

PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORT

PREPARED FOR

S.E.E.D.S. INSTITUTE FOR SELF-DETERMINATION & SUSTAINABILITY

(SISDS)

BY

AKINLABI E. A. MACKALL & JACQUELINE L. WRIGHT

MARCH 2010

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS _____ Page 2

INTRODUCTION _____ Page 7

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY _____ Page 8

PHASE I

COMMUNITY DISTRICT NINE (CD9) TARGET AREA FINDINGS _____ Page 13

TARGET AREA STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS _____ Page 14

Introduction _____ Page 14

TARGET AREA SECONDARY SCHOOLS _____ Page 19

Academic Characteristics _____ Page 21

“Similar Schools” Classification _____ Page 22

Selected 4-Year Proficiency Test Metrics _____ Page 24

Selected 4-Year Proficiency Test Findings _____ Page 24

Secondary School Completion and Non-Completion Findings _____ Page 32

Columbia Secondary School For Math, Science and Engineering (CSS) _____ Page 39

Target Area Students and School Selectivity _____ Page 42

The Specialized Secondary Schools _____ Page 42

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Specialized High Schools Admissions Test (SHSAT) Schools Demographics ___ Page 44

TARGET AREA MIDDLE SCHOOLS SUMMARY _____ Page 50

Four Representative Target Area Middle Schools _____ Page 51

TARGET AREA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS SUMMARY _____ Page 58

TARGET AREA CHARTER SCHOOLS SUMMARY _____ Page 60

NEW YORK CITY DOE RE-ORGANIZATION _____ Page 62

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS _____ Page 66

Limitations of NYS and NYC Report & Review Instruments _____ Page 66

Hidden Behind the Numbers: *Lack of Equity and Excellence* _____ Page 67

Educational Achievement Gap _____ Page 70

Core Institutional Weaknesses and Educational Problems _____ Page 71

PHASE II

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS _____ Page 89

RECOMMENDATIONS OUTLINE _____ Page 91

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

AFTERWORD: COLUMBIA IN CONTEXT _____ Page 94

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE: Excerpt of GCA request for consultant services, “Research and General Advice on Secondary Education” _____ Page 96

APPENDIX TWO: NEW YORK STATE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ART (ELA) & MATHEMATICS TEST PROFICIENCY / SCORING LEVELS _____ Page 97

APPENDIX THREE: Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability _____ Page 98

APPENDIX THREE - A: SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY STATUS TERMS
Understanding Your School Accountability Status _____ Page 100

APPENDIX FOUR: *SIMILAR SCHOOLS* LISTINGS: NYC GROUPINGS ____ Page 103

APPENDIX FIVE: NYC DOE Student Performance & Accountability _____ Page 105

APPENDIX SIX: HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATORY PROGRAMS _____ Page 106

APPENDIX SEVEN: Selected NYC School and Community-based Proponents
Of Culturally Relevant Curricula & Culturally Competent Pedagogy _____ Page 108

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Target Area Public Schools Composite Demographic Data:2005-06 School Year _____ Page 16

Table 2: CD9 Private and Parochial Schools _____ Page 18

Table 3: CD9 Colleges and Post Secondary Institutions _____ Page 18

Table 4: Target Area Public Secondary Schools 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 20

Table 4-A: FDA I 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 28

Table 4-A-2: FDA I 2002 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 28

Table 4-B: TMA 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 29

Table 4-B-2: TMA 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 29

Table 4-C: B & R 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 30

Table 4-C-2: B & R 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 30

Table 4-D: APR 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 31

Table 4-D-2: APR 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction _____ Page 31

Table 4-E: Selected Target Area HS Completion Indices 2005-06 School Year: 2001 Cohort _____ Page34

Table 4-F: Target Area HS Completion & Performance Indices 2005-06 _____ Page 38

Table 5: NYC Specialized High School (SHS) 2005-06 Enrollment Data _____ Page 47

Table 5-A: NYC 2005-06 Enrollment Data For Original SHSAT High Schools _____ Page 48

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

List of Tables (continued)

Table 5-B: NYC 2005-06 Enrollment Data For Newer SHSAT Schools _____ Page 49

Table 6: Target Area Public Middle Schools 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 55

Table 6-A: *Roberto Clemente Middle School (IS 195)* Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 56

Table 6-B: *Frederick Douglass Academy I* Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 56

Table 6-C: *Powell Middle School For Law & Social Justice (IS 172)* Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 57

Table 6-D: *Booker T. Washington Middle School (JHS 54)* Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 57

Table 7: Target Area Public Elementary Schools 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 59

Table 8: Target Area Charter Schools 2005-06 School Year _____ Page 61

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared in response to the crisis in US public education in general and the woeful situation within New York City in particular. Touted in many circles as “the capital city of the world”, New York is certainly no paragon of **educational** equity and excellence. Not nationally, and certainly not globally, can New York claim to be a leader in the education of public-school students. In fact, there is an increasing body of research which places NYC among the most racially and economically stratified and separated/segregated cities in the US. It is perhaps also not surprising that the NYC public education system does not provide most of its public-school students with a high quality education. African ancestry, Latino and Indigenous¹ students constitute over 72% of New York City’s public-school population, yet they are overwhelmingly under-educated in the NYC public school system. In sharp contrast, a relatively small percentage of students are enabled to flourish. These “very successful” students are overwhelmingly White or Asian. Ironically, Asian students and White students each of which comprises slightly more than 14% of the total student population. In the course of examining NYC’s educational disparities, this report will identify a representative selection of significant systemic failures. This report’s purpose is to provide advocates for students with information and advice on several public education issues that collectively have critical relevance in transforming public education into a liberating, equitable and excellent experience for all students. The issues range from broad public policy matters such as *centralized mayoral control* and *the lack parental and other stakeholder input to the roles of culture, teacher preparation, and student-centered pedagogy and curricula*. These are matters which relate to public education conditions within several Community Boards and beyond.

They include considerations about:

- the character of secondary education within CD9, and the quality of area middle and elementary schools as “feeders” to high school;

¹ The Indigenous student population is far less than one percent in NYC, however, the educational experiences of these three student groupings are generally very similar.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

- the recent re-organizations of NYC Department of Education’s (DOE) administrative structure;
- chronic problems which impede many CD9 and NYC public education students... along their paths;
- core elements of a “solution set” in preparing average or typical CD9 and NYC public education students for admission to and success within strong secondary education environments.

Hopefully, the report’s analyses, conclusions and recommendations regarding these issues, resonate among peoples and communities across Harlem and New York City; especially with many parents and advocates of Latino and African Ancestry students.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In producing this report, we undertook an array of educational research, investigations and analyses.² Initially we sought to examine secondary education in CD9; and to identify the “pathway(s)” along which an “average or typical public-school child” found in CD9, greater Harlem (or even New York City) could reasonably be expected to progress from “toddlerhood” to successful admission into an academically rigorous high school.³ [This focus framed our subsequent inquiries and research. NYC DOE relevant administrative structures.] We realized that under present NYC public schools conditions, the “average or typical” child, whether in CD9 or citywide, has little likelihood of gaining admission to a selective, college preparatory secondary school. We found that 94 percent of the public-school students in CD9 were Latino or Black as are about 72 percent of the students citywide. We found that most of these students were caught in a school system which underserved or “undereducated” them—generation-after-generation.

At the same time, empirical evidence graphically demonstrated that other students were overwhelming beneficiaries; apparently tracked for success. These students are the “elite” high academic performers. They are overwhelmingly Asian and White—two groups comprising less than 6 percent of CD9, and less than 30 percent of citywide students. Not

² Primary educational data source was *2005-06 New York State Reports* for New York City.

³ The imminent opening (September of 2007) of Columbia Secondary School For Math, Science and Engineering (CSS) in CD9 was an impetus for considering this “pathway” issue.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

only are these students exceptionally well educated, they are also largely not in financial need. These students comprise the bulk of the students in the elementary and middle school talented and gifted (T & G) schools and programs, as well as most of the students in the city’s selective college prep middle and secondary schools. Their anointed place at the top of the public education “system’s” pyramid is also confirmed by the system’s own data. The data shows that of the students enrolled in the city’s eight specialized high schools using the *Specialized High Schools Admissions Test (SHSAT)*⁴, 84 percent are Asian and White. We found that in relationship to their proportion of the public-school population, Asian students were about 13.5 times and 19 times more heavily enrolled in these schools than Black and Latino students respectively. White students were about 8 times and 12 times more heavily enrolled than Black and Latino students respectively. Preliminary researches of several additional highly regarded, honors-type public high schools produced similar findings. Unfortunately, these disparities have other, more harmful manifestations in the Latino and African ancestry student populations. Academically, the vast majority of Latino and Black students seemed tracked for mediocrity and failure. In the CD9 middle schools— feeders to secondary school—huge numbers of Latino and African ancestry students are recipients of math and English proficiency scores of “level 1” (not proficient at grade level) and “level 2” only (partially proficient). Thirty percent or more of Latino and Black students do not graduate; and many more are earning “local high school” ([non-regents) diplomas. Directly affecting their personal lives, Black and Latino students are increasingly being criminalized for a variety of school-based disputes as well. This is occurring at such an alarming (and disparate) rate that the “school-to-prison-pipeline” is now a commonly referred to phenomenon. We recognize these and other differences in the educational careers of specific student groupings as manifestations of the *educational achievement gap (EAG)*. A “gap” defined by the disparity in the “*system’s*” delivery of educational services. The responsibilities for causing and addressing the EAG are with society, its institutions, and its officials; not with any groupings of students. Finally, the report identifies a confluence of societal, NYC and DOE policies and practices as being at the root of the EAG. The

⁴ There are nine Specialized High Schools. La Guardia High School admits students on the basis of Arts auditions.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

causes are systemic and only a multi faceted response, geared to change the “system” would be appropriate. Thus this report ultimately morphed into an examination of relevant data and a discussion of these core problems. Admittedly, the report and recommendations may reflect an expanded, more comprehensive addressing of the request for a “pathway” than GCA originally envisioned. In any case, we trust that the material will be useful.

General Report Organization

The report is presented in two major sections, *Phase I* and *Phase II*. Phase I contains discussions of (1) the *Community District Nine (CD9) Target Area*, including selected demographic information; (2) *Target Area public secondary schools*, including presentations of selected school and student demographic, test performance and graduation data; (3) *Columbia Secondary School For Math, Science and Engineering (CSS)*, the new, Columbia-co-sponsored public school, including consideration of its mission, targeted student population and selectivity process; *similar types of public schools to CSS (e.g., college-sponsored secondary schools and the specialized high schools)*, including their relationship & relevancy to (e.g., demographic congruency of their targeted enrollees with) Target Area students; (4) *Middle and elementary schools*, including a presentation of selected student demographics; and (5) the reorganized NYC Department of Education (DOE) administrative structure. In a section of *Conclusions*, the report first (6) discusses certain inadequacies of NYSED & NYCDOE educational evaluation & assessment instruments, reviews and reports in facilitating *educational equity & excellence*, which signal broader, more fundamental problems. Next in the *Conclusions*, the report notes that (7) a “vast majority” of students – whether in CD9 or citywide-- is not the focus or priority of New York City’s public education system. The report then identifies overwhelming beneficiary of the NYC DOE’s highly stratified public-school system, as a relatively small, elite segment of students who are targeted and effectively tracked for “success”. Finally, in the *Conclusions*, the report presents several (8) *core problems and issues* that are instrumental in *limiting the educational opportunities*, intellectual lives, and the very futures of most students. The disparity in the delivery of effective educational services and resources between the “gifted & talented”

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

elite students, and that vast majority of “other students” –especially lower performing students, is identified as the “*educational achievement gap*” (*EAG*). It is stated at this point that most elite student groupings are overwhelmingly white and Asian. The vast majority of non-elite students are Latino and African ancestry. This is most graphically the case for lower performing groupings of students such as: *low income students* and *students with disabilities*. It is also noted that addressing the EAG is the responsibility of society and government. EAG is not the fault of any group(s) of students. The EAG, which is systemic, results from a confluence of core societal and educational problems. Broadly they can be categorized as follows:

- chronic institutional failures;
- wrongheaded, anti-democratic & anti-stakeholder structures and public policies;
- long-sustained fiscal inequity & neglect; and most crucially,
- poor curricular, instructional, teacher training and professional development practices.

In Phase II, the Recommendations are presented in an outline of selected policy implementation efforts intended to meaningfully address the EAG and facilitate the struggle for much needed institutional change(s); changes which will provide that “average child equitable, if long overdue, access to the “pathway” of educational opportunity. We understand that *quality public education is a human right* and that *stakeholders must be important parts of “the process” of change*. However, progressing from “articulation to action” always seems to be a challenge. In this case, the task of developing and converting these important social ideas into new, liberating public policies will be especially formidable. Toward that end, we developed a detailed outline of seven recommendations. They are summarized in the following general headings:

- NYC Governmental / Public Education Policy Implementation
- NYC DOE Classroom Curriculum & Instruction Policy Implementation
- NYC DOE Teacher Recruitment and Retention Policy Implementation
- NYC DOE Teacher Preparation (Training) & Professional Development Policy Implementation
- NYC DOE Principal Training & Development and School Leadership Policy Implementation
- Schools of Education & Collegiate Paradigm Shift: Integrated Approaches

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

- Columbia-specific Efforts

Individual implementation of the outlined recommendations which are detailed at the end of this report will produce significant and empowering results. Collectively, the whole will be even “greater than the sum of its parts”. The impact will not only be comprehensive, but also transformative to millions of young lives.

PHASE I

COMMUNITY DISTRICT NINE (CD9) TARGET AREA FINDINGS⁵

Community District Nine (CD9) encompasses Morningside Heights, Manhattanville, and Hamilton Heights. West 110th Street and West 155th Street are the southern and northern boundaries respectively. Sections of Morningside, St Nicholas, Bradhurst and Edgecombe Avenues form its long, eastern boundary; with the Hudson River providing CD9's western boundary. CD9 is a vibrant district with an array of diverse, cultural, economic, ethnic communities within. In both decades between 1980 and 2000, CD9 averaged about four percent (4%) population growth. **According to 2000 Census data, approximately 43.2% the district's 112,000 residents self-identified as Latino; 31.3% as African American/Black; about 17.8% white; 5% Asian/Pacific Islander; 2.6% one or more Nonhispanic races, and .2% Native.** Forty-three percent (43%) of the approximately 64,000 households spoke languages other than English. About 20% of households spoke a language other than either English or Spanish. For decades the Black and Latino populations have combined for a seventy-plus percent share of residency. However, certain trending and cultural shifts are occurring within these communities during the most recent decades.

When compared to the 1990 Census, the 2000 data evidences a significant increase in Latino residents and sharp decreases in the percentages of both Blacks and Whites. In 1990 there were: 38,666 (36%) Latino residents; 41,849 (39%) Black residents; 20,876 (19.5%) White residents; 4,804 (4.5%) Asian residents; and 349 (.4%) Indigenous residents recorded. In 2000, CD9 recorded 48,233 Latinos, an increase of nearly 25% and 5,751 Asians, an increase of nearly 20%. Contrastingly, Black, White and Indigenous residency decreased by nearly 17% (to 34,924); 5% (to 19,837); and 22% (to 272) respectively. While Puerto Rican residency has declined, an increasing percentage of

⁵ Data sources: a) US Bureau of Census. b) New York State Profile Community Board Nine <http://www.cb9m.org/maps.php>; <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/lucds/mn9profile.pdf>; and c) Pratt Institute "CB 9 197-A Plan Appendix A Population Characteristics", 2005. <http://www.prattcenter.net/pubs/CB9/9-appendix-a.pdf>

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Dominican ancestry people make CD9 their home. Mexican ancestry, Central and South American ancestry peoples have also continued to move to CD9 in recent years. The African ancestry population, while steadily declining in CD9, increasingly includes a mix West African and Caribbean immigrants. While in 2000, the difference in the African Ancestry population and the Latino population were only about three percentage points, trending patterns indicated that the Latino population would surpass the Black population in CD9 in the century's first decade.

TARGET AREA STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS

Introduction

This section of the report focuses largely on data and analyses regarding public schools and student populations either within, or in close proximity to, Community District Nine (CD9). As noted previously, CD9 is on the west side of Manhattan; and encompasses a substantial portion of West Harlem and borders Northern Manhattan. Some “Target Area schools” are actually located east of CD9, in CD10. They are included because their student catchment areas, administrative leaderships and/or array of support programs extend into CD9. In certain cases, the schools/students have direct links to Columbia U. and/or the newly opening *Columbia Secondary School For Math, Science and Engineering (CSS)*.

Additionally, in a section below, we briefly contrast selected categories of “high performing types” of citywide secondary schools (and their student populations) with the Target Area schools and students. That discussion is intended to help clarify and contextualize several glaring public education policy problems that the report identifies as having profoundly negative effects on the *majority* of Target Area students and the *corresponding majority* of students citywide.

General Target Area Schools Findings

The majority of the report's public-school demographic information is for the 2005-06 school year. The school demographics are generally consistent with the 2000 Census findings, cited above. Notably however, the 2005-06 school data show even greater

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Latino and African ancestry representation than in CD9's resident population. For example, the 93.8% enrollment of Black and Latino students in Target Area schools can be contrasted with Census 2000's nearly 75% Latino and Black population in CD9. This 19 percentage point increase-differential for Latino and Black public school and residential population is, reflected in a correspondingly large 14 percentage point decrease-differential of *White student enrollment; which is only 4%*. Census 2000 showed a nearly 18% *White residential population*. While there was clear evidence of long-term general losses in White residential population, the 14-point differential in student population still seems to be extreme. This hyper-difference is probably due, in part, to a significantly greater proportion of the Target Area's white residents a) sending their children to private schools.

Since the impetus of GCA's request was premised on certain secondary education (high school) matters, the discussion of Target Area students and schools begins with the *secondary schools* and proceeds to *middle schools*, and then to *elementary schools*. *Charter schools*, which receive substantial public funds, and have significant relevancy, are discussed as well. **Table 1** presents a composite of the student enrollments for these four categories (within three educational levels) of schools. There are a total of forty-four (44) schools and more than seventeen thousand (17,280) students (as of the 2005-06 school year) in the Target Area. All the schools are within NYC D.O.E. Region 10. Most are concentrated in School Districts 5 and 6; with a few in the northern portion of School District 3. The categorical distribution is as follows:

- Nine (9) secondary schools with 4,240 students;
- Eleven (11) middle schools with 4,125 students;
- Thirteen (13) elementary schools with 7,119 students; and
- Eleven (11) charter schools with 1,796 students.

Race/ethnicity data are especially significant in considerations regarding Target Area school/student *enrollment, academic performance, graduation and drop out rates*; and therefore are incorporated into many of the tables within the report. In **Table 1**, the population of Black and Latino students enrolled in Target Area schools is 50 percent to 43 percent respectively. Population trends suggest that these percentages are expected to

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

continue a precipitous shift; with a majority of Latino elementary, middle and secondary school students within 3 to 5 years. In 2005-06, large Black student majorities still existed in the high school, middle school and charter school categories; while there was a large Latino student majority in the elementary school students. The 2006-07 data are expected to evidence growth in the percentage of Latino students in all school categories.

**Table 1: Target Area Public Schools Composite Demographic Data:
2005-06 School Year⁶**

Student Demographics	HS	MS	EI S	Ch S	Sub Totals:	
	N=9	N=11	N=13	N=11	N	%
A/B	2,117	2,025	3,090	1,470	8,702	50.35
A/P	168	91	83	6	348	2
L/H	1,805	1,555	3,826	319	7,505	43.42
W	135	435	95	1	666	3.85
I	15	19	25	0	59	<.35
Totals	4,240	4,125	7,119	1,796	17,280	100

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America-Western Hemisphere

Nineteen of report’s twenty-four tables present a variety of composite, aggregated and school-specific data for the 2005-06 school year regarding: *enrollment, student ethnicity, high school completion and test score levels*. Tables 3, 3A and 3B present enrollment and ethnicity data for New York City’s *Specialized High Schools*. **Tables 2 and 3** present listings of CD9 *private & parochial schools, and colleges & institutions of higher education* respectively. These institutions, many of them world renown, are all important elements of the fabric of CD9. Furthermore the very concentration of so many facilities such as these in a modestly-sized municipal unit like CD9, not only enriches the

⁶ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. Data for 2006-07 School Year Not Yet Available

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

“community’s” resources, it can become a pivotal factor in plans / decisions made about that community’s socio-economic future.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

**Selected Facilities and Program Sites
In New York City, 2002-2005**

MANHATTAN COMMUNITY DISTRICT 9

Table 2: CD9 Private and Parochial Schools⁷

Block Lot

Private & Parochial Elementary and Secondary Schools

1970	42	ANNUNCIATION SCHOOL	461 W 131 St	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	240	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1894	56	BANK STREET SCHOOL FOR CHILDR	610 W 112 St	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	427	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1865	1	CATHEDRAL SCHOOL	1047 Amsterdam Ave	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	240	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1976	6	CORPUS CHRISTI SCHOOL	535 W 121 St	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	218	Enrollment	NYS DOE
2058	55	OUR LADY OF LOURDES SCHOOL	468 W 143 St	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	156	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1991	32	RIVERSIDE CHURCH WEEK DAY SCH	490 Riverside Drive	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	55	Enrollment	NYS DOE
2084	40	SAINT CATHERINE OF GENOA SCHO	508 W 153 St	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	260	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1967	24	SAINT JOSEPH SCHOOL	168 Morningside Ave	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	226	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1896	9	SS. HILDA & HUGH SCHOOL	619 W 114 St	Elementary School - Private/Parochial	365	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1991	1	COOKE CENTER SCHOOL	475 Riverside Dr	Special/Other School - Private/Parochial	132	Enrollment	NYS DOE

Total Enrollment

2319

Table 3: CD9 Colleges and Post Secondary Institutions⁸

Colleges and Other Post-Secondary Institutions

1957	100	CITY COLLEGE (CUNY)	181 Convent Ave	Public College - CUNY	12459	Enrollment	CUNY
1894	56	BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATI	610 W 112 St	Independent - Degree Granting Institution	1001	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1989	1	BARNARD COLLEGE	3009 Broadway	Independent - Degree Granting Institution	2281	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1896	72	COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	600 W 116 St	Independent - Degree Granting Institution	22875	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1977	1	JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEM OF AME	3080 Broadway	Independent - Degree Granting Institution	667	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1993	1	MANHATTAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC	120 Claremont Ave	Independent - Degree Granting Institution	796	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1975	1	TEACHERS COLLEGE	525 W 120 St	Independent - Degree Granting Institution	4993	Enrollment	NYS DOE
1992	13	UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	3041 Broadway	Independent - Degree Granting Institution	220	Enrollment	NYS DOE

The data for the 2006-07 school year –when available-- will be useful in updating Target Area information. However, the 2005-06 data seems to be current enough. It offers an adequate baseline on which to relate and contextualize past socio-economic (census) data with the present educational situations and conditions. This baseline information provided the authors with school and student profile material, through which consistent enrollment, ethnicity and performance patterns were identified; and more sophisticated socio-cultural and socio-economic relationships were disclosed.

⁷ <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/lucds/mn9profile.pdf> (pg. 20)

⁸ <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/lucds/mn9profile.pdf> (pg. 21)

TARGET AREA SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Nine (9) target area secondary schools are presented. See *Table 4* below. Two are new and scheduled to begin teaching operations in fall 2007. They are the *Columbia Secondary School* and the *Academy For Social Action (a College Board School)*. Each of these two schools is actually a grade 6-12 “*middle school – high school*”; and will begin the school year with eighty-one students in grade 6 classes only. Each school will add one grade annually. The initial 9th grade classes are slated to commence in 2010.

The seven secondary schools which are already operating in the target area had a total enrollment in 2005-06 of 4,240 students. The individual enrollments ranged between 309 and 1,628 students. Three of the schools, the Frederick Douglass Academies I & II and Thurgood E. Marshall Academy, offer grade 6-12 and grade 7-12 instruction respectively.

From data derived from the *2005-06 New York State Department of Education School Report Cards* <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>, we found that nearly ninety-three percent (93%) of the students in the target area secondary schools were Latino (43%) or Black (50%). Approximately seven percent of the students were Asian/Pacific Islanders (4%), White (3%) and Indigenous North American (< .3%).

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 4: Target Area Public Secondary Schools 2005-06 School Year⁹

Secondary School /Level of Need	Address / School District #	Eligibility/ Selection	Enrollment	Demographics % A/B-A/P-L/H-W-I	Grades Served
Mott Hall High School I Lower Level of Need	6 Edgecombe Ave NYC 10030 #5	Limited: Unscreened	209	%: 36- 2- 57- 4- 0 N: 75-5-120-8-1	9 & 10
Frederick Douglass Academy Lower Level of Need	2581 Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Blvd. NYC 10030 #5	Selective: Screened	1387 950	%: 73-1- 24-1- 0 N: 698-9-229-12-2	6-12
Frederick Douglass Academy II Lower Level of Need	215 W. 114 th St. NYC 10026 #3	Ed Option / Selective	209	%: 80-0-18-0-1 N: 168-0-37-1-3	6-11
A. Philip Randolph HS Campus Middle Level of Need	443 West 135 Street NYC 10031 #6	Ed Option / Selective	1,628	%: 34-3-62-1- 0 N: 552-42-1014-14- 6	9-12
Thurgood Marshall Academy Middle Level of Need	200 West 135 Street NYC 10030 #5	Ed/Option	353	%: 83-0- 17-0- 0 N: 292-0-60-0-1	9-12
Bread & Roses Integrated Arts HS Higher Level of Need	6 Edgecombe Avenue NYC 10030 #5	Open to NYC Residents	488	%: 52-0-46-1- 0 N: 255-2-226-3-2	9-12
HS for Mathematics, Science & Engineering @ City College Lower Level of Need	138 Convent Avenue NYC 10031 #6	Selective ¹⁰ SHSAT	403	%: 19-27-30-24-1 N: 76-110-119-97-1	9-12
Columbia Secondary School ¹¹	425 West 123 Street NYC 10027 #5	Selective: Screened	--	n/a	6-12
Academy for Social Action: A College Board School ¹²	509 West 129 Street #5	Limited: Unscreened	--	n/a	6-12
Enrollment Totals; Demographic Totals & Percents			4,240	%: 50-4-43-3-<.4 N: 2,116-168-1,805- 135-16	

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

⁹ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. Data for 2006-07 School Year Not Yet Available

¹⁰ Specialized High School Test Required for Admission

¹¹ New School with Staggered Opening September 2007-13

¹² New School with Staggered Opening September 2007-13

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Four of the seven schools have open admissions or education option admissions; and two of the seven, *HS for Mathematics, Science & Engineering @ City College and Frederick Douglass Academy I*, have selective admissions. Please note that the *HS for Mathematics, Science & Engineering @ City College (HSMSE@CCNY)* is one of the newer of New York City's *nine specialized high schools*. As we discuss later, most these schools emphasize *science, mathematics, engineering and technology*; and with the exception of *La Guardia HS For Music and Performing Arts*, all select their enrollment by means of ranked scoring on the citywide *specialized high school admissions test (SHSAT)*. Of the two Target Area secondary schools opening in Fall 2007, the *Columbia Secondary School For Math, Science and Engineering (CSS)*, while not one of the “specialized high schools”, will also be highly selective.

Target Area Secondary Schools: Academic Characteristics

In considering academic characteristics of general high school education within the Target Area, the focus was on a selection of *student test proficiency data* (English and Math) and *school completion & non-completion* (graduation, type of diploma & GED, dropout) *data*. Most of this was longitudinal data, based on 4-year and 5-year, New York State-generated research and findings. New York City and New York State formats much of this information as “cohort data”; that is, for students who either began grade-9 in 2001-02 (2001 Cohort) or 2002-03 (2002 Cohort). Cohorts also include ungraded students with disabilities who reach their seventeenth birthdays the particular school year and were enrolled in the school/district for five months.¹³

Academic Characteristics: Four (4) Representative Secondary Schools

This section of the report draws on findings from four (of the seven) schools in operation during the 2006-07 school year. These four schools were selected because they (1) all had fully operational 9th through 12th grades during the 2005-06 school year –the latest year for which there is comprehensive data available to the public; and (2) they have general

¹³ Students are excluded from the cohort if they transferred to another school district, nonpublic school, or criminal justice facility, or left the U.S. and its territories or died before the report date. Statewide total cohort also includes students who were enrolled for fewer than five months.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

academic enrollment criteria (and student populations) which are generally “representative” of the broad array of “regular” NYC high schools.

Two of the three *not-included-schools*, *Mott HS* and *Frederick Douglass Academy II (FDA II)*, are excluded because they had not yet enrolled their grades-11 & 12 and grade-12 classes respectively. The third school, *HSMSE@CCNY*, as a *citywide, specialized* high school, is not representative of the broad array of CD9’s (or NYC’s) regular high schools –whether selective or non-selective. Therefore inclusion of *HSMSE@CCNY* in “student proficiency” or “school completion” information, would inappropriately skew data and distort the *academic characteristics* findings and conclusions.

The *four representative secondary schools* are also the largest. They are: *Frederick Douglass Academy I (FDA I)*; *Bread & Roses HS (B & R)*; *Thurgood Marshall Academy (TMA)*, and *A. Phillip Randolph HS Campus (APR)*. See **Tables 4-A through 4-F**. This 4-school grouping contained 86 percent of the Target area’s public high school enrollment. The percentages of African ancestry (54.2%) and Latino (43.2%) students combine to total more than 97% of the grouping. This is an increase from the 93% totals for the entire 7-school grouping. The percentage of Latino students is nearly constant in both groupings. It is the Black student percentage which is more than four percentage points greater than its 7-school enrollment share (50%). There is a correspondingly large decrease (down to <3%) in combined Asian and White student enrollment. This specific drop in enrollment within the 4-school grouping is understandable, since nearly 65 percent of the White students and 72 percent of the Asian secondary school students in the entire Target Area are enrolled in *HSMSE@CCNY*, specialized school. This demographic anomaly underscores the finding that this school and its students while certainly *in* CD9, are clearly not representative *of* CD9’s general public secondary schools and their student populations.

“Similar Schools” Classification

New York State Education Department (NYSED) maintains much of its public school data in ways in which it is able to compare and contrast school and student performance

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

in relationship to “*similar schools*”¹⁴; that is, schools which have broadly similar ranges of student needs characteristics. There are three *categories of need* according to which Secondary, Middle and Elementary level schools are divided:

1. *lower* range of student needs
2. *middle* range of student needs
3. *higher* range of student needs

NYSED uses household income status as a primary needs characteristic; with “*free lunch eligibility*” specifically recorded. Student English language proficiency needs are also considered; with *LEP and ELL eligibility* specifically recorded. NYSED, based on its needs criteria, has developed and recorded a “*Needs Statistic*” for each public school throughout the state. However within that data, NYSED is also clear to note that “membership” in the various similar school groups was actually “determined by NYC Department of Education using other criteria than the Needs Statistic.” While NYC’s “other criteria” were not spelled out by the state, the city’s *similar schools groups* were presented in the state data.

New York City schools are considered discretely from other municipalities across the state. Thus each NYC public school is only measured in relationship to “similar” NYC schools. In the 2005-06 data, 356 NYC secondary public schools are identified among the three categories. There were 67 schools with a lower range of student needs; 151 schools with a middle range, and 138 schools with a higher range of student needs. (See **Appendix Five: *Similar Schools Listing: NYC*** for a general breakdown of the middle school and elementary school numbers as well.)

Among the four representative Target Area secondary schools (the 4-school grouping), FDA I, is in the lower student needs category; APR and TMA are in the middle range, and B & R is in the higher student needs range. In selected performance and completion sections, the report presents information on the Target Area schools, as well as their respective similar schools. That is, the average of all other NYC public schools

¹⁴ *Similar Schools information link:*

<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/reportcard/2006/similar-schools/home.shtml>

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

designated (by DOE) as having a student population within the same general need category.

Selected 4-Year Proficiency Test Metrics

The following eight tables (*Tables 4-A through 4-D-2*), present student proficiency test results *after four years of instruction* in *Mathematics and English language arts (ELA)* for the 2001 and 2002 Cohorts of the four representative high schools. In general, the proficiency tests are intended to assess the student’s grasp of core subjects as measured against *statewide standards* of “grade level content knowledge” and “analytical ability”. Each student’s understanding of the subject matter is presumably reflected in her/his scores. Scores range from level 1 to level 4 and are discretely recorded to determine whether her/his level of comprehension is unsatisfactory, partially acceptable, satisfactory or advanced (that is, reflective of *subject mastery* at grade-level). The statewide *subject area* proficiency test standards are actually recorded as follows:

- Level 1: “Not Meeting Learning Standards”
- Level 2: “Partially Meeting Learning Standards”
- Level 3: “Meeting Learning Standards”
- Level 4: “Meeting Learning Standards With Distinction”

Student raw scores within the “level 3” or “level 4” ranges are recognized as demonstrating proficiencies at or above the broad grade-12 standards for Mathematics and/or English language arts. New York City and State recognize “level 2” scores as indicative of the lowest level of acceptability. **That is, even though student scores in the level-2 range only demonstrate *partial meeting of the learning standards*, they are recorded (along with “3’s” and “4s”) as “passing”.** Only level-1 scores are not passing.

Selected 4-Year Proficiency Test Findings

There are "combined" totals of 656 and 658 students in the 2001 and 2002 cohorts respectively. These cohorts comprise students who were largely seniors in the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years respectively.

FDA I’s 2001 Cohort had 83% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with 23%

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

scoring level 2, 60% scoring level 3 and 21% level 4. Seventeen percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Similar schools had 89% with level 2-4; 41% level 3, and 44% level 4. An average of 11% of the scores was level 1. Eighty-eight percent had math scores between 2 and 4; with 21% scoring level 2, 67% scoring level 3 and 3% level 4. Twelve percent of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 88% with level 2-4; 46% level 3, and 37% level 4. An average of 12% of the scores was level 1. FDA I's 2002 cohort showed improvement over the relatively strong performance of its 2001 peers. **FDA I's 2002 Cohort** had 85% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with 6% scoring level 2, 59% scoring level 3 and 20% level 4. Fifteen percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Similar schools had 88% with level 2-4; 45% level 3, and 39% level 4. An average of 12% of the scores was level 1. Ninety-one percent had math scores between 2 and 4; with 3% scoring level 2, 60% scoring level 3 and 28% level 4. Nine percent of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 89% with level 2-4; 41% level 3, and 44% level 4. An average of 11% of the scores was level 1. Similar schools had 89% with level 2-4; 48% level 3, and 37% level 4. An average of 11% of the scores was level 1.

TMA's 2001 Cohort had 90% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with a large 33% scoring level 2, 48% scoring level 3 and 9% level 4. Ten percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Similar schools had 69% with level 2-4; 42% level 3, and 16% level 4. An average of 12% of the scores was level 1. Eighty-four percent had math scores between 2 and 4; with 22% scoring level 2, 57% scoring level 3 and 5% level 4. Sixteen percent of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 69% with level 2-4; 46% level 3, and 9% level 4. An average of 30% of the scores was level 1. TMA's 2002 cohort also showed improvement over the relatively strong showing of its 2001 peers. **TMA's 2002 Cohort** had 90% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with 27% scoring level 2, 49% scoring level 3 and 14% level 4. Ten percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Similar schools had 68% with level 2-4; 46% level 3, and 11% level 4. An average of 32% of the scores was level 1. Eighty-eight percent had math scores between 2 and 4; with 13% scoring level 2, 63% scoring level 3 and 13% level 4. Twelve percent of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 70% with level 2-4;

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

47% level 3, and 9% level 4. An average of 30% of the scores was level 1.

B & R's 2001 Cohort had 73% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with a 12% scoring level 2, 51% scoring level 3 and 10% level 4. Twenty-seven percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Similar schools had 57% with level 2-4; 35% level 3, and 8% level 4. An average of 43% of the scores was level 1. Only 67% had math scores between 2 and 4; with 11% scoring level 2, 52% scoring level 3 and 4% level 4. A whopping 33% of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 59% with level 2-4; 38% level 3, and 5% level 4. An average of 41% of the scores was level 1. **B & R's 2002 Cohort** continued to have a far too large percentage of level 1 scores. **B & R's 2002 Cohort** had 63% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with 8% scoring level 2, 51% scoring level 3 and 4% level 4. Similar schools had 58% with level 2-4; 37% level 3, and 6% level 4. An average of 42% of the scores was level 1. Thirty-seven percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Seventy-three percent had math scores between 2 and 4; with 17% scoring level 2, 54% scoring level 3 and 2% level 4. Twenty-seven percent of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 63% with level 2-4; 40% level 3, and 6% level 4. An average of 37% of the scores was level 1.

