yrs. on List	Percent At/Above Grade Level	
				Math	Reading
32	106	584	1	43.0	24.4
32	111	1,163	7	18.4	19.5
32	274	1,166	7	19.5	26.9
32	291	1,106	6	25.8	16.0

32% of District's 1,819 Graduates Attend Bushwick High School

Bushwick High School:

2,536	Students
30.0%	4 Year Graduation Rate
4.7%	Graduates Attain Regents Diplomas
10.6%	11th and 12th Graders Take the SAT
292	Average Verbal Score
341	Average Math Score

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

UD031851

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: FUTURES DENIED: CONCENTRATED FAILURE IN THE NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM	
Author(s): Parents Organized to Win Education Reform	
Corporate Source: Industrial Areas Foundation-Metro NY and Public Education Association	Publication Date: March, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

[X]

Check here For Level 1 Release: Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

[ ]

Check here For Level 2 Release: Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Raymond Domanico	Printed Name/Position/Title: Raymond Domanico, Executive Director	
Organization/Address: Public Education Association 39 West 32nd Street New York, NY 10001	Telephone: (212) 868-1640	FAX: (212) 268-7344
	E-Mail Address: www.pea-online.org	Date: 6/11/97

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: Industrial Areas Foundation-Metro NY and Public Education Associatiom

Address:
39 West 32nd Street
New York, NY 10001

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Box 40, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: