



LEARNING FROM PHILADELPHIA'S SCHOOL REFORM

Adequate Yearly Progress: Where Philadelphia Public Schools Stand 2005

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOL
NOTEBOOK

*This information was compiled with the assistance of the Philadelphia Public School Notebook,
an independent newspaper promoting informed public involvement in the Philadelphia schools.
For more information, please visit www.thenotebook.org.*

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
‘No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania	2,3
Key to the Tables	3
Elementary Schools	4,5,6
K-4 Schools	6
Middle Schools	7
High Schools	8
Charter Schools	9
Disciplinary & Special Schools	9

Introduction

Adequate Yearly Progress: Where Philadelphia Public Schools Stand, 2005

Schools and school districts across the country are under pressure to show that student performance on standardized tests is improving. Much of this pressure is based on the idea that clear expectations, combined with sanctions for poor performance, will motivate educators and students to try harder and do better. The federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is a comprehensive expression of this pressure. NCLB requires states to set performance targets that schools and districts must meet - referred to as “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP). NCLB also outlines a series of escalating consequences for not meeting AYP targets. NCLB’s stringent requirements and consequences have generated a number of legal challenges, policy questions, and practical concerns which are likely to lead to some changes in the legislation when it is reauthorized in 2007.

Nevertheless, it is likely that school districts and state departments of education will continue to provide large amounts of data about student performance and school progress to educators, parents, and the general public. The theory behind the availability of data is that if educators have more information about their students, they can improve the ways they teach and influence how well their students perform. These data can also be an important resource for parents and community members who want to find out about their local schools and become part of efforts to improve them.

Research for Action (RFA) is committed to developing a set of resources to help the public take advantage of the increasing availability of school performance

data in order to influence policy and improve schools. As part of this effort, RFA is pleased to partner with the *Philadelphia Public School Notebook* to provide tools designed to help educators and the public better understand AYP.

In addition, because AYP is only one among many possible means of evaluating students and schools, RFA will be looking at other ways of using data and measuring student achievement to help educators and the public become informed, active participants in school improvement efforts.

Research for Action (RFA) is a Philadelphia-based non-profit organization engaged in education research and evaluation. Founded in 1992, RFA works with public school districts, educational institutions, and community organizations to improve the educational opportunities for those traditionally disadvantaged by race/ethnicity, class, gender, language/cultural difference, and ability/disability.

Learning from Philadelphia’s School Reform, led by RFA, is a multi-year research and public awareness project assessing the current reform efforts in Philadelphia public schools. Future resources will examine how schools learn to use achievement data and will analyze student outcomes. For more information, please visit: www.researchforaction.org.

The Philadelphia Public School Notebook is an independent newspaper promoting informed public involvement in the Philadelphia schools. For more information, please visit www.thenotebook.org.

'No Child Left Behind' and AYP in Pennsylvania

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, signed into law in 2002, gave the federal government a new, much larger role in K-12 education, with the stated goal of holding public schools more accountable for student achievement. For states to receive federal education funds, the government requires statewide student testing in reading, math, and science for students in public schools (including charter schools), as well as the introduction of an accountability system requiring school improvement on these tests.

Under NCLB, failure to meet targets for test scores in reading and math can trigger significant consequences for the school and the district, as well as new options for families. NCLB also holds schools accountable for the percentage of students that are tested, and which students are tested, in each school.

Each year, states and districts must issue "report cards" with statewide and school-by-school data for all schools, districts and charter schools. Under NCLB, schools must also notify parents about their right to request the qualifications of their children's teachers. Parents also have the right to know if their children have been taught for four or more weeks in a row by a teacher who does not meet state criteria for being "highly qualified."

Measuring "Adequate Yearly Progress" (AYP)

NCLB aims to have all public school students scoring at "proficient" or "advanced" levels on state reading and math tests by the end of the 2013-14 school year. NCLB holds schools and districts accountable for "Adequate Yearly Progress" toward meeting that goal. AYP is the minimum level of performance that states, school districts, and schools must achieve each year in these areas:

- the percentage of students who met test score goals (outlined below)
- the percentage of students who took the tests ("test participation"), which must be 95 percent or higher
- graduation rates for high schools (in Pennsylvania, the target is 80 percent or to show improvement)
- one other measure of school performance, chosen by the state, for elementary and middle schools (in Pennsylvania, schools must have attendance of 90 percent or show improvement).

	Reading: Percent Proficient/Advanced	Math: Percent Proficient/Advanced
2002-04	45	35
2005-07	54	45
2008-10	63	56
2010-11	72	67
2011-12	81	78
2012-13	91	89
2013-14	100	100

Testing requirements

Measures of school progress in Pennsylvania have been based on results of the state standardized test in reading and math, known as the PSSA (Pennsylvania System of School Assessment). In 2005, math and reading PSSA scores from grades 5, 8, and 11 were used for calculating AYP status. In 2006, math and reading PSSA scores from grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 will be used for calculating AYP status. It is anticipated that in 2007, math and reading PSSA scores from grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 will be used. Beginning in the 2007-08 school year, science achievement will also be tested.

In compliance with NCLB, Pennsylvania has set escalating test score targets for schools from 2002-03 to 2013-14.

To make sure schools are held accountable for all students, NCLB requires test scores to be broken down ("disaggregated") by "subgroups" to track the performance of the following groups of students within the overall school population:

- students of each of the major racial/ethnic groups (Black, Latino, Asian, White, etc.)
- students with disabilities
- students who are economically disadvantaged
- students with limited English proficiency status

Any subgroup representing 40 or more students must meet the same goals for test scores and test participation for a school to make AYP. The more such subgroups, the more targets the school must reach to achieve AYP.

Other ways of making AYP

Even at schools that fall short of these test score targets for proficiency, there are other ways of making AYP:

Safe harbor status is a way for a school or district to achieve AYP without meeting the standard achievement targets (in 2005, these targets were 54 percent in reading; 45 percent in mathematics). If a school or subgroup does not meet the performance targets but does reduce the percentage of below-proficient students by 10 percent or more, the state will consider it to have met AYP for this target area. A school where 90 percent of students are not proficient would achieve safe harbor if it reduced that percentage by 9 or more points.

Confidence intervals may allow schools to achieve AYP when they fall just short of reaching targets for proficiency or safe harbor. The confidence interval is a statistical adjustment made by the state that provides a margin of error to take into account the fact that the students in the tested grades may not be a representative sample of all the students in the school.

The Pennsylvania Performance Index (PPI) is a scaled system that detects and rewards growth at all PSSA performance levels, including "Basic" and "Below Basic." Each school and subgroup has its own 2002 baseline PPI score, and PPI sets growth targets for each school based on the trajectory needed to reach 100 percent proficiency by 2013-14.

Appeals of AYP status can now be filed by schools on one of two grounds: "data error" or "special circumstances." Previously, PPI was part of the appeals process.

If schools fall short of AYP goals

As of 2005-06, schools or districts are designated as needing a level of school improvement or corrective action and face escalating levels of consequences when they do not meet *the same* AYP targets for two or more consecutive years (previously, schools were so designated when they failed to meet *any* AYP targets for two or more consecutive years). Such schools are required to take the actions below before the beginning of the school year. If a school continues to fall short of AYP goals, NCLB's consequences for one year and level carry over to the next level and new ones are added. As of 2005-06, schools not meeting *different* AYP targets in consecutive years will not "Make AYP" but will not decline in status. Thus, a school may theoretically "Not Make AYP" year after year, but never move beyond the "Warning" status.

Here are the escalating levels categorizing schools that fail to make the same AYP targets for multiple consecutive years:

Year 1 of failure to make AYP – "Warning." The school is placed on notice that it has another year to develop its improvement strategies and achieve its AYP targets. The school is not subject to consequences.

Year 2 – "School Improvement I." Officials must develop a two-year school improvement plan. Districts must offer students the option to transfer from the "improvement" school to another public school that isn't facing consequences. The district pays for transportation.

Year 3 – "School Improvement II." Districts must offer low-income students free tutoring services from a list of approved providers (known as "supplemental educational services").

Year 4 – "Corrective Action I." When a school does not make "Adequate Yearly Progress" for four consecutive years, the state will place it under a "corrective action plan." The consequences may be changes in the staff or curriculum, lengthening the school day or year, or some other action.

Year 5 – "Corrective Action II." If a school continues to be identified as in need of improvement, it necessitates creation of a new plan to be carried out the following year, including at least one radical change: replacing the staff, converting to a charter school, turning over management of the school to the state or a private company, or other major management restructuring. Parents must be involved in decisions about the plan.

Year 6 – "Corrective Action II, second year;" also known as "restructuring." If the school still fails to make adequate yearly progress, the plan for school restructuring is to be implemented.

Year 7 – "Corrective Action II, third year;" If a school fails to make AYP for seven consecutive years, it is unclear what happens. In Pennsylvania, such schools have been designated as being "Corrective Action II, third year" despite this "School Improvement" status not existing in the NCLB legislation.

A school identified as "Making Progress" is one that was previously in either school improvement or corrective action but has made AYP for one year. If the school fulfills its AYP requirement for a second year, it will exit the improvement system and will be counted among schools that have "Met AYP." If in the second year it does not achieve AYP, the school reverts to the next level of school improvement or corrective action.

Sources:

- Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Assessment and Accountability
- United States Department of Education
- For more information, see www.nclb.gov and www.pde.state.pa.us.
- Special thanks to Pennsylvania Public Education Partnership. This article is adapted from "No Child Left Behind" in Pennsylvania" originally published by Mon Valley Education Consortium (www.mvec.org), 2004.

Key to the Tables

Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in green met all of their AYP targets in 2005. ☆ **Bolded schools in green** met all of their AYP targets in 2005 and either met AYP or had "Warning" status in 2004. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see "'No Child Left Behind' and AYP in Pennsylvania," pp 2-3.

TARGETS met/total: The number of AYP targets the school met, followed by the total number of targets. Schools have targets for test score performance and test participation in reading and math, and either attendance rate (at elementary and middle schools) or graduation rate (at high schools). The total number of targets varies from school to school because schools must meet the targets associated with any subgroups that have more than 40 students in the tested grades in the school. For a school or district to meet AYP, all AYP targets must be met.

AYP status: See above for definitions of "Warning," "School Improvement," and "Corrective Action" status. Schools labeled as having "Met AYP" met all their AYP targets in 2005 and either met AYP or had "Warning" status in 2004. Schools that are "Making Progress" met all their test performance and participation targets in 2005 but were in School Improvement or Corrective Action in 2004; their prior year AYP status is shown in parentheses (SI I = School Improvement I; CA II = Corrective Action II). A "Making Progress" school that fails to meet its

targets in 2005 will move down to the next level of the school improvement cycle.

How achieved: For schools that met all their AYP targets, the symbols indicate whether a school's test results met the state's proficiency standards or whether the school achieved AYP through "safe harbor," PPI, or the appeals process.

⊙ = Met all the proficiency targets – with or without the help of a confidence interval.

◆ = Achieved AYP through safe harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval.

PPI = Achieved AYP through meeting the targets of the Pennsylvania Performance Index which sets goals for growth at all performance levels.

% **proficient – reading:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA reading exam.

% **proficient – math:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA math exam.

NOTE: The Office of Restructured Schools was abolished during the summer of 2005. As of this printing, most schools designated as "Restructured" are regular district schools.

Elementary Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
☆ Adaire Alexander	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	53.4	56.7
☆ Alcorn James	Edison	13/13	Met AYP	⊕	24.8	28.6
Allen Ethan	District	14/17	School Improvement II	-	32.5	47.1
Allen Ethel	District	7/13	School Improvement I	-	10.3	8.2
Anderson Add B	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊖	50.8	55.6
Arthur Chester A	District	8/11	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	40.8	47.3
Bache-Martin	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	35.1	40.2
Barry Comm John	Restructured	9/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	25.5	20.0
Bethune Mary McLeod	Victory	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	21.6	18.2
Blaine James G	District	12/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	16.7	30.2
☆ Blankenburg Rudolph	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	35.2	55.3
Bluford Guion	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	18.7	16.1
☆ Bregy F. Amadee	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊕	31.4	44.3
☆ Bridesburg	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	64.7	91.1
Brown Joseph H	District	10/11	Warning	-	48.6	50.0
Bryant William C	U. of Penn	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	19.8	26.3
Carnell Laura H	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊕	49.7	60.0
Cassidy Lewis C	Restructured	13/13	Making Progress (SI II)	⊕	38.0	62.3
Cleveland Grover	Restructured	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	33.3	33.3
Clymer George	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	17.7	22.6
Comegys Benjamin B	Edison	10/13	Warning	-	24.8	36.1
☆ Comly Watson	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊖	60.3	74.1
☆ Cook-Wissahickon	District	5/5	Met AYP	⊖	67.1	76.7
Cramp William	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	31.9	41.8
☆ Creighton Thomas	District	17/17	Met AYP	PPI	31.5	35.1
☆ Crossan Kennedy C	District	5/5	Met AYP	⊖	72.9	89.6
Daroff Samuel	District	10/13	Warning	-	22.4	29.6
☆ Day Anna B	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	45.6	55.0
DeBurgos Bilingual	Restructured	17/17	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	24.1	48.9
☆ Decatur Stephen	Restructured	17/17	Met AYP	⊖	64.5	69.6
Dick William	District	10/13	Warning	-	22.1	35.4
☆ Disston Hamilton	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊕	48.4	57.5
☆ Dobson James	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	66.9	75.3
Douglass Frederick	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	20.4	14.3
Drew Charles R	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	30.0	22.8
Duckrey	Temple	10/13	Warning	-	18.4	20.5
Dunbar Paul L	Temple	3/5	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	21.5	29.2
☆ Edmonds Franklin S	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	78.7	91.7
Edmunds Henry R	District	14/17	School Improvement II	-	28.9	29.6
Ellwood	District	10/13	School Improvement II	-	42.3	59.2
☆ Emlen Eleanor Cope	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	56.8	67.8
☆ Fairhill	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊕	43.1	56.8
☆ Farrell Louis H	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊖	59.7	71.7
Fell D Newlin	District	16/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	44.3	57.5
Ferguson Joseph C	Temple	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	12.3	25.9
☆ Finletter Thomas K	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊕	38.3	32.7
☆ Fidler Academics Plus	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	72.1	73.9
FitzPatrick Aloysius	District	16/17	Corrective Action I	-	41.0	60.4
☆ Forrest Edwin	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	53.6	65.7
☆ Fox Chase	District	5/5	Met AYP	⊖	57.7	67.9
☆ Frank Anne	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	74.8	85.0
☆ Franklin Benjamin	District	19/19	Met AYP	PPI	54.0	51.0
Fulton Robert	Foundations	10/13	Warning	-	33.3	42.3
☆ Gideon Edward	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	47.7	54.5

KEY: Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in green met all of their AYP targets in 2005. ☆**Bolded schools in green** met all of their AYP targets in 2005 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2004. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see “‘No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania,” pp 2-3.

How achieved: ⊖= Met all the proficiency targets – with or without the help of a confidence interval; ⊕= Achieved AYP through safe

: harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval; PPI= Achieved AYP through meeting the targets of the Pennsylvania Performance Index which sets goals for growth at all performance levels.
 : **% proficient – reading:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA reading exam.
 : **% proficient – math:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA math exam.

Elementary Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Gompers Samuel	District	10/13	Warning	-	36.8	34.8
☆ Greenberg Joseph	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	79.9	82.8
☆ Greenfield Albert	District	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	56.6	61.7
Hackett Horatio B	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	35.8	55.9
☆ Hamilton Andrew	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	59.8	65.8
☆ Hancock John	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	73.5	89.0
☆ Harrison William	District	5/5	Met AYP	+	37.0	46.4
Harrity William F	Edison	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	26.7	26.2
☆ Hartranft John F	Restructured	9/9	Met AYP	+	24.5	36.7
☆ Henry Charles W	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	66.9	69.2
☆ Heston Edward	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	52.1	65.9
Hill Leslie P	Restructured	9/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	27.4	43.2
Holme Thomas	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	46.8	77.2
Hopkinson Francis	District	14/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	35.0	39.6
☆ Houston Henry E	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	57.0	47.1
☆ Howe Julia Ward	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	76.1	73.9
Huey Samuel B	Restructured	10/13	Corrective Action II (first year)	-	18.6	21.3
Hunter William	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	14.2	45.0
Jackson Andrew	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	32.7	37.5
☆ Jenks John S	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	57.9	65.4
☆ Kearny Gen Philip	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	67.0	77.2
☆ Kelley William D	Edison	9/9	Met AYP	+	20.6	51.5
Kenderton	Edison	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	26.3	50.0
☆ Key Francis Scott	District	9/9	Met AYP	PPI	43.0	58.8
☆ Kinsey John L	Foundations	13/13	Met AYP	+	40.0	55.8
☆ Kirkbride Eliza B	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	51.9	70.1
Lamberton Robert E	District	12/13	School Improvement II	-	31.8	23.6
Lawton Henry W	District	15/15	Making Progress (SI I)	+	46.7	57.1
Lea Henry C	U. of Penn	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	35.0	37.4
☆ Leidy Joseph	Restructured	5/5	Met AYP	+	37.9	58.6
☆ Levering William	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	52.3	58.3
☆ Lingelbach Anna L	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	54.5	53.1
Locke Alain	Edison	9/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	12.9	17.5
☆ Loesche William H	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	75.0	89.1
☆ Logan	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	+	30.0	48.3
☆ Longstreth William C	District	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	35.2	37.3
Ludlow James R	Edison	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	27.8	35.8
Mann William B	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	20.0	24.6
☆ Marshall John	District	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	36.3	47.3
Marshall Thurgood	District	11/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	35.4	29.7
☆ Mayfair	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	62.9	67.9
McCall Gen George A	District	9/13	Warning	-	45.7	50.0
☆ McCloskey John F	District	9/9	Met AYP	PPI	29.0	41.3
☆ McKinley William	Restructured	9/9	Met AYP	+	43.5	58.1
☆ McMichael Morton	Edison	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	31.5	30.0
Meade Gen George C	Temple	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	27.8	35.2
☆ Meredith William M	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	76.1	77.7
☆ Mifflin Thomas	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	56.9	65.4
☆ Moffet John	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	63.2	81.6
☆ Moore J Hampton	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊙	56.8	64.7
Morris Robert	Trans. Charter	10/13	Warning	-	22.2	58.6
Morrison Andrew J	District	13/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	42.3	45.5
Munoz-Marín	Edison	14/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	22.0	38.4
☆ Nebinger George W	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	55.1	56.0

KEY: Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in green met all of their AYP targets in 2005. ☆ **Bolded schools in green** met all of their AYP targets in 2005 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2004. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see “‘No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania,” pp 2-3.
How achieved: ⊙= Met all the proficiency targets – with or without the help of a confidence interval; + = Achieved AYP through safe

: harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval; PPI= Achieved AYP through meeting the targets of the Pennsylvania Performance Index which sets goals for growth at all performance levels.
: **% proficient – reading:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA reading exam.
: **% proficient – math:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA math exam.

Elementary Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Olney	District	16/17	School Improvement II	-	41.1	56.5
Overbrook Education Ctr	District	9/9	Making Progress (SI II)	⊖	44.7	47.4
Overbrook Elementary	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (1st year)	-	38.4	42.6
Pastorius Francis P	Foundations	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	27.8	38.6
Peirce Thomas M	District	7/13	Warning	-	21.0	21.0
☆ Penn Alexander	District	11/11	Met AYP	⊖	63.5	73.0
Pennell Joseph	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	28.7	40.9
☆ Pennypacker Samuel	District	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	45.8	49.0
Penrose	District	10/13	School Improvement II	-	36.4	59.7
☆ Pollock Robert B	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊖	59.5	67.7
Potter–Thomas	Edison	10/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	11.7	9.0
Pratt Anna B	Victory	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	19.2	28.8
☆ Prince Hall	District	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	44.4	50.0
☆ Reynolds Gen John F	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	45.0	47.5
☆ Rhawnhurst	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊖	67.5	77.8
Rhoads James	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	36.0	61.8
☆ Richmond	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	56.1	61.3
Rowen William	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	33.9	43.2
☆ Sharswood George	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	56.0	45.2
☆ Shawmont	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊖	65.9	75.4
Sheridan West	District	6/13	Warning	-	10.7	14.7
Smedley Franklin	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	17.8	25.4
Smith Walter G	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊖	65.4	69.2
Solis–Cohen Solomon	District	15/15	Making Progress (SI I)	+	54.1	64.4
Southwark	District	14/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	31.1	40.7
Spring Garden	District	11/13	Warning	-	39.7	60.5
Spruance Gilbert	District	24/25	Warning	-	57.8	56.1
☆ Stanton Edwin M	Universal	5/5	Met AYP	+	30.4	47.8
☆ Stanton M Hall	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	72.6	83.9
Stearne Allen M	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	25.9	25.0
Steel Edward	Restructured	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	17.0	15.5
Sullivan James J	District	12/15	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	24.6	31.4
Taggart John H	District	7/9	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	35.7	42.1
☆ Vare Abigail	District	13/13	Met AYP	+	35.8	37.8
☆ Waring Laura	Edison	5/5	Met AYP	⊖	40.0	32.0
☆ Washington George	District	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	43.1	47.0
☆ Washington Martha	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	38.6	34.8
Webster John H	District	17/17	Making Progress (CA II)	+	31.0	42.2
☆ Welsh John	District	15/15	Met AYP	⊖	63.1	80.7
Whittier John G	District	7/13	School Improvement I	-	22.5	23.4
Wilson Alexander	U. of Penn	4/5	Warning	-	28.1	25.4
Wister John	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	42.9	34.9
☆ Wright Richard R	Victory	13/13	Met AYP	+	30.2	34.9
☆ Ziegler William H	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊖	54.1	43.5

K-4 Schools

School	TARGETS	Met AYP Status
☆ Barton Clara	Yes	Met AYP
Birney Gen Davis B	No	Warning
☆ Brown Henry A	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Catharine Joseph	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Cayuga	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Childs George W	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Elkin Lewis	Yes	Met AYP
Feltonville	No	Warning
☆ Girard Stephen	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Harrington Avery D	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Jenks Abram	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Kelly John B	Yes	Met AYP
Lowell James R	No	Warning
McClure Alexander	No	Warning

School	TARGETS	Met AYP Status
McDaniel Delaplaine	No	School Improvement I
☆ Mitchell	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Morton Thomas G	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Patterson John M	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Powel Samuel	Yes	Met AYP
☆ Sheppard Isaac	Yes	Met AYP
Sheridan Philip H	No	Corrective Action III (3rd year)
Taylor Bayard	No	Warning
Willard Frances E	No	Warning

Note: The 2005 AYP targets did not include proficiency on the PSSA test in K-4 schools. AYP status was based on other criteria. In 2006, PSSA math and reading scores in grade 3 will be used for calculating AYP status.

Middle Schools

School	Management	TARGETS		How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
		Met/Total	AYP Status			
☆ AMY at Martin	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	58.8	61.7
☆ AMY at NW	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	60.0	68.6
☆ Baldi C C A	District	29/29	Met AYP	⊕	66.5	73.3
☆ Barratt Norris S	Edison	17/17	Met AYP	⊕	49.4	54.1
Beeber Dimner	District	10/13	School Improvement I	-	31.2	31.1
Central East	District	21/21	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	47.3	61.0
Clemente Roberto	District	18/25	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	18.3	19.7
☆ Conwell Russell	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	75.0	80.9
Cooke Jay	District	13/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	25.0	32.9
Elverson James	Temple	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	15.3	4.4
FitzSimons Thomas Acad	Victory	9/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	19.7	13.4
Gillespie Eliz D	Edison	10/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	17.3	14.3
☆ Girard Acad Music Prog	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	84.6	82.0
Harding Warren G	District	17/25	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	33.8	27.0
☆ Hill-Freedman	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	87.5	89.6
Jones John Paul	District	23/29	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	17.8	23.5
☆ LaBrum Gen J Harry	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	55.0	41.5
Leeds Morris E	District	15/17	School Improvement II	-	35.2	33.6
Lewis Ada H	Foundations	7/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	19.0	13.0
☆ Masterman Julia R	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	99.1	98.7
Meehan Austin	District	19/23	School Improvement II	-	42.7	41.1
☆ Middle Years Alt	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	64.3	60.0
Peirce William S	Universal	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	25.5	20.5
Penn Treaty	Edison	23/25	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	22.1	30.6
Pepper George	Victory	12/16	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	26.9	27.5
Pickett Clarence E	Foundations	13/14	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	24.6	21.9
Rhodes E. W. Academy	Victory	9/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	29.9	15.0
Roosevelt Theodore	Restructured	11/15	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	29.5	22.1
Rush Benjamin	District	25/26	Corrective Action I	-	48.6	48.1
Sayre William L	Restructured	6/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	23.5	14.2
Shaw Anna H	Edison	5/14	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	19.2	24.3
Shoemaker Wm H	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	25.1	25.0
Stetson John B	Edison	0/25	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	11.3	10.6
Stoddart-Fleisher	Edison	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	28.7	31.1
☆ Sulzberger Mayer	Edison	15/15	Met AYP	PPI	25.9	27.7
Thomas George C	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	29.8	39.1
Tilden William T	Edison	4/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	17.9	24.1
Turner John P	District	9/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	40.5	20.9
Vare Edwin H	Universal	12/15	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	21.0	17.8
Vaux Roberts	Restructured	10/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	23.2	18.3
Wagner Gen Louis	District	17/17	Making Progress (SI I)	⊕	64.7	63.4
Wanamaker John	Temple	4/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	17.7	6.7
Washington Grover	District	23/29	Warning	-	38.7	40.0
☆ Wilson Woodrow	District	31/31	Met AYP	PPI	54.0	59.2

KEY: Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in green met all of their AYP targets in 2005. ☆ **Bolded schools in green** met all of their AYP targets in 2005 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2004. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see “‘No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania,” pp 2-3.

How achieved: ⊙= Met all the proficiency targets – with or without the help of a confidence interval; ⊕= Achieved AYP through safe

harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval; PPI= Achieved AYP through meeting the targets of the Pennsylvania Performance Index which sets goals for growth at all performance levels.

% proficient – reading: The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA reading exam.

% proficient – math: The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA math exam.

High Schools

School	Management	TARGETS		How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
		Met/Total	AYP Status			
Audenried Charles	District	1/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	7.8	2.3
Bartram Business	District	4/9	Warning	-	31.5	13.0
Bartram Comm	District	7/13	School Improvement I	-	25.1	12.6
Bartram Motivation	District	6/9	Warning	-	31.1	46.8
Bartram John	District	0/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	10.4	9.5
Bartram Human Services	District	10/13	School Improvement I	-	11.2	11.0
☆ Bodine William W	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	83.5	65.1
Bok Edward AVTS	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	21.2	20.3
Carroll Charles	District	0/9	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	7.4	4.6
☆ Carver	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	86.8	68.3
☆ Central	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	94.5	95.3
☆ Creative & Perf Arts	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊙	76.8	56.9
Dobbins Murrell AVTS	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	19.4	5.6
Douglas Stephen A	District	1/5	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	0.0	0.0
Edison	District	14/25	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	11.8	4.9
Fels Samuel	District	11/18	Corrective Action I	-	18.0	17.0
Frankford	District	4/23	Corrective Action I	-	13.1	8.4
Franklin Benjamin	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	5.7	1.9
Franklin Learning Center	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⬆	54.4	33.1
Furness Horace	District	12/15	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	21.6	24.1
Germantown	District	9/17	Corrective Action I	-	9.1	9.2
☆ Girard Acad Music Prog	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	84.6	82.0
☆ Girls	District	19/19	Met AYP	⊙	88.1	76.7
Gratz Simon	District	13/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	18.0	4.1
Kensington	District	1/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	9.3	4.3
King Martin Luther	Foundations	9/13	Corrective Action I	-	18.1	3.9
Lamberton Robert E	District	0/9	Warning	-	11.7	4.6
Lankenau	District	6/13	Warning	-	40.2	19.5
Lincoln Abraham	District	20/25	Corrective Action I	-	28.0	19.3
Mastbaum Jules E AVTS	District	14/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	20.9	7.4
☆ Masterman Julia R	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	99.1	98.7
Northeast	District	24/33	Corrective Action I	-	35.7	34.6
Olney	District	1/17	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	8.5	7.9
Overbrook	District	9/17	School Improvement II	-	12.6	5.3
☆ Parkway–Center City	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	68.8	73.4
Parkway Gamma	District	4/9	Warning	-	38.3	14.9
☆ Parkway Northwest	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	52.8	39.6
Penn William	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	11.0	6.4
Philadelphia Regional	District	6/10	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	10.1	1.1
Randolph A Philip	District	6/13	Warning	-	4.8	0.0
Roxborough	District	7/13	School Improvement II	-	24.7	16.3
Saul W B Agricultural	District	14/17	School Improvement II	-	43.9	24.5
South Philadelphia	District	14/21	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	10.9	25.4
Strawberry Mansion	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	34.9	28.7
Swenson Arts & Tech	District	11/17	Corrective Action I	-	19.8	8.2
University City	District	1/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	16.4	11.6
Washington George	District	16/27	Corrective Action I	-	36.1	31.0
West Philadelphia	District	11/13	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	13.7	10.6

KEY: Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. **Schools in green** met all of their AYP targets in 2005. ☆**Bolded schools in green** met all of their AYP targets in 2005 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2004. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see “‘No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania,” pp 2-3.

How achieved: ⊙= Met all the proficiency targets – with or without the help of a confidence interval; ⬆= Achieved AYP through safe harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval; PPI= Achieved AYP through meeting the targets of the Pennsylvania Performance Index which sets goals for growth at all performance levels.

% proficient – reading: The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA reading exam.

% proficient – math: The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2005 PSSA math exam.

Charter Schools

School	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Alliance	8/9	School Improvement II	-	16.0	12.5
Architecture & Design HS	9/9	Making Progress (SI II)	+	53.9	40.4
Belmont	8/9	Warning	-	19.0	23.0
Christopher Columbus	15/17	Warning	-	45.2	41.4
Community Acad of Phila	15/17	Corrective Action I	-	20.6	13.9
Delaware Valley HS	10/13	Corrective Action I	-	30.5	4.6
☆ Discovery	13/13	Met AYP	+	23.5	27.9
Eugenio Maria DeHostos	5/5	Making Progress (SI II)	⊙	47.5	32.5
Franklin Towne HS	9/9	Making Progress (SI II)	+	38.9	27.7
☆ Freire	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	31.6	22.8
Germantown Settlement	10/13	Corrective Action I	-	26.6	21.9
☆ Green Woods	5/5	Met AYP	⊙	68.0	76.9
☆ Harambee Institute	13/13	Met AYP	+	31.6	36.4
Hope	1/10	School Improvement II	-	0.8	0.0
☆ Imani Education Circle	13/13	Met AYP	+	26.2	30.4
Imhotep	7/13	School Improvement II	-	51.5	14.9
☆ Independence	5/5	Met AYP	⊙	55.0	67.5
Khepera	2/5	Warning	-	35.1	13.2
☆ KIPP Philadelphia	13/13	Met AYP	+	35.3	32.4
☆ Laboratory	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	100.0	100.0
Leadership Learning	13/13	Making Progress (SI II)	+	22.2	22.2
Mariana Bracetti Academy	18/23	Warning	-	28.8	23.4
Maritime Academy	11/13	School Improvement I	-	37.1	27.7
☆ MAST Community	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	73.3	65.9
Mastery	10/13	Warning	-	44.2	34.7
Math, Civics & Sciences	8/13	School Improvement II	-	30.0	17.7
Multi-Cultural Academy	4/5	Warning	-	36.8	14.3
☆ New Foundations	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	49.5	44.0
Nueva Esperanza Academy	12/13	School Improvement II	-	16.7	8.5
People for People	9/13	Warning	-	17.0	18.7
Philadelphia Academy	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	+	68.3	72.0
Phila Electrical & Tech	9/17	School Improvement I	-	24.1	9.4
☆ Philadelphia Performing Arts	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	63.0	58.7
Preparatory	15/15	Making Progress (SI II)	+	50.0	47.8
Raising Horizons Quest	10/13	School Improvement I	-	27.6	32.5
Renaissance	7/9	School Improvement II	-	29.6	15.4
Renaissance Advantage	4/5	Warning	-	23.8	14.5
☆ Richard Allen Prep	13/13	Met AYP	PPI	20.6	13.5
Russell Byers	3/5	Warning	-	20.0	8.6
Universal Institute	11/13	School Improvement II	-	31.5	49.6
Wakisha	5/9	Corrective Action I	-	25.3	13.8
☆ West Oak Lane	9/9	Met AYP	PPI	30.1	23.5
West Philadelphia Achievement	7/13	Warning	-	16.0	10.0
☆ Wissahickon	13/13	Met AYP	+	37.5	52.1
☆ World Communications	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	61.8	47.1
Young Scholars	7/9	School Improvement I	-	45.2	48.4

Other Disciplinary & Special Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Boone Daniel	District	1/5	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	6.1	2.1
Shallcross Day	District	3/7	Corrective Action II (3rd year)	-	7.4	4.3
☆ Widener Memorial	District	5/5	Met AYP	+	30.4	60.9

Note: In 2005, CEP's disciplinary schools were not assigned an AYP status. AYP data for students attending CEP schools, which are approved alternative education programs, were attributed back to students' schools of residence.



RESEARCH for *ACTION*

3701 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Phone: 215.823.2500
Fax: 215.823.2510
info@researchforaction.org
www.researchforaction.org

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOL
NOTEBOOK

3721 Midvale Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19129
Phone: 215.951.0330 x107
Fax: 215.951.0342
notebook@thenotebook.org
www.thenotebook.org