APR's 2001 Cohort had 75% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with an 8% scoring level 2, 53% scoring level 3 and 14% level 4. Twenty-five percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Similar schools had 69% with level 2-4; 42% level 3, and 16% level 4. An average of 12% of the scores was level 1. Seventy-six percent had math scores between 2 and 4; with 6% scoring level 2, 55% scoring level 3 and 15% level 4. Twenty-four percent of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 69% with level 2-4; 46% level 3, and 9% level 4. An average of 30% of the scores was level 1. **APR's 2002 Cohort** continued to have large percentages of level 1 scores. **APR's 2002 Cohort** had 73% of its ELA scores between level 2 and level 4; with 11% scoring level 2, 52% scoring level 3 and 10% level 4. Twenty-seven percent of the cohort had level 1 ELA scores. Similar schools had 68% with level 2-4; 46% level 3, and 11% level 4. An average of 32% of the scores was level 1. Seventy-seven percent had math scores between 2 and 4; with 10% scoring level 2, 55% scoring level 3 and 12% level 4.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Twenty-three percent of the cohort had level 1 math scores. Similar schools had 70% with level 2-4; 47% level 3, and 9% level 4. An average of 30% of students scored at level 1.

Again, we cited these Math and English proficiency test scoring data as metrics (after 4 years) of the *general academic preparation* of target area public secondary school students, who had entered the ninth grade in the fall of 2001 and 2002. State data indicates that 3,326 of the 3,419 students attending the four representative high schools during the 2005-06 school year were Black or Latino. Only 93 were identified as either Asian, Indigenous or White. There only were 12 Asian, 2 Indigenous and 14 White students among the 656 students comprising the 2001 combined cohorts. Twenty-three of these 28 students attended APR. There were 9 Asian, 4 Indigenous and 2 White students among the 658 students comprising the 2002 combined cohorts. Eleven of these 15 students also attended APR. Some of the proficiency test results for Asian, Indigenous and White students were unavailable because they were aggregated and presented as “small group” data. However, an examination of Tables 2-D and 2-D-2, that the proportion of proficiency scores of levels 3 and 4 at APR for Asian and White students ranged between 19 percent and 49 percent above the proportion of “3s” and “4s” for “All” APR students in the 2001 Cohort. Similarly, the proportion of proficiency scores of levels 3 and 4 at APR for Asian students ranged between 9 percent and 32 percent above the proportion of “3s” and “4s” for “All” APR students in the 2002 Cohort. Apparently there were no White students in APR’s 2002 Cohort.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Selected Target Area HS Test Performance Indices 2005-06 School Year:

2001 Cohort and 2002 Cohort¹⁵

Table 4-A: FDA I 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students N = 156	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
ALL	12	88	67	3	17	83	60	21
A/B	11	89	72	17	16	84	63	18
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H	15	85	44	41	19	81	48	33
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NOTE: % L/H includes “small sample” data for 3 White students and 1 Asian student.

Table 4-A-2: FDA I 2002 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students N = 187	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
ALL	9	91	60	28	15	85	59	20
A/B	8	92	61	27	14	86	82	18
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H N=27+1	11	89	57	32	18	82	46	29
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NOTE: % L/H includes “small sample” data for 1 White student.

¹⁵ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. Cohorts include students who entered 9TH Grade in 2001 and 2002 respectively.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 4-B: TMA 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
N = 79	1	2-4	3	4	1	2-4	3	4
ALL	16	84	57	5	10	90	48	9
A/B	12	88	59	6	8	92	47	9
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H	38	62	46	0	23	77	54	8
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

Table 4-B-2: TMA 2002 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
N = 59	1	2-4	3	4	1	2-4	3	4
ALL	12	88	63	12	10	90	49	14
A/B	10	90	62	13	8	92	52	15
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H	29	71	71	0	29	71	29	0
N = 7								
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 4-C: B & R 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
N = 89	1	2-4	3	4	1	2-4	3	4
ALL	33	67	52	4	27	73	51	10
A/B	19	81	61	3	14	86	66	6
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H	42	58	45	6	36	64	40	13
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: % A/B includes “small sample” data for 1 Indigenous student.

Table 4-C-2: B & R 2002 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
N = 82	1	2-4	3	4	1	2-4	3	4
ALL	27	73	54	2	37	63	51	4
A/B	29	71	50	2	36	64	52	5
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H	25	75	57	3	37	63	50	3
N = 40								
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: % L/H includes “small sample” data for 1 Indigenous student and 1 White student.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 4-D: APR 2001 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
N = 332	1	2-4	3	4	1	2-4	3	4
ALL	24	76	55	15	25	75	53	14
A/B	26	74	57	12	23	77	50	17
A/P	0	100	46	45	0	100	73	27
L/H	25	75	54	15	29	71	54	8
W	17	83	50	33	17	83	50	33
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: % W includes “small sample” data for 11 White students and 1 indigenous student.

Table 4-D-2: APR 2002 Cohort Math & English After 4 Years of Instruction

Students	4-Year Math Levels w/ Percentages				4-Year ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
N = 330	1	2-4	3	4	1	2-4	3	4
ALL	23	77	55	12	27	73	52	10
A/B	28	72	48	11	32	68	44	11
A/P	18	82	55	18	18	82	64	18
L/H	19	81	66	11	23	77	58	9
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: % A/P includes “small sample” data for 9 Asian students and 2 Indigenous students.

Secondary School Completion and Non-Completion Findings

In proceeding, let us clarify certain basics regarding graduation or high school completion and non-completion. “Earning a *regular Regents Diploma* requires passing Regents Exams in 5 subjects (English, math, science, U.S. History and Government and Global History and Geography) and earning 22 course credits. Earning an *Advanced Regents Diploma* requires passing 8 Regents Exams, including two science and two math exams, and earning 22 course credits.”¹⁶ A passing score of at least 65 is also required to earn the regular Regents Diploma; while a minimum score of 85 must be attained on each regents exam to earn the Advanced Regents Diploma. This is contrasted with the exam requirements for earning the non-regents *Local High School Diploma*, in which students must attain a score of at least 55 on each of their (minimum of) five “regents”.

In **Tables 4-E and 4-F**, cohort and overall school completion / non-completion data are presented. Specifically, five-year indices such as graduation and drop out rates for “all students” as well as by student race / ethnicity categories are presented for the 2001 Cohort, in **Table 2-A**. Five years is the longest available view of a cohort grouping of secondary school students.

After five years, 82% of the 152 **FDA I** students, who had entered grade-9 in 2001, had graduated. Thirteen percent had transferred to GED programs; 1% had earned *individual education plan (IEP)*¹⁷ diplomas, and 4% were still enrolled in FDA. None of the students in FDA I’s 2001 Cohort had dropped out. *Similar schools* across the city had a 7% average drop out rate for their 2001 cohorts.

After five years, 82% of the 76 **TMA** students, who had entered grade-9 in 2001, had graduated. Eight percent had transferred to GED programs; 3% had earned *individual*

¹⁶ NYS Board of Regents Press Release 5/8/07: “More Students Graduate, Earn Regents Diplomas in 2006, School Report Cards Show” <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/SchoolReportCard2007Release.Final.htm>. NY Sun article: City Students Lag In Regents Diplomas” <http://www.nysun.com/article/53794/>.

¹⁷ An individual education plan “IEP” diploma (aka “certificate of completion”) can be earned by students with disabilities in lieu of a general education regents diploma or general education local diploma.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

education plan (IEP)⁷ diplomas, and 1% were still enrolled in TMA. Seven percent of the students in TMA's 2001 Cohort had dropped out. *Similar schools* across the city had a 19% average drop out rate for their 2001 cohorts.

After five years, 70% of the 70 **B & R** students, who had entered grade-9 in 2001, had graduated. Six percent had transferred to GED programs; none had earned *individual education plan* (IEP)⁷ diplomas, and 13% were still enrolled in B & R. Eleven percent of the students in B & R's 2001 Cohort had dropped out. *Similar schools* across the city had a 26% average drop out rate for their 2001 cohorts.

After five years, 73% of the 309 **APR** students, who had entered grade-9 in 2001, had graduated. Eight percent had transferred to GED programs; 2% had earned *individual education plan* (IEP)⁷ diplomas, and 4% were still enrolled in APR. Thirteen percent of the students in APR's 2001 Cohort had dropped out. . *Similar schools* across the city had a 19% average drop out rate for their 2001 cohorts.

The 2005-06 school year data indicates that 76% of the 4-school grouping's **combined 2001 cohorts (656 students)**, had graduated after 5 years. Nine percent had dropped out. Another nine percent had also "transferred" into GED programs. Six percent were still enrolled in school.

It must be noted that while NYC DOE and NYSED separate out "GED transfers" from students who have dropped out, both categories describe students who have left the public education system *without graduating*. Furthermore, "transferring" to a GED program is hardly a guarantee of GED completion. The students who go on to earn GEDs, demonstrate a measure of personal follow through, however, they do not represent public school system successes. Therefore it is categorically appropriate to combine *students who transfer into GED programs* with *students who have dropped out* when evaluating or otherwise considering public school completion and non-completion data. ***In that context, it should be noted that 18% of the Target Area's combined 4-school grouping's 2001 cohort had left / not completed high school after 5 years.***

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 4-E: Selected Target Area HS Completion Indices 2005-06 School Year: 2001 Cohort¹⁸

Secondary School	Graduation Rates (% After 5Yrs)						GED et al (% After 5Yrs) ¹⁹						Drop Out Rates (% After 5Yrs)					
	All	A/B	A/P	L/H	W	I	All	A/B	A/P	L/H	W	I	All	A/B	A/P	L/H	W	I
Frederick Douglass Academy I	82	84	n/a	75	n/a	n/a	14	13	n/a	18	n/a	n/a	0	0	-	0	-	-
A. Philip Randolph HS Campus	73	75	100	69	91	n/a	10	10	0	11	0	0	13	13	0	16	0	0
Bread & Roses Integrated HS	70	73	n/a	68	n/a	n/a	6	3	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	11	9	n/a	14	n/a	n/a
Thurgood Marshall Academy	82	86	n/a	58	n/a	n/a	11	9	n/a	17	n/a	n/a	7	5	n/a	17	n/a	n/a
TOTALS																		

LEGEND: All: All students in Cohort; A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

¹⁸ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. This is *fifth year data* for students who entered Grade-9 in 2001-02 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2001-02 school year (w/exclusions).

¹⁹ Rates of GED Transfers and/or IEP Diplomas are combined. (To derive % of Cohort students still enrolled in HS: subtract sum of columns 2+3+4 from 100%)

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 4-F presents a selection of overall school data as well as **2002 Cohort-specific** (4-year) *completion and non-completion* data regarding both students who graduated and students who dropped out. In 2005-06, there were 658 seniors in the 2002 cohorts for the 4-school grouping. Six hundred sixteen were general education students and 42 were students with disabilities. There were 436 graduates among the four schools; 429 in general education and 7 students with disabilities. Three hundred thirty-six of these graduates earned regents diplomas; this included one student with disabilities. Seventy-six of the 336 regents graduates, earned “advanced designation” diplomas; with 260 receiving regular regents diplomas. One hundred of the 436 graduates received local high school diplomas; seven were students with disabilities. By the end of the 2005-06 school year, one hundred seventy-five students dropped out of the four high school; 12 of these were students with disabilities. The *graduation-to-drop out (g-t-d/o) ratio* for the four representative high schools was 2.5 to 1. That is, in 2005-06, for every 25 graduates, there were 10 students who dropped out.

FDA I had 187 seniors; 143 graduates; 110 students with regents diplomas, 44 of which received advanced designation. Three of FDA I’s 5 students with disabilities graduated. One of those three graduates was the only student with disabilities to earn a regents diploma among the 4 representative schools. Although there were no 2001 Cohort FDA I students identified (in Table 2-E) as having dropped out of school, in 2005-06 there were twenty-one 2002 Cohort students (see Table 2-F) who did drop out of FDA I. This nevertheless left FDA I with the highest (best) graduation-to-drop out (g-t-d/o) ratio, 6.8 to 1, among the Target Area’s four representative high schools. That is, for every 68 graduates, there were 10 students who dropped out. The other three schools had far lower (worse) g-t-d/o ratios of 1.8 to 1, 1.8 to 1 and 2.4 to 1 for B & R, APR and TMA respectively.

In New York State, there are uniform criteria and goals which ascribe a standard of “proficiency and satisfactory progress” to schools and school districts as well as for individual categories of students. The areas considered are many; ranging from *attendance* and *test performance* to *school completion* or *graduation rates*. The state’s

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

annual performance metric is called *Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)*. For a school or a district to make *AYP* in graduation rate, the percentage of 2001 graduation-rate cohort members earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2005 for the “All Students” group had to equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard or the *Graduation-Rate Progress Target* for 2005–06. The Graduation Rate Standard is the criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory percentage of cohort members earning a local diploma. **The State Graduation-Rate Standard for the 2001 cohort is 55 percent.** The Commissioner may raise the Graduation-Rate Standard at his discretion in future years.²⁰ The number “55” is quite a significant threshold for *successful completions* by high school students in New York State. As we previously noted, “55” is also the minimum “successful” score on regents exams for a student earning a *local* diploma. All of CD9’s *four representative secondary schools* exceeded the state’s *55% local diploma minimum graduation rate* standard by significant margins. However, it is a standard which *allows* a whopping 45% of the school’s student cohorts **not to graduate** and still officially be in *good standing*. Such a very low “standard” establishes a very high threshold of *failure-acceptability*. This denotes that very large percentages of students can be tolerated to *not graduate* without significant (if any) sanctions or penalties to educators and administrators within the city and state school systems or the respective legislative bureaucracies. If the “bar” is set low, students and our society as a whole suffer profoundly. In light of the various “55” minimum score requirements, each of CD9’s four representative high schools are officially in **good standing** according to the New York State Education Department of (NYSED). Unfortunately, in practical terms, “*good standing*” may actually mean the opposite. Great numbers of public high school students may be said to have “passed” according to New York standards, yet emerge – from schools said to be “in good standing”-- ill equipped to succeed at the higher levels of either education or work.

The standards for “good standing” in middle school and elementary school (lower grades) are suspect as well. These lower grades by definition provide entrée into the public-school system. Too often, they are also the weak foundation of a system which tolerates

²⁰ <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2006/AOR-2006-310500010000.pdf>

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

the poor preparation at several levels, and the neglect of large segments of the children in its care. Considering the educational preparation and prospects of current Target Area students, in light of GCA's expressed goal of identifying an effective "pathway" [along which students are prepared to succeed in intellectually challenging, academically rigorous secondary schools], it is clear that many of these students have been profoundly ill-prepared. To change these conditions, many *path-breaking* steps must be taken.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 4-F: Target Area HS Completion & Performance Indices 2005-06²¹

STUDENTS	FDA I	B & R	TMA	APR	TOTAL
2002 Cohort Size	187	82	59	330	658
Gen'l Education Seniors ²²	182	70	57	307	616
Sr. Students/w Disabilities (S/wD) ²³	5	12	2	23	42
All Graduates	143	48	46	199	436
Gen'l Ed Graduates	140	46	45	198	429
S/wD Local Diploma	2	2	1	1	6
Gen'l Ed. Local Diploma	31	15	28	19	93
Regents Diploma	66 ²⁴	31	17	147	261 ²³
Regents Diploma w/ Advanced Designation	44	0	0	32	76
N of General Education Dropped Out	21	25	18	99	163
N of S/wD: Dropped Out	0	1	1	10	12
Graduation to Drop Out Ratio ²⁵	6.8 to 1	1.8 to 1	2.4 to 1	1.8 to 1	2.5 to 1

LEGEND: FDA I: Frederick Douglass Academy I; B & R: Bread & Roses HS; TMA: Thurgood Marshall Academy; APR: A. Phillip Randolph HS Campus

²¹ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. This is *fourth year data* for 2002 Cohort: Students who entered Grade-9 in 2002-03 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2002-03 school year.

²² Note: 2002 Cohort only. Students with Disabilities (S/wD) not included in this number.

²³ Note: 2002 Cohort only. S/wD placed in cohort based on year reaching their 17th birthday.

²⁴ Includes one Student with Disabilities (S/wD).

²⁵ Ratio of 2005-06 *graduates* divided by students who *dropped out* of educational system by end of 2005-06.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Columbia Secondary School For Math, Science and Engineering (CSS)

Columbia Secondary School (CSS) will be the new CD9 college preparatory public middle school – high school that eventually will offer grades 6-12. Specifically, CSS is a partnership between the NYC Department of Education (NYC DOE), Columbia University (CU) and some “community” elements. Prominent among the school’s strategic goals, is the preparation of its students for admission to highly selective colleges and universities. CSS student eligibility is as follows: ***preference is given to residents of districts 3, 4, 5, and 6 who reside or go to school north of 96th street; then to other Manhattan residents. Selectivity is based on standardized tests and grades in 4th or 5th grade.*** “Minimum scores of 2 on Math & Literacy (proficiency) tests. Grades in science, math and literacy courses should be 85 average (or 3 pts.) or higher.” Each enrollee will also participate in a very important personal interview with the CSS admissions committee. Prior academic performance as well as the committee members gaining a sense of the student’s personal motivation will be important within the selection process.

September 2007 will mark the commencement of CSS classes with its “founding sixth grade” of 81 students. One grade will be added annually. Initially, CSS will be housed on the upper floors of PS.125 until its new facility at 125th Street and Broadway is completed in a few years. CSS is projected to have an enrollment of 650 students when it reaches full (Grade 6-12) operations in 2013.

From the outset, CSS 6th graders will have access to much of Columbia University’s wealth of educational and cultural resources. Providing such opportunity to highly motivated middle school students can both enrich their early life experiences and help to ensure an upward trajectory to their educational futures. For students who would otherwise lack such opportunity and access, CSS can be especially important.

The CSS Curriculum will be distinguished by:

- *science, math, and engineering focus with research and service learning opportunities in NYC and at Columbia University;*

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

- *a writing intensive and public communications focus. Students will learn public speaking, become adept at using multimedia to communicate and become effective writers;*
- *Philosophy for Thinking core course that will address critical thinking, moral reasoning, and personal and ethical decision-making skills;*
- *advisory program that provides students with mentoring, guidance and support necessary for academic and personal excellence;*
- *access to parts of Columbia University’s vast academic and cultural offerings. (Advanced students, for example, may take courses at Columbia University or other colleges and universities in the area);*
- *a comprehensive Field Expeditions and Travel Abroad program will allow students to explore the world’s natural and cultural diversity; and*
- *after school science, math, and technology electives and Saturday Academy programs.*²⁶

Public school partnerships between the DOE and universities are not unusual. In recent years, CCNY, Lehman and York College established partnerships, through which they have each launched one of the newer *specialized high schools*. Separately, these same CUNY colleges along with Hostos, offer at least six “*early college credit*” collaborations with other public high schools. Bard College and Hunter College have early college partnership as well. So, in that respect, CU’s partnership on CSS with DOE is neither out of the ordinary nor controversial. The selective nature of CSS admissions is also consistent with most of the NYC DOE’s secondary school-university collaborations. Across the city, the evidence is that typical *selectivity criteria*, which mandate high test scoring and/or a strong academic record of prior performance, consistently eliminate a substantial percentage of Black and Latino students. The CD9 community’s African ancestry and Latino student populations represent a very large majority. These students also need strong, well-rounded school environments. In light of this, CSS, as an increasingly well-known middle and secondary school, may have to make crucial enrollment policy decisions over time. That is, from the outset as students compete for a

²⁶ From CSS web site: <http://www.columbiasecondary.org/>

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

relatively scarce number of places, CSS must consider and address such important questions as:

- Is there an organic relationship with the community?
- How congruent are the local community's needs with CSS' Mission, Curriculum and Pedagogical approach?
- What, if any, is CSS' recruitment focus?
- Will racial/ethnic diversity supersede the local population's educational (and socio-economic) needs?

The school's projected overall size of 650 is also not large; and is very likely to guarantee that CSS will have annual overflows in its applicant pool and waiting list. The challenge will be nurturing and sustaining a substantial community-based enrollment. If CSS fails to do this, local residents may, in time, become disillusioned with a Harlem-based public school named "*Columbia*", which offers great resources to its students, but is unavailable to the community's children. As a public school positioning itself to prepare students for admission into highly selective colleges, CSS, like similar institutions will probably focus on enrolling those students who present very strong *early* academic and attitudinal evidence that they can be successful in rigorous educational environments. However, it will be quite intriguing if CSS actually expands the *typical admissions margins utilized by most similar schools*. That is, if it instead seeks out and enrolls significant numbers of students who have academic and/or affective profiles which are not the traditional "strong" or "early" predictors of future academic success. For example, we have noted earlier that math and ELA scores as low as "2" may be acceptable. How many students with "2s" will CSS actually seek to offer admittance? By definition, "selective" schools are "excluding" students more so than selecting students.

For schools like CSS, strong candidates are those students whose test scores and/or grades are high; whose interviews offer indication that the student's attitudes are positive and reasonably well-grounded. It would be out of sync with the missions of most selective schools, and therefore "counterproductive" for them to recruit / enroll significant numbers of *lower performing* and/or *less confident* students.

Target Area Students and School Selectivity

Ironically, we suspect that what is needed are schools and teachers with the expertise, energy and *mission* to serve / help empower those students who are not performing well; who are not successfully embracing their academic responsibilities. There is a need for schools and educators with the resources of CSS and similar schools, to seek out those students scoring at the “1” and “2” levels on their proficiency exams and help them work toward excellence. The greatest challenge confronting public education is creation of a system of schools and educators which enthusiastically engages and skillfully educates all of its students well. Schools and teachers who can actualize the concept that *such students must receive motivation and inspiration as well as information* are part of the solution set for systemic change. There must be an adjustment in the focus of selectivity as well as the development of coherent, effective alternative pedagogy.

Based on the academic profiles of the largely Latino and African ancestry elementary and middle school students who currently live in the CD 9 neighborhoods, there is limited expectation that an equitable number of them will gain admittance to specialized high schools² within the next few years. Without strategic educational interventions, typical Community District 9 neighborhood students are likely to remain underrepresented in the selective schools; underrepresented in the ranks of regents diploma graduates, and also underrepresented among college graduates.

The Specialized Secondary Schools

This section is included for several reasons. The specialized secondary schools, as the pinnacle of the city’s highly stratified public education system pyramid must be considered in any important discussions of selectivity, racial / ethnic disparity and fiscal & resource equity. Later in this section we present information regarding the under representation of Latino and Black students in the specialized secondary schools.

The NYC specialized secondary high schools provide rare opportunities to their students to pursue special interests and to develop their academic and arts talents.²⁷ Individually

²⁷ See NYC DOE Specialized High Schools Student Handbook : <http://schools.nyc.gov/OurSchools/HSDirectory/SpecializedHighSchoolsStudentHandbook.htm>

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

and as a group, the specialized schools offer their students elective courses and enrichment opportunities that compound an already large “benefit gap” that their students possess over most other NYC public high school students. Historically, students in the specialized secondary schools have received the best selections and most comprehensive arrays of resources –educational, financial, and institutional. The longest operating of the specialized schools have unrivaled reputations for academic and arts excellence, both locally and nationally. As such their students annually enjoy the highest acceptance rates to the nation’s most selective colleges and universities.

For decades, there were only four of these so-called specialized schools: *Stuyvesant HS*, *Bronx HS of Science*, *Brooklyn Technical HS* and *La Guardia HS*. Today there are nine “specialized high schools” in NYC.

Specialized Secondary Schools Admission

Eight of the nine specialized high schools base admission on the *Specialized High Schools Admissions Test (SHSAT)*. Only La Guardia HS is not an “*SHSAT school*”. La Guardia, renowned for its specializations in music, the performing arts and fine arts, bases its admissions on each student’s middle school academic record as well as portfolios and student performance in the school’s famous auditions. Most of the SHSAT schools emphasize science, mathematics, engineering and technology. Two of the schools lend special emphasis and depth to American History (HSAS @ Lehman College) and Humanities and “the Classics” (Brooklyn Latin).

The SHSAT is an extremely rigorous 3-hour exam which is the sole determinant in a student’s qualifying for admittance into all but one of the specialized high schools. All SHSAT scores are ranked and each student becomes eligible to enroll in the specialized school of her/his choice according to the test score rank. Based on capacity, each specialized school has a maximum number of students it will admit. Thus the schools identified as the “first choice” of the greatest amount of the highest scoring students are the most “difficult” for which to qualify for enrollment. Annually, over twenty-five

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

thousand grade 8 students take the SHSAT and compete for approximately three thousand places.

SHSAT Schools Demographics

Table 5 presents composite enrollment demographics on the SHSAT schools for the 2005-06 school year. There were seven of the schools then in operation. These seven SHSAT schools enrolled approximately 11,567 students in 2005-06. With the commencement of the 2006-07 school year, Brooklyn Latin High School and its “founding” 63-student freshman class became NYC DOE’s ninth specialized high school. Brooklyn Latin represented the last of five newer SHSAT schools, increasing the current number to eight. The increases in the number of SHSAT schools have come in the last 4 to 5 years; and provide evidence of very small increases in the overall African ancestry and Latino student representation in the specialized high schools. We noted previously that *HSMSE@CCNY*, which graduated its first class in 2006, is one of the newer specialized high schools and is located within the CD9 Target Area. *HSMSE*’s 49 percent Latino and African ancestry (that is, 30% & 19% respectively) student population represents a remarkable difference in SHSAT school demographics. This difference is also present in Bronx-based, *HSAS Lehman*, with a 47 percent Latino and African ancestry (that is, 24% & 23% respectively) enrollment; and may occur at *Brooklyn Latin*, which offers literature indicating that it will recruit heavily among middle schools with large Black and Latino populations. However, the sobering information gleaned from the data is that these three relatively diverse specialized schools represent only a small share of the total specialized school enrollment. In fact, their nearly 800 combined “places” are more than offset by not-so-diverse enrollments of *Staten Island Tech (SIT)* and *Queens HS @York (QHS)* which total nearly 1200 students. These two newer specialized schools reflect problematic patterns long sustained in the original SHSAT schools. That is, SIT and QHS have combined enrollments of White students and Asian students totaling 97 percent and 70 percent respectively.

Tables 5-B and 5-C, present data for the “original” 3 specialized high schools and 4 of the 5 “newer” SHSAT schools respectively. As of the 2006-07 year, the four additional

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

schools had a total of 1876 students enrolled. Thus the actual number of seats in the SHSAT schools had increased by only 19 percent. When Brooklyn Latin is at full capacity in a few years, the increase will only produce about a 22 percent increase in SHSAT school seats. In 2005-06, the three “original SHSAT schools” had a total enrollment of 9,691 students. This is more than 5 times the number of students in the four newer SHSAT schools. Asian and Pacific Island students represent approximately 57 percent of all students in the original four SHSAT schools. Contrastingly, A/P students represent just 15 percent of the citywide school population. White students represent 29 percent of the these SHSAT schools although they too are about 15 percent of the citywide student population. In these original SHSAT schools Black and Latino students comprise a total of only 14 percent --8% and 6% respectively-- of the students, while comprising 72 percent of the citywide public-school population. Thus Asian students were in these SHSAT schools at nearly 4 times their rate in the overall school population; and White students were in the original SHSAT schools at nearly 2 times their rate in the overall school population. Black and Latino students were therefore represented in these four original SHSAT schools at one-fifth their rate in the overall student population. This means that in relationship to their proportion of the public-school population, Asian students and White students were nearly 20 times and 10 times respectively, more heavily enrolled in the *ORIGINAL* SHSAT schools than Latino and Black students.

In the newer SHSAT schools, the percentage of Latino students increased by more than 133 percent and the Black student enrollment increased by 75 percent, to 14 and 12 percent, respectively. Thus their combined 26 percent of the enrollees in the newer SHSAT schools almost equals the 27 percent of Asian student enrollees; and is a little more than half of the 47 percent of White student enrollees. This means that in relationship to their proportion of the public-school population, White students and Asian students were still about 8 times and 5 times respectively, more heavily enrolled in the *NEWER* SHSAT schools than Latino and Black students.

Therefore the overall SHSAT combined representations of 84 percent Asian (52%) and White (32%) students, and 16 percent Black (9%) and Latino (7%) students, is clearly

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

business as usual. That is, in relationship to their proportion of the public-school population, Asian students and White students were 15 times and 9 times respectively, more heavily enrolled in *ALL* the SHSAT schools than Latino and Black students.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 5: NYC Specialized High School (SHS) 2005-06 Enrollment Data

School	Demographics (N - %) A/B		Demographics (N - %) A/P		Demographics (N - %) L/H		Demographics (N - %) W		Demographics (N - %) I		Total Students
Stuyvesant	66	2	1886	62	99	3	977	32	3	0	3,031
Bx. Science	101	4	1583	63	172	7	644	26	8	0	2,508
Bklyn. Tech	605	14	2450	57	349	8	887	21	5	0	4,296
Staten Island Tech	6	<.1	113	14	27	3	651	83	0	0	± 788
HSAS Lehman	75	22	60	18	87	26	112	34	0	0	334
HSMSE City College	64	15	118	27	156	35	101	23	1	0	440
QHS York (Queens)	74	20	226	60	38	10	38	10	0	0	376
Brooklyn Latin	37%		18%		28%		13%		4% other		(95) ²⁸
LaGuardia	-		-		-		-		-		[2519] ²⁹
Total	1,039	9	5,984	52	865	7	3,657	32	21	(<.2%)	11,567

LGND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America-Western Hemisphere

²⁸ 2007-08 Grade 9 and Grade 10 “Founding Class” Total Enrollment (Demographic Percentages)

²⁹ Enrollment included for information only; not incorporated into SHSAT Schools Data
SERVICE * EDUCATION * ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT * SCIENCE
110 West End Avenue Suite 19B * New York, NY 10023 *
212-362-6021 * jaydub16@aol.com * www.seedswork.org

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 5-A: NYC 2005-06 Enrollment Data For Original SHSAT High Schools

Demographics	Stuyvesant		Bronx Science		Brooklyn Tech		Total Students	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A/B	66	.2	116	.5	630	.15	812	.8
A/P	1764	.59	1465	.60	2253	.53	5,482	.57
H/L	99	.3	157	.6	350	.8	606	.6
W	1081	.36	688	.28	1001	.24	2770	.29
I	5	.2	10	.4	6	.1	21	.2
Totals	3,015		2,436		4,240		9,691	.100

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America-Western Hemisphere

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 5-B: NYC 2005-06 Enrollment Data For Newer SHSAT Schools

Demographics	HSMSE City College		York College		Brooklyn Latin	Staten Island Tech HS		HSAS Lehman		Total Students	
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
A/B	76	19	74	20	n/a	6	<.8	71	23	227	12
A/P	110	27	226	60	n/a	104	13	62	20	502	27
H/L	119	30	38	10	n/a	27	3	75	24	259	14
W	97	24	38	10	n/a	651	83	101	33	887	47
I	1	.2	0		n/a	0		0		1	.05
Totals	403		376		n/a	788		309		1,876	100

**LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic;
W: White; I: Indigenous North America-Western Hemisphere**

TARGET AREA MIDDLE SCHOOLS SUMMARY

There are eleven target area middle schools and (including previously mentioned) middle school–high schools cited in this report. The schools offer grades 6-8 instruction. They had a total enrollment in 2005-06 of 4,125 students. In 2005-06, the individual middle school enrollments ranged between 183 and 1,003 students. As previously noted, each of the two new schools will open in September 2007, with 81 grade 6 students. From data derived from the *2005-06 New York State Department of Education School Report Cards* <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>, we found that eighty-seven percent (87%) of the students in these middle schools were Latino (38%) and/or Black (49%). Thirteen percent (13%) of the students were Asian/Pacific Islanders (2%), White (11%) and Indigenous North American (< .5%).

Six of the eleven schools have open admissions. The five other schools, KAPPA IV, Frederick Douglass Academy, the two newly opening schools, and Booker T. Washington Middle School (JHS 54), have selective and partially selective admissions respectively.

Booker T. Washington Demographic & Program Considerations

Located in the northwestern sector of school district 3, Booker T. Washington is the largest middle school within the target area with over 1000 students. It has two discrete programs, *C.O.R.E. and Delta*, operating within it. C.O.R.E. is newly formed from three programs which have been phased out. It is an open admissions program in which approximately half of BTW's students are enrolled. Delta is actually the highly selective "Honors" program for middle school students in district 3. Admission and (further stratified) placement is based on the student's academic record and scoring on a special, school-administered high stakes test. To even be considered for admission, applying students must also identify "Delta" as their school/program of *first choice*. More Delta students may be admitted to the specialized science high schools annually than from any other middle school program in the city.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

In sharp contrast to the ten other target area middle schools, White students constitute the largest demographic in Booker T. Washington (40%). A glance at BTW's student population (Asian: 6%, African: 23%, Latino: 31% and White: 40%) even suggests real school diversity; especially for CD9. However, an examination of the distribution of students exposes an all too familiar, stratification. Unfortunately, BTW mirrors a citywide NYC DOE and phenomenon, in which the elite academic programs have an almost exclusive enrollment of White and Asian students. Specifically, at BTW, a very large percentage of the Latino and Black students are "enrolled" in C.O.R.E. (consistent with CD9 residential demographics and typical of Target Area public schools), while virtually all the White and Asian students are enrolled in Delta.

Without the inclusion of BTW (namely, its Delta Program), White and Asian students in target area middle schools would comprise a miniscule 2 percent of the grade 6-8 population. That is, 98 percent of students in the remaining area middle schools are Black and Latino. Though the students in the remaining ten (10) Target Area middle schools constitute 76% of the Target Area's middle school population, it is clear that many of these students do not garner admittance into secondary schools with the academic rigor and standards of the new CSS, or similar schools; much less, the city's specialized high schools.

Four Representative Target Area Middle Schools

Tables 6-A, 6-B, 6-C and 6-D present the NYS Grade 8 Math and English (ELA) proficiency scores for the four largest middle schools in the Target Area. They are *Roberto Clemente Middle School (RC)*, *Frederick Douglass Academy I (FDA)*, *BTW* and *Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. Middle School For Law & Social Justice (Powell)*.

Collectively, these schools enrolled over 3,050 students, nearly three-fourths of the Target Area's 2005-06 middle school student population of 4,125. Frederick Douglass Academy (FDA) utilizes selective admissions procedures and explicitly seeks to prepare its 437 middle school students in 2005-06 for challenging higher education pursuits. So does Booker T. Washington (BTW) Middle School, which has been previously noted to

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

have approximately one-half of its 1000-plus students admitted via the highly selective Delta Honors Program. Contrastingly, Roberto Clemente Middle School (RC), 972 students, and Powell Middle School For Law & Social Justice (Powell), 638 students, were open admissions, neighborhood schools; and have no recent histories of preparing large portions of their students for rigorous high school and college experiences. The size and variety of the particular schools make for a representative sample of the target area students who entered high school in the 2006-07 school year. As noted previously, these tests are intended to assess a student's grasp of math and English language arts as measure against grade level informational (content) and analysis standards. Each student's understanding of the subject matter is discretely considered to determine whether her/his comprehension is a) unsatisfactory, b) partially acceptable, c) satisfactory or d) advanced (reflective of grade level mastery). We cite these test scores as evidence of the current academic prospects of target area public school students as they transition to high school.

The scoring range on the statewide proficiency tests is actually recorded as follows:

- Level 1: "Not Meeting Learning Standards"
- Level 2: "Partially Meeting Learning Standards"
- Level 3: "Meeting Learning Standards"
- Level 4: "Meeting Learning Standards With Distinction"

In 2005-06, the African ancestry and Latino student populations citywide were approximately seventy-two percent (that is, 34 percent and 36 percent respectively). There were approximately twenty-eight percent Asian and White students (14 percent White students and 14 percent Asian) in 2005 as well. Thus these schools' respective eighth grades are also partially consistent with the citywide student demographics; except that only about three percent of these students are Asian. The lower percentage of Asian students is offset primarily by the sample's forty-six percent African ancestry population. As a result, this set of schools also gives a generally accurate metric of the basic academic preparedness of African ancestry and Latino students across the city. Although there were approximately 14 percent White students (as is the case citywide) in the sample, this segment is skewed. That is, 399 of the 435, White students in the CD9 sample (92 percent) are enrolled in BTW. Although a demographic delineation of students enrolled in C.O.R.E. and Delta has not been available, current findings do give

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

evidence that *virtually all the White and Asian students are in the Delta Honors Program*. We suspect that C.O.R.E. and Delta may really constitute two “separate and unequal” schools (rather than just two programs) within the BTW “campus”. As Table 6-D indicates, 96 percent & 95 percent of BTW’s White students and 79 percent & 76 percent of its Asian students in grade-8 recorded level 3 or level 4 scores on their Math and ELA proficiency tests respectively. This is especially noteworthy, since at the very same time, three other BTW “accountability groups” of students -- *Latino students, students with disabilities* and *students who were “limited English proficient”* -- were experiencing *sustained* academic difficulty. In fact, in 2005-06, the school was in “Year-4” and “Year-3” of failing to make *adequate yearly progress (AYP)* in math and ELA respectively. BTW was among schools officially designated by NYS as “*requiring academic progress*”. Our review of state “*accountability reports*” (report cards) and city “*Quality Review*³⁰” information, found that 3 of the 4 “representative” schools were not in *good standing*. The two others, Powell and RC, are recipients of Title 1 funds and have been officially cited for “corrective action” (in ELA & Math) and “restructuring” (in ELA & Math) respectively. Please note that Renaissance Military/Leadership Academy, a Target Area middle school has also been officially cited for corrective action in ELA & Math. **Table 6-A and 6-C**, provide insights into the profound challenges confronting students, parents as well as educators at RC and Powell respectively. These grade-8 proficiency test scores give some clarity regarding the general academic readiness of a school’s students as they prepare to enter high school. Sixty-nine percent of the grade-8 Latino students at RC scored at *level 1 (“Not Meeting Learning Standards”)* or *level 2 (“Partially Meeting Learning Standards”)* in math; and 76 percent in ELA. Eighty-seven percent of RC’s African ancestry eighth graders scored level 1 or level 2 in math; and 86 percent in ELA. Ninety-five percent of the grade-8 Latino students at Powell scored at level 1 or level 2 in math; and 92 percent in ELA; Ninety-eight percent of Powell’s African ancestry eighth graders scored level 1 or level 2 in math; and 97 percent in ELA. When reviewing *the scores for all students* in all middle school grades in these two schools, they remained overwhelmingly low. Proficiency test scores of level 1 or level 2

³⁰ See Appendix Five of this report. NYCDOE web link: <http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/default.htm>

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

at RC for grade-6 Math and ELA were recorded for: 56 and 67 percent of the students respectively; grade-7 Math and ELA were: 76 and 83 percent respectively; and grade-8 Math and ELA were: 76 and 81 percent respectively. Proficiency test scores of level 1 or level 2 at Powell for grade-6 Math and ELA were recorded for: 91 and 94 percent of the students respectively; grade-7 Math and ELA were: 89 and 94 percent respectively; and grade-8 Math and ELA were: 96 percent in both subjects.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 6: Target Area Public Middle Schools 2005-06 School Year³¹

Middle School / Level of Need	Address / School District	Eligibility/ Selection	Enrollment	Demographics % A/B-A/P-L/H-W-I	Grades Served
Roberto Clemente IS 195 (Higher Level of Need)	625 W. 133 St. NYC 10027 #5	Open Admission	972	%: 45-1- 53- 1-0 N: 433-12-515-11-1	6-8
Renaissance Military/Leadership Academy – MS 286 (Higher Level of Need)	509 W. 129 St. NYC 10027 #5	Open Admission	316	%: 67-0-32-1- 0 N: 211-0-100-4-1	6-8
Powell Middle School for Law & Social Justice – IS 172 (Higher Level of Need)	509 W. 129 St. NYC 10027 #5	Open Admission	638	%: 67-1-31-0-1 N: 429-5 -196-2-6	6-8
KAPPA IV (Middle Level of Need)	6 Edgecombe Ave. NY 10030 #5	Selective: Screened	190	%: 33-1-64-1-1 N: 63-2 -122-1-2	6-8
Booker T. Washington MS (Lower Level of Need)	103 W. 107 St., NYC 10025 #3	Selective: Honors Prog. Unscreened	1,003	%: 23-6-31-40-0 N: 234-58-309-399-3	6-8
Crossroads MS 246 (Middle Level of Need)	234 W. 109 St., NYC 10025 #3	Open Admission	206	%: 33-2-60-1-0 N: 67-5-124-8-2	6-8
Frederick Douglass Academy I (Lower Level of Need)	2581 Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Blvd. NYC 10030 #5	Selective: Screened	437	%: 73-1-24-1-0 N: 320-4-106-6-1	6-8
Frederick Douglass Academy II (Lower Level of Need)	215 W. 114 th St. NYC 10026 #3	Ed Option	180	%: 80-0-17-1-1 N: 144-1-31-2-2	6-8
Thurgood Marshall Academy (Middle Level of Need)	200 West 135 Street NYC 10030 #5	Ed/Option	183	%: 68-2- 28-1- 1 N: 124-4-52-2-1	7-8
Columbia Secondary School ³² (Lower Level of Need)	425 West 123 Street NYC 10027 #5	Selective: Screened	81	n/a	6-8
Academy for Social Action: A College Board School ³³	509 West 129 Street #5	Limited: Unscreened	81	n/a	6-8
Enrollment Totals; Demographic Totals & Percents			4,125 4,287 ³⁴	%: 49-2-38-11-<.5 N: 2,025-91-1,555-435-19	

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

³¹ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. Data for 2006-07 School Year Not Yet Available

³² New School with Staggered Opening September 2007-9

³³ New School with Staggered Opening September 2007-9

³⁴ Total of 2005-06 School Year Added to 2007-08 Enrollee Data

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 6-A: Roberto Clemente Middle School (IS 195) Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year

Student Demog	Grade 8 Math Levels w/ Percentages				Grade 8 ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
A/B	38	62	15	1	22	78	14	0
A/P	33	67	33	0	12	88	25	0
L/H	24	76	29	2	10	90	24	0
W	43	57	0	0	12	88	25	0
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: Less than 15 Asian, White and Indigenous students combined. % A/P includes “small sample” data for 5 Asian students and 1 Indigenous student.

Table 6-B: Frederick Douglass Academy I Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year

Student Demog	Grade 8 Math Levels w/ Percentages				Grade 8 ELA Levels w/ Percentages			
	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
A/B	12	88	59	11	10	90	58	1
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H	11	89	56	23	9	91	63	4
W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: % L/H includes “small sample” data for 1 Asian student and 1 White student. No Indigenous students recorded.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 6-C: Powell Middle School For Law & Social Justice (IS 172) Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year

Grade 8 Math Levels w/ Percentages

Grade 8 ELA Levels w/ Percentages

Student Demog	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
A/B	58	42	2	0	42	58	3	0
A/P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L/H	38	62	3	2	25	75	8	0
W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: % L/H also includes “small sample” data for 2 “Asian” students and 1 “Indigenous” student.

Table 6-D: Booker T. Washington Middle School (JHS 54) Grade 8 State Math & English (ELA) Test Results 2005-06 School Year

Grade 8 Math Levels w/ Percentages

Grade 8 ELA Levels w/ Percentages

Student Demog	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4	%Level 1	%Levels 2-4	%Level 3	%Level 4
A/B	19	81	34	3	18	82	28	3
A/P	16	84	26	53	18	82	35	41
L/H	33	67	26	6	27	73	27	1
W	1	99	53	43	1	99	66	29
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America

NOTE: % A/P also includes “small sample” data for 1 “Indigenous” student.

TARGET AREA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS SUMMARY

There are thirteen Target Area public elementary schools cited in this report. Only one is new, *Hamilton Heights School*, with its opening scheduled for September 2007. Nine (9) schools offer Pre-K instruction; three (3) offer K instruction, and one begins with grade one instruction.

Target Area elementary schools had a total enrollment in 2005-06 of 7,119 students. The individual elementary school enrollments ranged between 374 and 1,196 students.

From data derived from the *2005-06 New York State Department of Education School Report Cards* <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>, we found that ninety-seven percent (97%) of the students in Target Area public elementary schools were Latino and/or Black; that is, Latino (54%) and Black (43%). Slightly less than three percent (3%) of the students were Asian/Pacific Islanders (1.1% plus), White (1.3%) and Indigenous North American (< .4%).

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 7: Target Area Public Elementary Schools 2005-06 School Year³⁵

Elementary School	Address / School District	Eligibility/ Selection	Enrollment	Demographics	Grades Served
				% A/B-A/P-L/H-W-I	
Arthur Tappan School PS 46	2987 Frederick Douglass Blvd. NYC 10039	Open Admission	840	%: 61- 1- 37-1- 0 N: 511-5-313-10-1	K-6
Mary McLeod Bethune School PS 92	222 W. 134 St. NYC 10030	Open Admission	384	%: 79-1- 18- 1- 0 N: 305-3-69-3-4	PK-6
Adam Clayton Powell Jr. School PS 153	1750 Amsterdam Avenue NYC 10031	Open Admission	1,196	%: 23-1- 76-1- 0 N: 270-6-907-8-5	PK-5
Harriet Tubman School PS 154	250 W. 127 St. NYC 10027	Open Admission	429	%: 72- 1- 26-1- 0 N: 307-4-113-4-1	PK-5
Margaret Douglas School PS 36	123 Morningside Drive NYC 10027	Open Admission	474	%: 64- 3- 33- 0- 0 N: 301-13-157-2-1	PK-2
Ralph Bunche School PS 125	425 W 123 St. NYC 10027	Open Admission	467	%: 60- 0- 37- 0- 0 N: 279-8-173-6-1	1-6
John H. Finley Campus School PS 129	425 W. 130 St. NYC 10027	Open Admission	481	%: 51- 1- 46-1-0 N: 247-7-222-2-3	PK-6
Pedro Albizu Campos School PS 161	499 W. 133 St. NYC 10027	Open Admission	897	%: 16- 1- 82-1- 0 N: 141-8-736-8-4	PK-6
Hamilton Heights School ³⁶	475 W 155 St. 10032	Lottery	n/a	n/a	K-5
Jacob H. Schiff School PS 192	500 W. 138 St. NYC 10031	Open Admission	573	%: 8- 0- 91-0-0 N: 48-2-523-0-0	PK-6
Countee Cullen PS 194	244 W. 144 St. NYC 10030	Open Admission	374	%: 79- 0- 20-1- 0 N: 296-0-73-4-1	K-5
Robert E. Simon School PS 165	234 W. 109 St. NYC 10025	Open Admission	603	%: 16- 4- 72-7- 0 N: 96-27-434-43-3	PK-5
Hugo Newman School PS 180	370 W. 120 St. NYC 10027	Open Admission	401	%: 72- 0- 26-1- 0 N: 289-0-106-5-1	PK-5
Enrollment Totals; Demographic Totals & Percent s			7,119	%: 43-1-54-1 N: 3,090-83-3,826 95-25	

LEGEND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America-Western Hemisphere

³⁵ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. Data for 2006-07 School Year Not Yet Available

²⁰ New School Opening September 2007

TARGET AREA CHARTER SCHOOLS SUMMARY

There are eleven Target Area charter schools cited in this report. Two are new, *Democracy Prep* and *New Heights Academy*, with openings scheduled for September 2007. During the 2005-06 year, three (3) schools offered elementary instruction; four (4) offered elementary and middle school and two (2) offered middle school instruction.

None of the charter schools have their full complement of students. They had a total enrollment in 2005-06 of 1,796 students. The individual charter school enrollments ranged between 55 in the Leadership Academy, with just two grade 5 classes, and the Harlem Children Zone's Promise Academy with 383 students in its elementary and middle school components.

From data derived from the *2005-06 New York State Department of Education School Report Cards* <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>, we found that one hundred percent (100%) of the students in Target Area public elementary schools were Black (82%) and/or Latino (18%). There were no Asian/Pacific Islander, White or Indigenous students enrolled in the charter schools.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Table 8: Target Area Charter Schools 2005-06 School Year³⁷

Elementary/Middle/High School	Address / School District	Eligibility/ Selection	Enrollment	Demographics A/B-A/P-L/H-W-I	Grades Served
Harlem Children's Zone/ Promise Academy II	220 West 121 St. NYC 10027	Lottery	77	%: 87-0-13-0-0 N: 67-0-10-0-0	K-2 (K-3 in 2007-08)
Harlem Children's Zone/ Promise Academy	3 East 125 St. NYC 10027	Lottery	383	%: 86- 0-14-0-0 N: 331-0-52-0-0	K-1; 6-7
Sisulu Walker Charter School PS 720	125 W. 115 St. NYC 10026	Lottery	212	%: 92-0-8-0-0 N: 196-0-16-0-0	K-2, 5
Harlem Day Charter School PS 708	240 E. 123 St. NYC 10035	Lottery	231	%: 94-0-8-0-0 N: 216-0-15-0-0	K-5
Harbor Science & Art Charter School	1 East 104 St. NY 10029	Lottery	215	%: 80-0-20-0-0 N: 171-0-44-0-0	1-8
Future Leaders Institute Charter School M861	134 W. 122 St. NYC 10027	Lottery	299	%: 97-0-2-0- 0 N: 291-1-7-0-0	K-8
KIPP Infinity Charter School M336	625 W 133 St. NYC 10030 NY	Lottery	79	%: 23- 4-7-2-1-0 N: 18-3-57-1-0	K-8 by 7/08
KIPP Star College Prep M726	433 W. 123 St. NYC 10027	Lottery	245	%: 59-1-40-0-0 N: 145-2-98-0-0	5-8
Leadership Village Academy Charter School	315 E. 113 St. NYC 10029	Lottery	55	%: 64-0-36-0-0 N: 35-0-20-0-0	5
Democracy Prep Charter School ³⁸ M350	22 W. 134 St. NYC 10030	Lottery	135	n/a	6-7
New Heights Academy Charter ³⁹ School M353	1818 Amsterdam Ave. NYC 10031	Lottery	192	n/a	5-9
Enrollment Totals; Demographic Totals & Percents			1,796 2,123 ⁴⁰	%: 82-0 -18-0 N: 1,470-6-319-1-0	

LGND: A/B: African Ancestry/Black; A/P: Asian/Pacific Island; L/H: Latino/Hispanic; W: White; I: Indigenous North America-Western Hemisphere

³⁷ Source: NYS D of Ed. Report Cards <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/Home.do>. Data for 2006-07 School Year Not Yet Available

³⁸ New School Opening September 2007

³⁹ New School Opening September 2007

⁴⁰ Total of 2005-06 School Year Added to 2007-08 Enrollee Data

NEW YORK CITY DOE RE-ORGANIZATION

Incorporated below are three articles from the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) publication, *THE NEW YORK TEACHER*, reporting on and discussing the NYC DOE latest re-organization of school operations. Deidre Mc Fadyen is the author.⁴¹

Chancellor Joel Klein on April 16 unveiled more details about the school support organizations that will replace the 10 regions that he is eliminating in his most recent shake-up of the city school system.

Under the new reorganization, each of the city's 1,400 principals, in consultation with the school leadership team, must choose by May 15 a support organization to work with the school. The school must pay for those services out of its budget.

The three options are: 1. to be an Empowerment School; 2. to select a Learning Support Organization led by one of four experienced Department of Education superintendents; or 3. to hire on contract one of nine private, nonprofit partners [see "The support options"].

The collective-bargaining agreement and state and federal law remain in full force in all schools regardless of the "support system" that the principals choose.

Klein characterized the new structure as a reversal of the Department of Education hierarchy so the individual school is now at the pinnacle.

"We are transforming a school system based on compliance and top-down decision-making to one that empowers principals to make key decisions about what's best for students and their school communities," Klein said at a press conference at the Department of Education headquarters.

Turning to face the two dozen leaders of the support organizations arrayed behind him, Klein said, "Today, the competition to sign up schools begins."

Under the new system, each school will receive an additional \$170,000 on average out of which it can purchase the services of one of the organizations at a cost ranging from \$25,000 to \$145,000, depending in the size of the school and the level of services.

The DOE selected nine private, nonprofit providers from the 35 organizations that responded to its request for proposals. None of the 10 for-profit organizations that submitted proposals were chosen.

⁴¹ "Klein discloses reorganization details" by Deidre Mc Fadyen, New York Teacher April 16, 2007.
http://www.uft.org/news/teacher/general/reorganization_details/

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

“This is not privatization,” Klein insisted. “The school support organizations do not manage or supervise. They have no power to hire or fire principals.”

It was notable that Success for All made the cut since its highly scripted reading curriculum, which was used with success in struggling elementary schools in the now-disbanded Chancellor’s District, is nothing like balanced literacy, the curriculum that Klein has until now insisted that all elementary schools use.

Schools that choose a nonprofit partner (a Partnership Support Organization in DOE parlance) must indicate a second choice since the provider may not have the capacity to take on all schools that apply for its support.

To get the word out about the options, Klein said the DOE held a principals’ symposium on April 23 and will hold five borough fairs where parents will be welcome.

The principal’s choice of support organization will be subject to the approval of the district superintendent and the chancellor, he said.

Klein dismissed concerns that principals had only a month to decide.

“The schools are already familiar with most of these support organizations,” he said. “There is ample time. The process started months ago.”

The support options

1 *Be an Empowerment School*, in which the principal agrees to meet performance targets including higher test scores in exchange for greater discretion on budget and hiring and more flexibility in designing the school’s education plan. The schools are organized into networks of approximately 20 schools that provide instructional and operational support.

2 *Purchase the package of services of one of four Learning Support Organizations* built around different themes and led by a veteran DOE superintendent:

- Community group, which will focus on partnerships with community and families (led by Marcia V. Lyles⁴² from Region 8 in Brooklyn)
- Integrated Curriculum and Instruction group, which will help schools develop an interdisciplinary “thinking curriculum” that integrates arts and technology (led by Judith Chin from Region 3 in eastern Queens)
- Knowledge group, which will help schools implement a “content-rich” curriculum that focuses on core facts (Kathleen Cashin from Region 5 in Brooklyn and Queens)

⁴² Ms. Lyles has been promoted to position of Deputy Chancellor For Teaching and Learning
SERVICE * EDUCATION * ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT * SCIENCE
110 West End Avenue Suite 19B * New York, NY 10023 *
212-362-6021 * jaydub16@aol.com * www.seedswork.org

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

- Leadership group, which will focus on strengthening the leadership skills of principals and their instructional staff (Laura Rodriguez from Region 2 in the Bronx)

3 Purchase the services of one of the following nine private, nonprofit providers:

- Academy of Educational Development, a Washington, D.C.-based organization that will support 10 schools serving students in grades 5-8. It has special expertise in urban middle school reform.
- American Institute for Research, a Washington, D.C.-based educational research group that designs and implements assessment development programs and scientifically sound accountability systems
- Center for Educational Innovation-Public Education Association, a New York City-based group that will provide networks of 10 to 20 schools with support to improve the skills of teachers and school leaders, increase parent involvement and build cultural and academic enrichment programs
- City University of New York, which will make all of CUNY's programs and services available to middle and high school principals and focus on preparing students to succeed in college
- Fordham University, which will use current science-based research and schools' data to assess each school's current practices and results, set goals and develop a plan to meet those goals
- Learning Innovations at WestEd, a national research, development and service agency that will work with elementary and middle schools to conduct data-driven reviews.
- New Visions for Public Schools, which has been a leader in creating and supporting small schools in New York City that combine personalized learning environments with rigorous educational programs
- Replications, Inc., which will use its highly structured Essential Features Support system to keep schools at all levels apprised of their progress
- Success for All Foundation, which uses daily 90-minute reading period for all students, with a focus on phonics, and tutoring for children who are falling behind or need extra help. Teachers receive training in Success for All's structured teaching practices and rigorous pacing.

Questions for your principal

1. Do you have a preference for any of the support organization models? On what are you basing your preference and what are your expectations for the school from that particular model?
2. When can we anticipate that you'll sit down with the chapter, the parents, students and members of the School Leadership Team to discuss what choice our school should make?
3. As there appears to be no referral network for student discipline matters in the latest reorganization, how do you plan to enforce the school discipline code, including suspensions and establishing a SAVE room as required by state law?
4. We are told that you have preliminary allocations for next year. What is the school budget this year compared to next year? Is it based on the same number of children? How much goes to support the new reorganization structure?

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

5. How will you assure that there is instruction in art and music?
6. Now that you will apparently have more control over the school budget and how you spend money, what priorities for the next school year will you present to the chapter and the School Leadership Team (e.g., lowering class size, maintaining or starting special programs, additional personnel)?
7. How much money will the new support organization cost the school?
8. Will we collaborate on our school's curriculum, textbooks and other educational decisions or will these be mandated from outside?
9. If we don't use the current educational program next year, do you have the budget to buy the appropriate resources and supplies for a new program?
10. Are you aware that the regulations, supports and protections for students with special needs are still in effect? How will you provide support for these special groups of students (e.g., special education, gifted and talented, English language learners)?
11. We know that the Regional Operations Centers are being eliminated and replaced by Integrated Service Centers. Are you confident that this new structure can handle the school's salary and personnel matters?
12. How will you ensure that new teachers get mentoring and other support they need?
13. In the past, the school system limited its SBO approval to those a Local Instructional Superintendent permitted. Now that it appears the LIS will no longer exist, are there any other limitations on your ability to approve SBOs that you and the chapter agree on?
14. What are the school's performance targets and how were they arrived at? What plans do you have to help teachers to get students to reach those targets?
15. How will our school obtain professional development? Will it be driven by the support organization or the needs of our school?
16. What will it mean that we are a part of an "organization?" What other schools will be in this network and what will our relationship with these schools be?
17. Are you planning to contract with any outside vendors for services? If yes, what services are you considering and why did you make that decision? When can we meet to discuss what they have to offer?
18. We understand that you and all principals have to sign a performance contract. What are the terms of that contract?
19. We understand that the school can only list our preference for the model — empowerment, Learning Support Organization or Partnership Support Organization — and the specific service providers it wants. If we are not given our preferred model, what recourse will you, parents and teachers have? Is there an appeals process?
20. What is the principal and school relationship to the community school superintendent? Is it geographic? By support organization? By level of school? Will high schools have their own superintendents?

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

21. What happens if the community school superintendent and the empowerment/LSO/PSO network leader have a conflict? Who makes a decision?
22. Are you aware that the UFT contract remains in full force and effect under the new reorganization no matter what model the school chooses?
23. Will these new structures have parent councils?

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND ANALYSIS

Limitations of NYS and NYC Report & Review Instruments

In several of the foregoing sections, we have collected and reported extensive demographic data for CD9 public schools and selections of other schools. As noted, these data include detailed secondary school longitudinal information for the two cohorts (generations) of high school students who entered grade 9 in 2001 and 2002 respectively. Focusing on four “representative” CD 9 public secondary schools, the report has examined student proficiency test scoring levels, after 4-years, in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics; as well as 4-year and 5-year “school completion” (graduation) results. In assessing performance and proficiency findings, both the state through its *REPORT CARDS*, and the city, through its *PROGRESS REPORTS*, *QUALITY REVIEWS* and other *accountability and performance material*⁴³, provide an array of relevant information. These instruments and data sources, while useful, can be inadequate as measures of “*educational equity and excellence*”. They generally provide “descriptive” data; not enough analytical material or substantive prescriptive insights. On a positive note, efforts to more rapidly provide classroom teachers with student-specific proficiency test scores will be initiated in the 2007-08 school year. This is intended to enable instructors to identify those students requiring intensive assistance much earlier in the year. Additionally, the areas of need can be focused on for prescriptive attention.

⁴³ See APPENDIX FIVE: NYC DOE Student Performance & Accountability. Link: <http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/default.htm>

Unfortunately, centrally important questions, focused on reversing “system errors” such as the “under-education” of huge portions of each “entering class” of students, continue to not really be addressed; much less, answered. While most of the various data collection, assessment & evaluation instruments as well as most reports & reviews are formatted to address the federal (e.g., NCLB), New York State and NYC standards, there is a fundamental disconnect with the problems “*on the ground*”. They are not organized to see through to either lingering or emerging educational problems. There have been no major changes; that is, no breakthroughs in resolving the overall problems ranging from *poor proficiency test scores* to the *annual loss of thousands of public school students* as a result of dropping out of school.

Hidden Behind the Numbers: *Lack of Equity and Excellence*

Hidden behind an often obfuscating wall of the numbers can be found core problems -- reflective of systemic weaknesses-- which chronically remain unsolved; and generally not even addressed. We will discuss several such educational problems at the end of PHASE I of this report. However, let us consider, here in the specific context of CD9 secondary schools, a couple of general public education “standards” problems.

The Target Area secondary schools are comparatively strong. In the 2005-06 school year, all the accountability criteria and performance data for the four representative high schools (“the 4-school grouping”) were at or above the specified standards of “acceptability” for both NYC and New York State. Each school’s operations and student performance evaluations were also comparable or superior to the averages of “similar schools” across the city. Generally speaking, the 4-school grouping’s data provide a variety of favorable ratings with respect to CD9 secondary school academic characteristics. However, there are public educational problems within CD9 (as well as across the city) which co-exist alongside those favorable ratings and belie or undermine any claims of excellence. Two of these problems are: (1) ***The percentages of students, who are academically unsuccessful, remain far too high. These students are marginalized within the public school system; and eventually jettisoned to the socio-***

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

economic margins of society. (2) Many of the quantitative measures and standards which define what is “passing” or “acceptable”, have been set too low.

With respect to problem #1: Generally, this marginalization can occur at numerous points within a student’s educational life. It may come as a result of very low standardized test scores; a designation for special education; or a major rule infraction. The focus here is on “low test scores”. Scores in the “level 1” range on statewide ELA proficiency tests, especially in grades 3, 5 and 7 mandate summer school and possible repeating of the grade. