School Quality Reports
Educator Guide

Transfer High Schools
2015-16

Last Updated: October 25, 2016

Overview

The School Quality Reports are an important part of the New York City Department of Education's (NYC DOE's) efforts to share information about school performance, set expectations for schools, and promote school improvement. The School Quality Reports include (1) the **School Quality Snapshot**, a short report designed primarily to give families and community members a summary of key information about a school's practices and performance, and (2) the **School Quality Guide**, a more detailed report designed primarily to assist educators with their efforts at school improvement, but also publicly available for community members interested in more information about the school.

The School Quality Reports include information from a variety of sources, including Quality Reviews, the NYC School Survey, and student performance in courses and on state tests. The School Quality Reports provide context for a school's performance results by including the results of a Comparison Group, consisting of similar students from throughout the city. The School Quality Guide also includes customized, school-specific targets for each quantitative metric, set in advance primarily based on the past performance of the school's Comparison Group of similar students.

This Educator Guide describes the methodology used to calculate metric values and ratings in the School Quality Reports.

School Quality Report Sections

The School Quality Reports are organized around the Framework for Great Schools, which sets forth six elements—Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, Supportive Environment, Effective School Leadership, Strong Family-Community Ties, and Trust—that drive student achievement and school improvement.

The School Quality Reports do not include an overall grade or rating for the school. Instead, they share ratings and information on how schools are performing on the six Framework elements and on Student Achievement.

Rigorous Instruction: This rating reflects the degree to which curriculum and instruction are designed to engage students, foster critical-thinking skills, and are aligned to the Common Core. This section draws upon data from the Quality Review and the NYC School Survey.

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

Supportive Environment: This rating reflects the degree to which the school establishes a culture where students feel safe, challenged to grow, and supported to meet high expectations. This section draws upon data from the Quality Review, the NYC School Survey, average change in student attendance, and movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments.

Effective School Leadership: This rating reflects the degree to which school leadership inspires the school community with a clear instructional vision and effectively distributes leadership to realize this vision. This section draws upon data from the NYC School Survey.

Strong Family-Community Ties: This rating reflects the degree to which the school forms effective partnerships with families to improve the school. This section draws upon data from the NYC School Survey.

Trust: This rating reflects the degree to which relationships between administrators, educators, students, and families are based on trust and respect. This section draws upon data from the NYC School Survey.

Student Achievement: This rating reflects students' progress towards graduation by accumulating credits and passing Regents exams, graduation rates, college and career readiness, and how students in higher-need groups performed. The section rating will be based on how the school performed against the targets published in the prior year's School Quality Guide.

These section ratings are presented on a four-level scale. In the School Quality Guide, the four levels are called Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, Approaching Target, and Not Meeting Target. In the School Quality Snapshots, the four levels are called Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor.

New York State School Designations

New York State implements a state accountability system, which measures student performance on NYS ELA and math exams and Regents exams as well as graduation rates. State accountability status is not incorporated into the School Quality Guide ratings, but is another tool used to evaluate school performance.

Definitions

School Quality Report School Type

For 2015-16, School Quality Reports are provided for the following school types:

School Type	Grades and Students Served
Early Childhood School	K, K-1, K-2, K-3
Elementary School	K-4, K-5, and K-6
K-8 School*	K-7, K-8, and K-12 (minus grades 9-12)
Middle School	5-8, 6-8, and 6-12 (minus grades 9-12)
District 75 Schools	K-8 and K-12, focused on students with disabilities
High School	9-12, K-12 (minus grades K-8), and 6-12 (minus grades 6-8)
Transfer High Schools	9-12, focused on overage and undercredited students.
Young Adult Borough Center (YABC) Programs	9-12, focused on overage and undercredited students

* If a new K-8 school has grade 6, but does not yet have grades 3 or 4 it will be considered a middle school until it adds one of those grades.

This document details the rules for the School Quality Reports for transfer high schools. Separate Educator's Guides detail the rules for the other school types.

Survey School Type

For analyzing and scoring survey results in the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, schools are categorized by a survey school type:

School Type	Grades and Students Served
Early Childhood School	K, K-1, K-2, K-3
Elementary School	K-4, K-5, K-6
Elementary / Middle School	K-7, K-8
Elementary / Middle / High School	K-12
Middle School	5-8, 6-8
Middle / High School	5-12, 6-12
High School	9-12
Transfer High School	Transfer High School
YABC	YABC
District 75 School	District 75 School

Comparison Group

Please see pages 18-20of the Educator Guide for a detailed explanation of a school's Comparison Group.

Economic Need Index

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

- The student's Economic Need Value is 1.0 if:
    - The student is eligible for public assistance from the NYC Human Resources Administration (HRA); or
    - The student lived in temporary housing in the past four years; or
    - The student has a home language other than English and entered the NYC DOE for the first time within the last four years.
- Otherwise, the student's Economic Need Value is based on the percentage of families (with school-age children) in the student's Census tract whose income is below the poverty level, as estimated by the American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate. The student's Economic Need Value equals this percentage divided by 100.
- The school's Economic Need Index is the average of its students' Economic Need Values.

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

The school's Economic Need Index is used as part of the matching process to create Comparison Groups.

Minimum N (Number of Students)

In general, the minimum number of values used for reported calculations at the school level is 15. For Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, the minimum number of students for each metric is five. Metrics are excluded for a school when the sample-size criteria are not met because of confidentiality considerations and the unreliability of measurements based on small numbers.

Year in High School / Cohort Letter

A student's cohort is generally determined by the amount of time that has passed since the year that the student entered ninth grade. A group of students in the same year in high school is referred to as a "cohort" and each cohort is assigned a letter of the alphabet. The following table shows the group of students corresponding to each cohort letter:

Year in High School During 2015-16	Cohort Letter	Ninth Grade Entry School Year
First	U	2015-16
Second	T	2014-15
Third	S	2013-14
Fourth	R	2012-13
Fifth	Q	2011-12
Sixth	P	2010-11

In general, transfer school cohorts work the same as the ATS cohort (and students who entered ninth grade in 2010-11 are assigned to Cohort P)—but there are two differences. First, students who entered the school "most-at-risk" are given seven years to graduate for transfer school graduation metrics. They are therefore moved from ATS Cohort O to Transfer School Cohort P, for purposes of transfer school graduation metrics. Second, any students from ATS Cohort O or earlier who graduated during 2015-16 also contribute to the transfer school graduation metrics. They are therefore also moved to Transfer School Cohort P for purposes of transfer school graduation metrics.

Overage/Undercredited

A student is considered overage/under-credited based on the following criteria (where age is as of December 31 of the entry school year, and the credits and Regents are before the start of the entry school year).

Age	Criteria
16	• Under 11 credits; or • Under 22 credits and zero Regents passed.
17	• Under 22 credits; or • Under 33 credits and zero Regents passed.
18	• Under 33 credits and four or fewer Regents passed.
19 or older	• Under 33 credits; or • Under 44 credits and four or fewer Regents passed; or • Two or fewer Regents passed.

For students entering a high school from outside of the DOE, a credits-only criteria is used (because those students generally would not have taken Regents exams at their prior school).

Age	Criteria for students entering from outside of DOE
16	• Under 11 credits.
17	• Under 22 credits.
18	• Under 33 credits.
19 or older	• Under 44 credits.

Students with history of incarceration are also considered overage/undercredited.

Most-at-Risk

A subset of the overage/undercredited category is called “most at risk,” and takes into account students who are very far behind when they enter the school. A student is considered “most at risk” based on the following criteria (where age is as of December 31 of the entry school year, and the credits and Regents are before the start of the entry school year).

Age	Criteria
16	• Under 11 credits and zero Regents passed.
17	• Under 11 credits; or • Under 22 credits and zero Regents passed.
18	• Under 22 credits and three or fewer Regents passed.
19 or older	• Under 22 credits; or • Under 44 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.

For students entering a high school from outside of the DOE, a credits-only criteria is used (because those students generally would not have taken Regents exams at their prior school).

Age	Criteria for students entering from outside of DOE
16	• Under 11 credits.
17	• Under 11 credits.
18	• Under 22 credits.
19 or older	• Under 33 credits.

Students with history of incarceration are also considered most at risk.

Student Achievement
Metrics

This section describes the Student Achievement metrics in the School Quality Guide. The School Quality Snapshot includes a subset of those metrics.

Progress Toward Graduation

Student Attribution for Progress Toward Graduation Metrics

Students in grades 9-12 who are continuously accountable in the NYC DOE from October 31, 2015 through June 30, 2016 are attributed to the last diploma-granting school responsible as of June 30, 2016.

A student is considered continuously accountable for the year if the student is accountable to one or more NYC DOE schools or programs on every day from October 31 through June 30. Students who receive a cohort-removing discharge during the period are non-accountable for the year. Students who enter the DOE for the first time or who return from a cohort-removing discharge during the period are also non-accountable.

Students who graduate mid-year remain accountable for the remainder of that school year only. Students who are discharged with anything other than a cohort-removing discharge or graduation are considered dropped out. Dropped-out students remain accountable for one year, or until the end of their sixth year of high school, whichever comes first. Students in non-diploma granting programs, such as YABC, GED, home/hospital instruction, or programs for incarcerated students, are also accountable through the end of the sixth year of high school. Dropped-out students and students in non-diploma granting programs are accountable for the same time period as dropped-out students.

► *Credit Accumulation Per Year: Students Beginning with 0.00 - 11.00 Credits; Students Beginning with 11.01 - 22.00 Credits; Students Beginning with 22.01 - 33.00 Credits; Students Beginning with 33.01 - 38.00 Credits*

These metrics evaluate the average credits earned per year for students with different credits at the start of the school year.

Students who start the year with more than 38 credits are excluded from these measures as the relevant measure for these students is graduation. NYSAA-eligible students are excluded from this measure.

Students who meet the inclusion criteria contribute different values to the denominator based on the proportion of the year they were enrolled. Students who are dropped out as of June 30th have a denominator contribution of 1.0. Students that are still enrolled or graduated will be assigned a denominator contribution based on the proportion of the year the student was enrolled (marked present or absent) at that particular school. For example, if a student transferred from a regular high school to a transfer high school on February 1st, the denominator contribution would

be about 0.5. Any student enrolled for 90% or more of the school year has a denominator contribution of 1.0.

In the numerator, only credits earned at the accountable transfer school will be included, plus any credits earned at any summer school that year. The credit cap for each student is 16 times the denominator contribution.

► *Average Completion Rate for Remaining Regents*

This metric evaluates a school's ability to help students progress each year toward passing the five Regents subject tests required for a Regents diploma: English, Math, Science, Social Studies, and an "additional" exam. The "additional" exam can be a second exam in Math, Science, or Social Studies. This metric applies to students in years two, three, four, five, and six of high school.

The metric value for the school is the total number of needed subjects passed (the numerator) divided by the total number of needed subjects (the denominator).

For students in years three through six of high school, the denominator contribution (exams needed) is the total number of subjects not passed as of the beginning of 2015-16. The numerator (exams passed) is the total number of needed subjects passed in 2015-16.

For students in year two of high school, the first and second years are considered together as if they were one long year. Also, because second-year students are only expected to have passed any three of the five subjects total, the denominator contribution (exams needed) is three minus the number of subjects passed in middle school. The numerator contribution is the number of needed subjects passed during years one or two.

When applying these rules, the denominator is never allowed to go below zero and the numerator is never allowed to be higher than the denominator.

On Regents exams, the required passing score for all students in all exams is 65 or higher. Scores of "PR" on component exams are considered passing. RCT exams in the corresponding subject are also considered passing. Successful completion of state-approved Regents alternatives, including some Advanced Placement exams, International Baccalaureate exams, and SAT subject exams, also count towards satisfying the Regents requirements. The minimum acceptable scores that can be substituted for Regents exams are described on the NYSED website. Subjects with Regents waivers (WA) are excluded from the numerator and denominator unless the student actually takes an exam in that subject.

Exams that are failed have no impact on this metric. Since the denominator is based on the needed exams for the entire cohort, failing a needed exam counts the same as having never taken it. Students who are dropped out or in non-diploma granting programs contribute to this metric (until after their 6th year of high school). Students eligible for NYSAA are excluded. Schools with a waiver from the state to use portfolio assessments instead of some Regents exams do not get values for this metric.

► *Average Regents Score on the Following Exams:*

English (non-Common Core), English (Common Core), Living Environment, Global History, U.S. History, Algebra I (non-Common Core), Algebra I (Common Core)

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

NOTE: Because it was not possible to accurately predict who will take the Regents exams in advance, we shared *estimated* targets for these Regents score metrics in the 2014-15 School Quality Guide. These targets were adjusted based on the students at the school who actually took the exams. Similarly, the 2015-16 School Quality Guide will share estimated targets for 2016-17, which will be adjusted based on the students at the school who actually take the exams during 2016-17.

Graduation, Diploma, and Non-Dropout Metrics

Student Attribution

Transfer High School Graduation Cohort

Attribution for graduation metrics uses a separate system from the Progress Toward Graduation metrics. Students are attributed to the last diploma-granting school as of June 30 of the transfer school graduation deadline year. Consistent with state and federal graduation reporting rules, continuous enrollment is not necessary. Any student enrolled for one or more days (including no-shows) is accountable if their enrollment represents the last diploma-granting school before June 30 of the transfer school graduation deadline year.

The transfer school graduation deadline for a student can either be the end of year six of high school or the end of year seven of high school. If the student entered the transfer school most-at-risk overage/under-credited in year five or six, then the graduation deadline is the end of year seven. Otherwise, it is the end of year six.

For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, a transfer school's graduation cohort, represented by the letter 'P', consists of all students who:

- Have a transfer high school graduation deadline of 2016; or had a transfer high school graduation deadline before 2016 and graduated during 2016;
- Were active in the school as of June 30, 2016, or the school is the last diploma-granting high school that they attended before June 30, 2016; *and*
- Did not meet the criteria for a documented cohort removing discharge (see below) before June 30, 2016.

There are limited circumstances under which a discharged student can become non-accountable. Dropped-out students and non-diploma granting program students still contribute toward the graduation rate denominator when the student's cohort reaches expected graduation. If the student leaves school for one of the reasons below before June 30 of year four, then the student will become non-accountable if all required documentation is collected and stored on file. For more information about discharges, please see the Transfer Discharge Guidelines.

Potentially Cohort-Removing Discharge Codes:

Code	Description
08	Admitted to nonpublic NY school with documentation
10	Discharged to a court-ordered placement (non-incarceration)

11	Transferred to a school outside of NYC with documentation
15	Deceased
20	Early admission to a four-year university
25	Already received a high-school diploma outside DOE at time of enrollment

► *Transfer High School Graduation Rate*

This metric reflects the percentage of students in the transfer school's graduation cohort (defined above) that graduated with a Regents or Local Diploma, including August graduates.

► *Transfer High School Persistence Rate*

This metric is the percentage of the students in the transfer school's graduation cohort (defined above) who have either earned a local or higher diploma, earned a HS equivalency (formerly known as GED), earned a CDOS/SACC (only NYSAA-eligible students), or are still enrolled in a DOE school or program with at least 50% attendance since February 1, 2016.

► *Transfer High School Graduation Rate by Category at Admission: Most at Risk, Other Overage/Undercredited, Non-Overage/Undercredited*

These metrics are similar to the transfer school graduation rate, except that they are limited to students who enter the transfer in different categories: most at risk, other overage/undercredited (i.e., overage/undercredited but not most at risk), or non-overage/undercredited.

College and Career Readiness Metrics

Student Attribution

For the College and Career Readiness metrics, students are attributed to the last diploma-granting school as of June 30 of the transfer school graduation cohort deadline year. The inclusion criteria are the same as those used for the graduation rate; both graduates and non-graduates are included.

If a student earns an Associate's Degree before the end of high school, that student contributes positively to all of the college and career readiness metrics regardless of whether they meet the other requirements.

► *College and Career Preparatory Course Index*

This metric indicates the percentage of students in the 2016 transfer school graduating cohort who have to have successfully completed approved rigorous courses and assessments after four years of high school.

A student who has accomplished any of the following achievements contributes positively to this metric:

- Scored 65+ on the Algebra II or Math B Regents exam;

- Scored 65+ on the Chemistry Regents exam;
- Scored 65+ on the Physics Regents exam;
- Scored 3+ on any Advanced Placement (AP) exam;
- Scored 4+ on any International Baccalaureate (IB) exam;
- Earned a grade of "C" or higher in a college credit-bearing course (e.g. College Now, Early College);
- Passed another course certified by the DOE as college- and career- ready;
- Earned a diploma with a Career and Technical Education (CTE) endorsement;
- Earned a diploma with an Arts endorsement; or
- Passed an industry-recognized technical assessment.

Students who meet more than one of the requirements above will only be counted once in the numerator.

► *Comprehensive Readiness Rate (including Enrollment)*

Phase-Out Metric
This metric is included in the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, but is being phased out and will not be included in the 2016-17 School Quality Reports.

This metric shows the percentage of students in the school's 2016 graduating cohort who, by June of their transfer school graduation deadline year, have graduated with a Local Diploma or higher and (1) have met CUNY's standards for college readiness in English and mathematics or (2) graduated and enrolled in a two- or four-year college, vocational program, or public service by June of their transfer school graduation deadline year.

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

Assessment	Minimum Score Needed
NYS English Regents	75
SAT Verbal (pre-March 2016)	480
SAT Reading Test (March 2016 and later)	26
ACT English	20
CUNY Assessment Test	Reading – 70 and Writing – 56

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

Assessment	Minimum Score Needed
Integrated Algebra, Geometry, or Algebra 2/Trigonometry Regents	80
Common Core Math Regents	70
SAT Math (pre-March 2016)	500

SAT Math (March 2016 and later)	530
ACT Math	21
CUNY Assessment Test	Math 2 – 40
New York State Performance Standards Consortium PBAT	Pass, plus coursework requirement

If a student uses a NYS Regents math exam (or PBAT) to demonstrate math proficiency, the student must also demonstrate completion of coursework through at least Algebra II / Trigonometry. Any of the following accomplishments satisfy the coursework requirement:

- Passing a course identified as Algebra II / Trigonometry or Pre-Calculus, and also attempting (scoring 1 or higher on) the Algebra II / Trigonometry Regents or any A.P. / I.B. math exam;
- Passing the Algebra II / Trigonometry Regents exam or any A.P. / I.B. math exam;
- Earning two credits in a course identified as Geometry and earning two credits in a course identified as Algebra II / Trigonometry or Pre-Calculus;
- Passing a course identified as Calculus; or
- Passing a course identified as a math class that results in college credit.

Math courses are identified by schools in STARS, with the exception of charter schools. Charter schools use the UACR screen in ATS to identify advanced math courses.

► *Transfer High School College Readiness Index*

Phase-In Metric

This metric is being phased into the School Quality Reports. It is not included in the 2015-16 ratings, but targets will be set for 2016-17 and it will be included in the 2016-17 School Quality Report ratings.

This metric shows the percentage of students in the school's 2016 graduating cohort who, by June of their transfer school graduation deadline year, have graduated with a Local Diploma or higher and have met CUNY's standards for college readiness in English and mathematics

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

This metric shows the percentage of students who have graduated and enrolled in a two- or four-year college, vocational program, or public service within six months of their transfer school graduation deadline. For the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, this metric evaluates the transfer school graduating cohort whose transfer school graduation deadline year is 2014-15. To contribute positively, a student must have graduated high school with a local or higher diploma and enrolled in a qualifying postsecondary program by December 31, 2015.

For this metric, public service includes enlistment in armed forces (U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard) or participation in AmeriCorps or the City Year Volunteer Corps.

Closing the Achievement Gap Metrics

These metrics reflect the degree to which the school helps high-need students succeed. In some cases, schools will not receive ratings for these metrics because those students make up a very small proportion of the school's student population.

The metric values show the school's results with its students in the relevant group. Data is not provided for any metric where the school has fewer than five students in the relevant high-need category. Metric scores and ratings show how the school's results compared to its targets. A metric will not be scored, however, if those students are a very small proportion of the school—specifically, if the school's population percentage is more than one standard deviation below the citywide average. These unscored metrics receive a rating of "N/A" in the School Quality Snapshot.

The following table summarizes these rules:

Closing the Achievement Gap	
No metric value if…	Fewer than five students in the category.
No metric score (or rating) if…	School's population percentage is more than one standard deviation below the citywide average.

► *Transfer School Graduation Rate for Student Subgroups: English Language Learners; Self-Contained, ICT, SETSS; Overage/Undercredited; Overage/Undercredited Black and Hispanic Males*

These metrics are calculated in the same way as the Transfer High School Graduation Rate, except that each metric is limited to students in each of the specified groups.

Students are included in the Students with Disabilities group if their most restrictive placement in the last five school years was self-contained, ICT, or SETSS.

Any student identified as an English Language Learner for any of the last five school years will be considered an ELL for this metric.

If a student belongs to more than one of these groups, the student is counted in all groups in which the student belongs.

► *College and Career Preparatory Course Index – Overage/Undercredited*

This metric is calculated in the same way as the corresponding metric for the school, except that the metric is limited to students in the specified group.

► *Comprehensive Readiness Rate (including Enrollment) – Overage/Undercredited*

Phase-Out Metric

This metric is included in the 2015-16 School Quality Reports, but is being phased out and will not be included in the 2016-17 School Quality Reports.

This metric is calculated in the same way as the corresponding metric for the school, except that the metric is limited to students in the specified group.

► *Transfer High School College Readiness Index – Overage/Undercredited*

Phase-In Metric
This metric is being phased into the School Quality Reports. It is not included in the 2015-16 ratings, but targets will be set for 2016-17 and it will be included in the 2016-17 School Quality Report ratings.

This metric is calculated in the same way as the corresponding metric for the school, except that the metric is limited to students in the specified group.

► *Postsecondary Enrollment Rate by Six Months after High School – Overage/Undercredited*

This metric is calculated in the same way as the corresponding metric for the school, except that the metric is limited to students in the specified group.

Student Achievement
Scores and Ratings

The 2015-16 School Quality Guides include scores and ratings based on the targets that were published in the 2014-15 School Quality Guides. Those targets were customized for each school, and were based mostly on the performance of the Comparison Group of similar students. The targets specified the values needed for a school to receive a metric rating of Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, Approaching Target, or Not Meeting Target.

Metric Scores and Ratings

For each metric, the school earns a metric score from 1.00 to 4.99 based on how the school's metric value compared to the published targets. The score is analogous to the state test proficiency ratings based on scale scores: the first digit indicates the rating level, and the subsequent digits show how close the result is to the next level.

- If the school did not meet its Approaching Target level, the first digit is 1.
- If the school met its Approaching Target level (but not higher targets), the first digit is 2.
- If the school met its Meeting Target level (but not the higher target), the first digit is 3.
- If the school met its Exceeding Target level, the first digit is 4.

The subsequent digits reflect where the school's value fell between the highest target level that it met and the next higher target level.

> **Example:** If a school surpassed the Meeting Target level (t3) but did not reach the Exceeding Target level (t4), the metric score would be: 3 + (school's metric value – t3) / (t4 – t3), with the score not to exceed 3.99.

> **Example:** If a school received a metric score of 2.50, the 2 means that the school's value met the Approaching Target level (but did not meet the Meeting Target level), and the .50 means that the school's result fell halfway between the Approaching Target level and the Meeting Target level.

To generate scores between 1.00 and 1.99 and between 4.00 and 4.99, a bottom and top of the target range must be used in addition to the published target levels. The bottom of the target range = 0.85 x 2014-15 bottom of Comparison Group range + 0.15 x 2014-15 bottom of city range. The top of the target range = 0.85 x 2014-15 top of Comparison Group range + 0.15 x 2014-15 top of city range.[1]

> **Example:** If a school surpassed the Exceeding Target level (t4), the metric score would be: 4 + (school's metric value – t4) / (top of target range – t4), with the score not to exceed 4.99.

[1] See pages 18-21 for further details on the Comparison Group range and city range.

In the School Quality Snapshot, the 4-bar ratings for specific metrics are based on the metric ratings described above.

Weighted Average Score

The Weighted Average Score is a weighted average of the Student Achievement metric scores (not including the Closing the Achievement Gap metrics), where each metric score is multiplied by its weight percentage.

If any metrics (not including the Closing the Achievement Gap metrics) are missing, their weight is distributed proportionally to the other metrics.

The weight percentage for each metric is listed in the Student Achievement Scoring Appendix in the 2015-16 School Quality Guides.

Closing the Achievement Gap Additional Points

The Closing the Achievement Gap metrics are additional points that can increase a school's Student Achievement score.

For each Closing the Achievement Gap metric, a score will be generated on the 1.00 – 4.99 scale, based on the published targets, in the same way as for the other Student Achievement metrics—except that the metric score will be blank (N/A) if the school's population percentage for the applicable high-need group is more than one standard deviation below the citywide average.

For each Closing the Achievement Gap metric, the extra points will be (metric score – 1.00) / (4.99 – 1.00) x extra points possible. The extra points possible are specified in the scoring appendix. If a Closing the Achievement Gap metric score is N/A, the extra points associated with that metric do not shift to any other metrics.

The total Closing the Achievement Gap Additional Points is the sum of the extra points earned on each metric.

Overall Student Achievement Score and Rating

The Overall Student Achievement Score equals the Weighted Average Score plus the Closing the Achievement Gap Additional Points, rounded to the nearest hundredth, and capped at 4.99.

The Student Achievement section rating will be based on the first digit of the Overall Student Achievement Score:

- If the first digit is 4, the section rating is Exceeding Target.
- If the first digit is 3, the section rating is Meeting Target.
- If the first digit is 2, the section rating is Approaching Target.
- If the first digit is 1, the section rating is Not Meeting Target.

Schools designated for phase-out and schools in their first year of operation in 2015-16 will not receive a Student Achievement rating.

Rating Labels in the Guide and Snapshot

The ratings in the School Quality Snapshot are the same as in the School Quality Guide, except that different rating labels are used in the Snapshot:

School Quality Guide Rating Labels	School Quality Snapshot Rating Labels
Exceeding Target	Excellent
Meeting Target	Good
Approaching Target	Fair
Not Meeting Target	Poor

Student Achievement

Metric Comparisons

In addition to the scores and ratings based on the targets published last year, the School Quality Reports provide context for a school's performance by sharing a variety of comparisons—including city averages, borough averages, and the results of a Comparison Group of similar students throughout the city.

City and Borough Averages

In general, city and borough averages are calculated by taking n-weighted averages of school-level results for all schools within the same school type. The n-weighting is based on the number of students at each school included in the metric; it means that a school with many students included in a metric will count more toward the city and borough averages than a school with fewer students included in that metric.

For graduation cohort metrics (including graduation rates, high school persistence rates, College Readiness Index metrics, College and Career Preparatory Course Index, post-secondary enrollment rates, and College Persistence), the city and borough averages are calculated based on the full cohort of high school students.

Comparison Group's Results

To understand how effectively a school is helping its students, it is important to take into account students' starting points and challenges that they face. Without that context, schools can be mischaracterized as ineffective simply because they serve higher-need students.

The School Quality Reports provide context for each school's performance by presenting the results of a Comparison Group of similar students. The Comparison Group takes into account the student population served by the school, and allows the reader to assess the school's effectiveness at helping its students improve. The Comparison Group results can be thought of as an estimate of how the students at the school would have performed if they had attended other schools throughout the city.

To generate the Comparison Group, each student at the main school is matched to the 50 most similar students from other schools throughout the city, based on prior test scores and demographic factors. The pool of potential students includes students at transfer high schools, YABC programs, and high schools. The similar students identified for each student are grouped together into a large Comparison Group. We then calculate the performance results (such as average test scores and graduation rates) of the Comparison Group.

The process of matching each student with the 50 most similar students involves two main steps.

- **Step 1:** For each student, the DOE identifies a large group of students who are exact matches on the following student characteristics:

Transfer High School (9+)
-Graduation Cohort -Overage/under-credited status -Year of Entry to Transfer HS (or year, if HS student) -IEP category (past 5 yrs)[2] -Temporary housing (past 4 years) or HRA-eligible

Example: If a student is in Cohort S, is overage/under-credited on entry in 2015, is in a self-contained disability setting, and was in temporary housing, the first step is to identify all other Cohort S Transfer HS students from other schools who are overage/undercredited on entry in 2015 or HS students who were overage/undercredited in 2015, and were in self-contained disability settings during the past 5 years, and are in temporary housing or eligible for public assistance.

- **Step 2:** Within the group of students identified in Step 1, the DOE finds the 50 students who are most similar to the main student based on the following factors:

High School (9+)
Primary Factors -Grade 8 ELA score -Grade 8 Math score **Secondary Factors** - School's % students with IEPs -School's Economic Need -School's % overage/undercredited -School's % ELL

- To find the 50 most similar students from the group, the primary factors are weighed more heavily than the secondary factors.

  Example: Student A is in her second year of high school. Her group of Step 1 matches includes Student B and Student C. Student A scored 2.8 on both her Grade 8 ELA and Math exams, Student B scored 2.1, and Student C scored 2.9. Student A is more likely to be matched with Student C than with Student B.

  Example: Student D is in his third year of high school. His group of Step 1 matches includes Student E and Student F. All three students scored 2.7 on both their Grade 8 ELA and Math exams. Student D's school has 25% students with disabilities, Student E's school has 23% students with disabilities, and Student F's school has 2% students with disabilities. Student D is more likely to be matched with Student E than with Student F.

- In addition to the primary factors based on the student's own characteristics, the secondary factors about school characteristics are also taken into account because the school's population can have peer effects on the student.

Once the Comparison Group has been established by finding 50 matches for each of the students attributed to the school for 2015-16, we calculate the performance results (such as graduation rate) achieved by that Comparison Group.

[2] The IEP category is defined as the most restrictive of the following three categories, over the lookback period: (1) Self-Contained, (2) ICT or SETSS, (3) Related Services only or no IEP.

> **Example:** For a school with 300 students, we find 50 matches for each student and the Comparison Group has 300 x 50 = 15,000 students in it.[3] We then calculate performance results for the Comparison Group—such as graduation rate.

The Comparison Group results are shared in the Snapshot and the Guide.

Citywide and Comparison Group Percent of Ranges

The School Quality Reports also use a comparison called "percent of range," including a citywide percent of range and a Comparison Group percent of range. These values are not displayed directly in the reports, but are used to calculate metric targets.

Range

The range spans two standard deviations above and below the average, and it represents a continuum from very poor to very strong results (excluding extreme outliers).

For example, if the average graduation rate was 70%, with a standard deviation of 10%, the top of the range is $70\% + 2 \times 10\% = 90\%$. And the bottom of the range is $70\% - 2 \times 10\% = 50\%$.

If the calculated top of the range extends beyond what is theoretically possible, the range is cut off so that only the possible values are used. For example, if the average core course pass rate for a peer group was 96% and the standard deviation was 3%, the peer range might extend up to 102%, which is impossible for a school to achieve. In that case, we would use 100% as the highest value in the range instead.

If the calculated bottom of the range is lower than the theoretical minimum for a metric, then the top of the range will be adjusted downward so that the average stays in the middle of the range. This ensures that a school that achieves the average will fall at the middle of the range.

The Comparison Group range is similar to the citywide range, with two differences. First, the middle of the range is the Comparison Group's result (instead of the citywide average). Second, the top and bottom of the range are two *conditional standard deviations* away from the middle. While the standard deviation used for the citywide range reflects how far away each school in the city was from the citywide mean, the conditional standard deviation used for the Comparison Group range reflects how far away each school in the city was from its own Comparison Group's result. The conditional standard deviation sheds light on the degree to which very poor performers fall below their Comparison Group's result and the degree to which very strong performance surpass their Comparison Group's result.

> **Example:** A school's 4-year graduation rate is 73%, which is 14% higher than the Comparison Group's 59%. Is the school's result exceptional, or just somewhat above average? If the conditional standard deviation is 7%, then the Comparison Group performance range runs from 45% to 73%. This school's result is at the top of this range, two conditional standard deviations above average—a very strong performance. Based on the conditional

[3] While the same student cannot appear more than once in an individual student's group of 50 matches, a student can appear multiple times in the school's Comparison Group. This will occur if the same student falls within the group of 50 matches for multiple students at the school.

standard deviation in this example, only a very small percentage of schools throughout the city would be expected to exceed their Comparison Group value by 14% on this metric. (Note that the conditional standard deviation used in this example is hypothetical.)

Percent of Range

The percent of range reflects the position of the school's result within the range.

The percent of range can be interpreted as showing how far along the path, from very poor performers to very strong performers, the school's result fell. For example, a percent of range of 70% means that the school's result covered 70% of the distance between the results of very poor performers and very strong performers.

Another way to interpret percent of range is based on standard deviations away from the mean:

Percent of Range	Interpretation
0%	Two or more standard deviations below average
25%	One standard deviation below average
50%	Equal to the average
75%	One standard deviation above average
100%	Two or more standard deviations above average

In general (assuming that results are normally distributed), approximately 2% of schools achieve results that are two or more standard deviations above (or below) average, approximately 15% of schools achieve results that are one or more standard deviations above (or below) average, and approximately two-thirds of schools achieve results within one standard deviation of the mean.

The percent of range can be calculated based on the following formula:

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

Student Achievement
Targets for 2016-17

The targets for 2016-17 are realistic and rigorous goals customized for each school, based on the historical performance of the Comparison Group and city schools. The targets are driven primarily by results that have been achieved in the past by the similar students in the Comparison Group, and also reflect results achieved by all schools citywide (of the same school type).

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

- **Step 1:** For each school, we calculate a "combined percent of range" (on a 0-100% scale) for each of its 2015-16 metric values. The combined percent of range is a weighted average of the school's Comparison Group percent of range (85%) and the school's citywide percent of range (15%). Step 1 results in each school having a combined-percent-of-range value for Student Achievement metric, which primarily reflects the school's performance against its Comparison Group performance range, and also takes into account its performance against the citywide performance range.

- **Step 2:** For each metric, we review the combined-percent-of-range results from from Step 1 for each school, and determine the cut levels associated with the 70th percentile, the 45th percentile, and the 10th percentile. These are combined-percent-of-range cut scores for Exceeding Target, Meeting Target, and Approaching Target.

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

  > **Example:** For a specific metric, suppose that Steps 1 and 2 produce a combined-percent-of-range cut level of 70% for Exceeding Target—meaning that only the top 30% of schools achieved combined-percent-of-range scores of 70% or higher on that metric in 2015-16. Suppose that a school's comparison range for ELA percent proficient ran from 10% to 40%. The school's specific target for ELA percent proficient in 2016-17 would be 70% of the way along that range—or 70% x (40% - 10%) + 10% = 31%.[4]

- **Step 4:** The targets calculated in Step 3 are compared to a set of floors and ceilings: the targets cannot fall below the floors and cannot be above the ceilings.

[4] This example is simplified because it refers to a single percent of range and comparison range. The actual target calculation is more complicated because it involves the combined percent of range and two comparison ranges (one for the Comparison Group and one for the city). But the concept is the same as what is described in the example.

These floors and ceilings are designed to prevent unreasonable results (e.g., a school receiving a very low metric rating despite achieving a very high raw metric value, or a school receiving a very high metric rating despite achieving a very low raw metric value). See Appendix B for a table of target floors and ceilings.

The Comparison Group range used in Step 3 of the target-setting is based on a Comparison Group of matches to the students attributed to the school in October 2016. The matching method works the same as described above in the section on Comparison Group Results, except that there is a one-year offset: each student at the school is matched to 50 students who were in the student's grade last year.

Example: To create a Comparison Group to set targets for 2016-17, the fourth graders at a school (in October 2016) are each matched to the closest 50 students throughout the city who were fourth graders in 2015-16 (and are fifth graders in 2016-17).

This approach allows the school's targets for 2016-17 to be customized and based on the closest matches to the specific students at the school in 2016-17.

The target levels will be used to generate metric ratings and scores in 2016-17. Although Step 2 of the target-setting process involves finding cut levels associated with fixed percentiles, the ratings for 2016-17 do not have a fixed distribution. Because these targets are set ahead of time, schools will not be competing for a limited number of top ratings. The percentages of schools achieving each rating will not be fixed, and will depend on how schools perform in 2016-17 against their targets. If all schools perform well, then all schools can get strong ratings.

Framework Elements

Metrics

The sections of the School Quality Reports on the Framework elements draw from the following data sources:

Section	Data
Rigorous Instruction	Quality Review indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2; NYC School Survey data related to Rigorous Instruction
Collaborative Teachers	Quality Review indicator 4.2; NYC School Survey data related to Collaborative Teachers
Supportive Environment	Quality Review indicator 3.4; NYC School Survey data related to Supportive Environment; student chronic absenteeism; movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments
Effective School Leadership	NYC School Survey data related to Effective School Leadership
Strong Family-Community Ties	NYC School Survey data related to Strong Family-Community Ties
Trust	NYC School Survey data related to Trust

Quality Review

The School Quality Reports include ratings that the school received during its most recent Quality Review (that took place after August 2012) on the following five indicators:

1.1	Ensure engaging, rigorous, and coherent curricula in all subjects, accessible for a variety of learners and aligned to Common Core Learning Standards and/or content standards.
1.2	Develop teacher pedagogy from a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best that is informed by the instructional shifts and Danielson Framework for Teaching, aligned to the curricula, engaging, and meets the needs of all learners so that all students produce meaningful work products.
2.2	Align assessments to curricula, use on-going assessment and grading practices, and analyze information on student learning outcomes to adjust instructional decisions at the team and classroom levels.
3.4	Establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to staff, students and families, and provide supports to achieve those expectations.
4.2	Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams using an inquiry approach that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning.

For each indicator, the rating given to the school by the reviewer is presented on a four-level scale, corresponding to the ratings of Well Developed, Proficient, Developing, and Underdeveloped. The School Quality Guide includes short excerpts from the Quality Review report.

For additional information about the Quality Review, please visit http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/tools/review/default.htm.

NYC School Survey

The NYC School Survey is administered annually to parents, teachers, and students in 6th grade and above. The survey was designed to gather information from school communities on the six elements of the Framework for Great Schools.

The survey is organized as groups of questions relating to a measure, and groups of measures relating to an element.

- **Example:** The element of Rigorous Instruction is composed of four measures: Common Core Shifts in Literacy, Common Core Shifts in Math, Course Clarity, and Quality of Student Discussion. The NYC School Survey includes groups of questions related to each of those four measures.

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

► *Question-Level Percent Positive*

For each survey question, we calculate the percentage of "positive" responses (excluding "I don't know" or missing responses from the denominator).

Positive responses are defined as those in the favorable half of response options (i.e., out of four possible response options, the two most favorable options are treated as positive responses).

► *Measure-Level Percent Positive*

For each measure, we calculate the percentage of positive responses. This value is the average of the question-level percent positives of all the questions that fall within the measure.

► *Element-Level Percent Positive*

For each element, we calculate the percentage of positive responses. This value is not simply the average of the percent positives of all the questions that fall within the element. Instead, this value is the average of the measure-level percent positives for all the measures within the element. (For example, the percent positive for the Rigorous Instruction element is the average of the percent positives on its four measures: Common Core Shifts in Literacy, Common Core Shifts in Math, Course Clarity, and Quality of Student Discussion.)

The School Quality Snapshot reports element-level percent positives as well as the percent positives for selected questions.

NYC School Survey Reports, which include detailed information about the responses to each survey question, are available at each school's website. For additional information about the survey, please visit http://schools.nyc.gov/surveys or email surveys@schools.nyc.gov.

Other Metrics

► *Average Change in Student Attendance*

This measure presents a school's average change in student attendance from 2014-15 to 2015-16. This measure looks at two pieces of information for each student:

- Student's attendance rate for 2014-15. (Note: The student's attendance rate is the aggregate rate for any New York City public school(s) the student attended in 2014-15.)

- Student's attendance rate for 2015-16 (Note: The student's attendance rate only includes the rate for the school under evaluation.)

To be included in this metric, a student must have an attendance rate for the 2014-15 school year with a minimum aggregate of 40 days on register at any New York City schools during that year. Additionally, at the school under evaluation during the 2015-16 school year, the student must have been on that school's register for a minimum of 40 days.

This metric value for the school is calculated by taking the average of each student's change in attendance rate from 2014-15 to 2015-16, for all students at the school under evaluation.

► *Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments*

This measure recognizes schools that educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment that is educationally appropriate. Students with an IEP during any of the last four school years are sorted into four tiers based on primary program recommendations and the amount of time spent with general education peers, as of the end of September of each year. The denominator for this measure includes all K-8 students with tier two or higher in any of the years 2014-15, 2013-14, or 2012-13. Students who are newly certified in 2015-16 are excluded.

The numerator contribution of each student is the highest tier number from the last four school years minus the tier number for 2015-16. This number can range from zero (for students who are in their highest tier in 2015-16) to three (for students who were previously in Tier Four and are in Tier One in 2015-16). Negative numbers are not possible; students who move to a more restrictive environment count the same as if they had always been in that setting.

Tier One – General education

- No IEP, or
- IEP with a recommendation of related services only

Tier Two – 80-100% of time with general education peers

- Primary recommendation of SETSS or ICT, or
- Primary recommendation of self-contained, spend 80-100% of instructional periods with general education peers

Tier Three – 40-79% of time with general education peers

- Primary recommendation of self-contained, spend 40-79% of instructional periods with general education peers

Tier Four – 0-39% of time with general education peers

- Primary recommendation of self-contained, spend 0-39% of instructional periods with general education peers

Framework Elements

Scoring and Ratings

Ratings on each element of the Framework are generated from the raw metric scores (described in the previous section of this Educator Guide) through a multi-step process:

- **Step 1:** Raw metric values are collected from data sources.
- **Step 2:** Raw metric values are converted into standard scores[5], on a scale from 1.00 – 4.99.
- **Step 3:** Standard scores on different metrics are combined to generate element scores for the school.
- **Step 4:** The element scores are used to generate element ratings.

This section of the Educator Guide explains this multi-step process for the different data sources and elements. It explains how raw metric scores are converted into standard scores for Quality Reviews, the NYC School Survey, chronic absenteeism, and movement of students with disabilities to less restrictive environments. It explains how the standard scores on metrics are combined into element scores for the six elements—Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, Supportive Environment, Effective School Leadership, Strong Family-Community Ties, and Trust. It then explains how ratings are determined for each of the six elements.

Converting Metric Values into Standard Scores

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

For ease of interpretation, the standard scores are placed on a scale from 1.00 – 4.99 (similar to the scoring scale for the Student Achievement metrics), where 1, 2, 3, 4 reflect the cut levels for the four ratings.

Quality Reviews

Quality Review ratings on Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, and 4.2 are converted into standard scores as follows:

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

[5] "Standard scores" place the raw scores on different metrics onto a common scale, so that scores on different metrics can be combined.

The scoring uses a school's most recent published Quality Review ratings, from a review that took place after August 2013. If a school's most recent review took place in August 2013 or earlier, the Quality Review scores are N/A.

NYC School Survey

For purposes of survey scoring, schools are categorized by survey school type, and are compared to other schools of the same survey school type.[6]

The scoring method for the NYC School Survey follows the structure of the survey, which was organized as groups of questions relating to a measure, and groups of measures relating to an element.[7] Measures are sub-topics within each element.

The following process is used to generate a *standard survey element score* from *raw question scores*:

(1) Raw question score (based on percent positive responses to question)
↓
(2) Raw measure score (based on average of raw question scores for all questions within the measure)
↓
(3) Standard measure score (standardized version of raw measure score)
↓
(4) Standard survey element score (based on average of standard measure scores for all measures within the element)

Each step in this process is described in detail below.

(1) Raw question score

For each question, the *raw question score* is the percent of "positive" responses (excluding "I don't know" or missing responses from the denominator).

"Positive" responses are defined as those in the favorable half of response options (i.e., out of four possible response options, the two most favorable options are treated as positive responses; out of six possible response options, the three most favorable are treated as positive responses).

(2) Raw measure score

This metric is the average of the *raw question scores* for all questions within the measure.

For example, Outreach to Parents is a measure (within the element of Strong Family-Community Ties). The Outreach to Parents score is the average of the raw question scores on all the Outreach to Parents questions.

(3) Standard measure score

This metric is a standardized version of the *raw measure score,* which is converted to a scale that reflects standard deviations away from the mean. This standard score

[6] See the Definitions section of this Educator Guide for more information on the survey school types.
[7] See Appendix B for a detailed explanation of the element-measure-question survey structure.

uses the “percent of range” method, which shows where the school’s score falls with a range of two standard deviations above and below the city average (for the same survey school type).

For example, if the school is an Early Childhood School, the average and standard deviation are calculated based on the results from all Early Childhood Schools throughout the city.

The standard measure score is calculated by first calculating percent of range = (raw score – bottom of range) / (top of range – bottom of range), where top of range = city average + 2 standard deviations and bottom of range = city average – 2 standard deviations. The top of the range cannot exceed the maximum possible score of 100 and the bottom of the range cannot fall below the minimum possible score of 0. The percent of range is then converted from a 0 – 100 scale to a 1.00 – 4.99 scale using the following method: standard score = 1.00 + (percent of range / 25), with result capped at 4.99.

After the standard score is calculated using the percent-of-range method, an additional rule is applied: If the *raw measure score* meets certain thresholds, then the *standard measure score* cannot fall below certain floor levels:

If raw measure score is at least…	Standard measure score cannot fall below…
95%	4.00
90%	3.00
85%	2.00

(4) Standard survey element score

This metric is the average of the *standard measure scores* for all measures within the element.

For example, the Strong Family-Community Ties element contains two measures: Teacher Outreach to Parents and Parent Involvement in the School. The school’s *standard survey element score* for the Strong Family-Community Ties element is the average of the *standard measure score* for the Teacher Outreach to Parents measure and the *standard measure score* for the Parent Involvement in the School measure.

Low Response Rates and Numbers

Each element in the Framework draws primarily from questions asked of one (or two) respondent groups. If there was a low response rate or very few responses submitted by that respondent group, then the *standard survey element score* will be N/A. The following table describes these situations:

Element	Standard survey element score will be N/A if…
Rigorous Instruction	• Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded.
Collaborative Teachers	• Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded.

Supportive Environment	For Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools: • Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded. For other school types: • Student response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 students responded.
Effective School Leadership	• Teacher response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded.
Strong Family-Community Ties	• Average of teacher response rate and parent response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded, or • Fewer than 5 parents responded.
Trust	• Average of teacher response rate and parent response rate was less than 30%, or • Fewer than 5 teachers responded, or • Fewer than 5 parents responded.

Average Change in Student Attendance

The raw value of this metric shows the average change in attendance rate of the students at the school under evaluation. The standard score for this metric is calculated based on how the school performed against its targets published in the 2014-15 School Quality Reports. It is calculated based on the same methodology used to calculate metric scores for Student Achievement metrics based on targets, as described on page 15of this Educator Guide.

Movement of Students with Disabilities to Less Restrictive Environments

The standard score for this metric is based on how the school performed against its targets published in the 2014-15 School Quality Guide. It is calculated based on the same methodology used to calculate metric scores for Student Achievement metrics based on targets, as described on page 15 of this Educator Guide.

Framework Element Scores

This section explains how the standard scores from the various data sources are combined to create elements scores.

Weighted Average of Standard Scores

The school's element scores are a weighted average of the standard scores from the data sources within each element category. The weights applied depend on the

survey response rate(s) of the primary group(s) of respondents asked about that element on the NYC School Survey. When survey responses rates are lower, greater weight is given to non-survey data sources within that element (when non-survey data sources are available). If the survey response rates or numbers fall below specified thresholds, the element score will be N/A. The following table shows the weights applied to the different data sources to produce the element scores:

Weighted Combinations of Data Scores to Produce Framework Element Scores

	Different Weights Based on Survey Response Rates		
Rigorous Instruction	*If teacher response rate is at least 50%*	*If teacher response rate is below 50% but at least 30%*	*If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses*
Quality Review 1.1	22%	25%	Element score is N/A.
Quality Review 1.2	22%	25%	
Quality Review 2.2	22%	25%	
Survey (Rigorous Instruction)	34%	25%	
Collaborative Teachers	*If teacher response rate is at least 50%*	*If teacher response rate is below 50% but at least 30%*	*If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses*
Quality Review 4.2	50%	67%	Element score is N/A.
Survey (Collaborative Teachers)	50%	33%	
Supportive Environment	*If teacher response rate is at least 50% (for elementary schools); If student response rate is at least 50% (for non-elementary schools)*	*If teacher response rate is below 50% but at least 30% (for ES); If student response rate is below 50% but at least 30% (for non-ES)*	*If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses (for ES); If student response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses (for non-ES)*
Quality Review 3.4	30%	35%	Element score is N/A.
Survey (Supportive Environment)	35%	25%	
Average change in student Attendance	30%	35%	
Less Restrictive Environment	5%	5%	
Effective School Leadership	*If teacher response rate is at least 30%*	*If teacher response rate is less than 30% or fewer than 5 responses*	
Survey (Effective School Leadership)	100%	Element score is N/A.	

Strong Family-Community Ties Survey (Strong Family-Community Ties)	*If average of teacher and parent response rates is at least 30%* 100%	*If average of teacher and parent response rates is at less than 30% or fewer than 5 teacher or parent responses* Element score is N/A.
Trust Survey (Trust)	*If average of teacher and parent response rates is at least 30%* 100%	*If average of teacher and parent response rates is at less than 30% or fewer than 5 teacher or parent responses* Element score is N/A.

Examples:

- If the teacher response rate was over 50%, the school's element score for Rigorous Instruction = 0.22 x QR 1.1 standard score + 0.22 x QR 1.2 standard score + 0.22 QR 2.2 standard score + 0.34 x survey element score for Rigorous Instruction.
- If the teacher response rate was under 50% but at least 30%, the school's element score for Collaborative Teachers = 0.67 x QR 4.2 standard score + 0.33 x survey element score for Collaborative Teachers.
- If the student response rate was under 30%, the school's element score for Supportive Environment is N/A.

Rigorous Instruction – Additional Rule

The Rigorous Instruction score, after being calculated based on the weighted average of standard scores as described in the table above, is supplemented with an additional rule:

The Rigorous Instruction score cannot fall below 3.00 if

- The school received a Quality Review during the past three years but not during the past year (i.e., during 2013-14 or 2014-15 but not 2015-16); and
- The school's Rigorous Instruction survey score is at least 3.50; and
- The school's Student Achievement score is at least 3.50.

This rule is designed to make it possible for schools that attain strong results on the Rigorous Instruction survey questions and in student achievement to earn Meeting Target in Rigorous Instruction if they do not have updated Quality Review ratings from 2015-16.

Missing Data

If Quality Review data is unavailable for a district school, its element scores will be N/A for Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, and Supportive Environment.

For charter schools and YABCs, which do not receive Quality Reviews, any weight that would be applied to the Quality Review is shifted to the other data sources in the element. For example, if a charter school had a teacher response rate above 30%,

then its element score for Rigorous Instruction would be based 100% on the survey.[8]

If a school does not have a score for Chronic Absenteeism, Average Change in Student Attendance, or Less Restrictive Environment, the weight for that metric is shifted to the other data sources in the element.

[8] Because standard scores based on Quality Reviews and survey results are systematically different from standard scores based on surveys only, a rescaling is applied to the overall standard scores for charter schools and YABCs in Rigorous Instruction, Collaborative Teachers, and Supportive Environment. The rescaling has the effect of putting the results for charter schools and YABCs (without Quality Reviews) on the same scale as the element scores of district schools (that include Quality Reviews).

Framework Element Ratings

Element Ratings

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

Rating	Element Score
Exceeding Target (4 bars)	4.00 to 4.99
Meeting Target (3 bars)	3.00 to 3.99
Approaching Target (2 bars)	2.00 to 2.99
Not Meeting Target (1 bar)	1.00 to 1.99

Schools designated for phase-out and schools in their first year of operation in 2015-16 will not receive Framework element ratings in the 2015-16 School Quality Reports.

Rating Labels in the Guide and Snapshot

The metric and section ratings in the School Quality Snapshot are the same as in the School Quality Guide, except that different rating labels are used in the Snapshot:

School Quality Guide Rating Labels	School Quality Snapshot Rating Labels
Exceeding Target	Excellent
Meeting Target	Good
Approaching Target	Fair
Not Meeting Target	Poor

Appendix A
Floors for 2016-17 Targets

The following table shows floors (levels that the specific targets cannot go below).

	Target Floors		
	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target
Credit Accumulation			
Average Credit Accumulation (Students Beginning the Year with 0-11 Credits)	3.00	4.00	5.00
Average Credit Accumulation (Students Beginning the Year with 11-22 Credits)	6.00	8.00	10.00
Average Credit Accumulation (Students Beginning the Year with 22-33 Credits)	6.00	8.00	10.00
Average Credit Accumulation (Students Beginning the Year with 33-38 Credits)	6.00	8.00	10.00
Regents Performance			
Average Completion Rate for Remaining Regents	10%	20%	25%
Average Regents Score - English (non-Common Core)	50	55	60
Average Regents Score - English (Common Core)	50	55	60
Average Regents Score - Living Environment	50	55	60
Average Regents Score - Global History	50	55	60
Average Regents Score - US History	50	55	60
Average Regents Score – Algebra I (non-Common Core)	50	55	60
Average Regents Score - Algebra I (Common Core)	50	55	60
Graduation / Non-Dropout			
Transfer School Graduation Rate	20%	30%	40%
Transfer School Graduation Rate (Most at Risk)	20%	30%	40%
Transfer School Graduation Rate (Other Overage/Undercredited)	20%	30%	40%
Transfer School Graduation Rate (Non-Overage/Undercredited)	20%	30%	40%
High School Persistence	20%	30%	40%
College and Career Readiness			
College and Career Preparatory Course Index	1%	3%	5%
Comprehensive Readiness Rate (Including Enrollment)	5%	10%	15%
Postsecondary Enrollment Rate - 6 months	10%	20%	25%
Closing the Achievement Gap			
Transfer School Graduation Rate (English Language Learners)	20%	30%	40%
Transfer School Graduation Rate (Self-Contained / ICT / SETSS)	20%	30%	40%
Transfer School Graduation Rate (Overage/Undercredited)	20%	30%	40%

	Target Floors		
	Approaching Target	Meeting Target	Exceeding Target
Transfer School Graduation Rate (Overage/Undercredited – Black and Hispanic Males)	20%	30%	40%
College and Career Preparatory Course Index (Overage/Undercredited)	1%	3%	5%
Comprehensive Readiness Rate (including Enrollment) (Overage/Undercredited)	5%	10%	15%
Postsecondary Enrollment Rate – 6 months (Overage/Undercredited)	10%	20%	25%

Appendix B
Element-Measure-Question Structure of the NYC School Survey

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

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

Rigorous Instruction

Questions included within each measure in the Rigorous Instruction element.

Common Core shifts in literacy

		For general/self-contained/literacy/science/social studies: In planning my last instructional unit, I had the resources and tools I needed to include multiple opportunities for…
T	q16a	building students' knowledge through content-rich non-fiction.
T	q16b	reading and writing experiences grounded in evidence from text, both literary and informational.
T	q16c	students to interact with complex grade-level text.
T	q16d	students to interact with academic language.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 =Strongly agree

Common Core shifts in math

		For general/self-contained/math/science: In planning my last instructional unit, I had the resources and tools I needed to include multiple opportunities for…
T	q17a	focusing deeply on the concepts emphasized in the standards to help students build strong foundations for learning.
T	q17b	creating coherent progressions within the standards from previous grades to current grade so student knowledge/skills build onto previous learning as foundations for math concepts.
T	q17c	creating coherent progressions within the standards from current grade to next grades so student knowledge/skills build onto previous learning as foundations for math concepts taught in later years.
T	q17d	developing students' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and their ability to apply math in context.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Course clarity

		In how many of your classes is the following statement true?
S	q2a	I learn a lot from feedback on my work.
S	q2b	It's clear what I need to do to get a good grade.
S	q2c	The work we do in class is good preparation for our class tests.
S	q2d	The homework assignments help me learn the course material.
S	q2e	I know what my teacher wants me to learn in class.
		1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

Quality of student discussion

		How many students in your classes…
T	q18a	build on each other's ideas during class discussions?
T	q18b	use data or text references to support their ideas?
T	q18c	show that they respect each other's ideas?
T	q18d	provide constructive feedback to their peers/teachers?
T	q18e	participate in class discussions at some point?
		1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

Collaborative Teachers

Questions included within each measure in the Collaborative Teachers element.

Collective responsibility

		How many teachers at this school…
T	q1a	help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom?
T	q1c	take responsibility for improving the school?
T	q1d	feel responsible for helping students develop self-management?
T	q1g	feel responsible that all students learn?
		1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

Cultural awareness and inclusive classroom instruction

		How much do you agree with the following statements?
S	q1f	My teachers use examples of students' different cultures/backgrounds/families in their lessons to make learning more meaningful for me.
S	q1g	I see people of many races, ethnicities, cultures, and backgrounds represented in the curriculum.
S	q1h	My teachers call on students of different races, ethnicities, cultures, and backgrounds.
S	q1i	I feel that my teachers respect my culture/background.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know
		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. I am able to...
T	q2a	use my students' prior knowledge related to their cultural and linguistic backgrounds to help make learning meaningful.
T	q2b	modify instructional activities and materials to meet the developmental needs and learning interests of all my students.
T	q2c	critically examine the curriculum to determine whether it appropriately represents all groups.
T	q2d	design appropriate instruction that is matched to English language learners (ELL) proficiency and students with disabilities.
T	q2f	develop appropriate Individual Education Programs for my students with disabilities.
T	q2g	distinguish linguistic/cultural differences from learning difficulties.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know
		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.
P	q1i	My child's teachers incorporate materials about different races, ethnicities, cultural backgrounds, and families into the curriculum to make learning more meaningful.
P	q1j	My child sees people of many different races, ethnicities, or cultural backgrounds represented in the curriculum.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know
		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.
P	q2g	My child's school communicates with me in a language and in a way that I can understand.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Innovation

		How many teachers at this school…
T	q1b	are really trying to improve their teaching?
T	q1e	are willing to take risks to make the school better?
T	q1f	are eager to try new ideas?
		1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

Peer collaboration

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school…
T	q10a	teachers design instructional programs together.
T	q10b	teachers make a conscious effort to coordinate their teaching with instruction at other grade levels.
T	q10c	the principal, teachers, and staff collaborate to make this school run effectively.
T	q10d	teachers talk about instruction in the teacher's lounge, faculty meetings, etc.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

School commitment

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following.
T	q4a	I usually look forward to each working day at this school.
T	q4b	I wouldn't want to work in any other school.
T	q4c	I would recommend this school to parents/guardians seeking a place for their child.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Quality of professional development

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. Overall, my professional development experiences this year have...
T	q11a	been sustained and coherently focused, rather than short-term and unrelated.
T	q11b	included enough time to think carefully about, try, and evaluate new ideas.
T	q11c	included opportunities to work productively with colleagues in my school.
T	q11d	included opportunities to work productively with teachers from other schools.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Supportive Environment

Questions included within each measure in the Supportive Environment element.

Classroom behavior

		In how many of your classes at this school do students…
S	q6a	listen carefully when the teacher gives directions?
S	q6b	follow the rules in class?
S	q6c	pay attention when they are supposed to?
S	q6d	work when they are supposed to?
S	q6e	behave well even when the teacher isn't watching?
		1 = None, 2 =A few, 3 = Most , 4 = All
		How many students in your classes…
T*	q19b	listen carefully when the teacher gives directions?
T*	q19d	follow the rules in class?
T*	q19f	pay attention when they are supposed to?
T*	q19h	do their work when they are supposed to?
T*	q19i	behave well in class even when the teacher isn't watching?
		1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Guidance

		If you are a student in grades 6-8, ANSWER this question. If you are a student in grades 9-12, SKIP this question.
S	q9a	This school provides useful information to students about the application/enrollment process to high school.
S	q9b	This school provides guidance for the application process for high school.
S	q9c	This school educates families about the application/enrollment process for high school.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree
		If you are a student in grades 9-12, ANSWER this question. How much do you agree with the following statements? Adults at this school (including teachers, administrators, counselors, and the principal)…
S	q10a	help keep me on track for college or career.
S	q10b	provide me with information about the college enrollment process.
S	q10c	help me plan for my next steps after graduation (career planning, college selection and application process, financial aid process, etc.).
S	q10d	help me choose which colleges to apply to.
S	q10e	talk with me about how to pay for college.
S	q10f	help me plan for how to meet my future career goals.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Peer support for academic work

		In how many of your classes at this school do students…
S	q6f	feel it is important to come to school every day?
S	q6g	feel it is important to pay attention in class?
S	q6h	think doing homework is important?
S	q6i	try hard to get good grades?
		1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

		How many of the students in your class(es)…
T*	q23a	feel it is important to come to school every day?
T*	q23b	feel it is important to pay attention in class?
T*	q23c	think doing homework is important?
T*	q23d	try hard to get good grades?
		1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Personal attention and support

		In how many of your classes is the following statement true? My teachers...
S	q3a	help me catch up if I am behind.
S	q3b	notice if I have trouble learning something.
S	q3c	give me specific suggestions about how I can improve my work in class.
S	q3d	explain things a different way if I don't understand something in class.
S	q3e	notice when I am upset.
		1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All

Press toward academic achievement

		In how many of your classes …
S	q4a	are you challenged?
S	q4b	do your teachers ask difficult questions on tests?
S	q4c	do your teachers ask difficult questions in class?
S	q4d	do you work in small groups?
S	q4e	do your teachers want students to become better thinkers, not just memorize things?
		1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = Most, 4 = All
		How much do you agree with the following statements?
S	q5a	I'm learning a lot in my classes at this school to prepare me for the next level or grade.
S	q5g	My classes at this school really make me think.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree
		How many students in your classes…
T*	q19a	feel challenged?
T*	q19c	have to work hard to do well?
T*	q19e	respond to challenging test questions?
T*	q19g	respond to challenging questions in class?
		1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All
		How often do students in your class(es)…
T*	q22a	Work in small groups?
		1 = None of the time, 2 = Some of the time, 3 = Most of the time, 4 = All of the time

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Safety

		How much do you agree with the following statements?
S	q5h	Discipline is applied fairly in my school.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

		How much do you agree with the following statements? I feel safe…
S	q7a	outside around this school.
S	q7b	traveling between home and this school.
S	q7c	in the hallways, bathrooms, locker rooms, and cafeteria of this school.
S	q7d	in my classes at this school.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree
		How much do you agree with the following statements? My students are safe…
T*	q24a	outside around this school.
T*	q24b	traveling between home and this school.
T*	q24c	in the hallways, bathrooms, locker rooms, and cafeteria of this school.
T*	q24d	in my class(es).
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree
		How much do you agree with the following statement?
T*	q25a	Discipline is applied to students fairly in my school.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

* These teacher questions are included for scoring only for Elementary Schools and Early Childhood Schools, where students do not take the NYC School Survey.

Social-emotional

		How many adults at this school…
T	q20a	help students develop the skills they need to complete challenging coursework despite obstacles?
T	q20b	tell their students they believe they can achieve high academic standards?
T	q20c	teach critical thinking skills to students?
T	q20d	teach students how to advocate for themselves?
T	q20e	teach students the organizational skills needed to be prepared for their next level?
T	q20f	recognize disruptive behavior as social-emotional learning opportunities?
T	q20g	teach students the skills they need to regulate their behavior (i.e. by focusing their attention, controlling their emotions, or managing their thinking, behavior, and feelings)?
T	q20h	have access to school based supports to assist in behavioral/emotional escalations?
T	q28a	create an atmosphere that encourages students to work towards a college degree?
		1 = None, 2 = Some, 3 = A lot, 4 = All, 5 = I don't know

Effective School Leadership

Questions included within each measure in the Effective School Leadership element.

Inclusive principal leadership

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.
P	q1g	The principal/school leaders encourage feedback from parents/guardians and the community through regular meetings with parent and teacher leaders.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know
		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements. The principal/school leader at this school…
P	q3a	is strongly committed to shared decision making.
P	q3b	works to create a sense of community in the school.
P	q3c	promotes family and community involvement in the school.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know

Instructional leadership

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. The principal/school leader at this school...
T	q12a	makes clear to the staff his or her expectations for meeting instructional goals.
T	q12b	communicates a clear vision for this school.
T	q12c	understands how children learn.
T	q12d	sets high standards for student learning.
T	q12e	sets clear expectations for teachers about implementing what they have learned in professional development.
T	q12f	carefully tracks student academic progress.
T	q12g	knows what's going on in my classroom.
T	q12h	participates in instructional planning with teams of teachers.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Program coherence

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school…
T	q8a	once we start a new program, we follow up to make sure that it's working.
T	q8b	it is clear how all of the programs offered are connected to our school's instructional vision.
T	q8c	curriculum, instruction, and learning materials are well coordinated across the different grade levels at this school.
T	q8d	there is consistency in curriculum, instruction, and learning materials among teachers in the same grade level at this school.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Teacher influence

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school…
T	q9f	The principal/school leader encourages feedback through regular meetings with parent and teacher leaders.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree
		How much influence do teachers have over school policy in each of the areas below?
T	q13c	Selecting instructional materials used in classrooms.
T	q13d	Developing instructional materials.
T	q13e	Setting standards for student behavior.
		1 = No influence, 2 = Little, 3 = A moderate amount, 4 = A great deal of influence

Strong Family-Community Ties

Questions included within each measure in the Strong Family-Community Ties element.

Parent involvement in the school

		Since the beginning of the school year, how often have you…
P	q4a	Been asked or had the opportunity to volunteer time to support this school (for example, spent time helping in classrooms, helped with wide school-wide events, etc.)?
P	q4b	Communicated with your child's teacher about your child's performance?
P	q4c	Seen your child's projects, artwork, homework, tests or quizzes?
		1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often

Outreach to parents

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following. At this school…
T	q9a	Parents/guardians are invited to visit classrooms to observe the instructional program.
T	q9c	Teachers understand families' problems and concerns.
T	q9d	Teachers work closely with families to meet students' needs.
T	q9e	School staff regularly communicate with parents/guardians about how parents can help students learn.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree
		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.
P	q1a	School staff regularly communicate with parents/guardians about how parents can help students learn.
P	q1b	Parents/guardians are invited to visit classrooms to observe instruction.
P	q1c	Parents/guardians are greeted warmly when they call or visit the school.
P	q1e	Teachers work closely with families to meet students' needs.
P	q1f	Teachers communicate regularly with parents/guardians.
P	q1h	Teachers understand families' problems and concerns.
		1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree, 5= I don't know

Trust

Questions included within each measure in the Trust element.

Parent-principal trust

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.
P	q2c	I feel respected by my child's principal/school leader.
P	q2d	I trust the principal/ school leader at his or her word (to do what he or she says that he or she will do)
P	q2e	The principal/school leader is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly.
P	q2f	The principal/school leader at this school works hard to build trusting relationships with parents/ guardians like me.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Parent-teacher trust

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.
P	q1d	Teachers and parents/guardians think of each other as partners in educating children.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 5 = I don't know
		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements about this school.
P	q2a	I feel respected by my child's teachers.
P	q2b	Staff at this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents/guardians like me.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Student-teacher trust

		How much do you agree with the following statements?
S	q5b	There is at least one adult in the school that I can confide in.
S	q5c	My teachers will always listen to students' ideas.
S	q5d	My teachers always keep their promises.
S	q5e	My teachers treat me with respect.
S	q5f	When my teachers tell me not to do something, I know they have a good reason.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree

Teacher-teacher trust

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following.
T	q5a	Teachers in this school trust each other.
T	q5b	It's OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with other teachers.
T	q5c	Teachers respect other teachers who take the lead in school improvement efforts.
T	q5d	I feel respected by other teachers at this school.
T	q5e	Teachers at this school respect those colleagues who have a specific expertise.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree

Teacher-principal trust

		Please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following.
T	q6a	I feel respected by the principal at this school.
T	q6b	The principal at this school is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly.
T	q6c	The principal has confidence in the expertise of the teachers at this school.
T	q6d	I trust the principal/school leader at his or her word (to do what he or she says that he or she will do).
T	q6e	At this school, It's OK to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with the principal.

T	q6f	The principal takes a personal interest in the professional development of teachers.
T	q6g	The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the staff members.
T	q6h	The principal places the needs of children ahead of personal interests.
T	q6i	The principal and assistant principals function as a cohesive unit.
		1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree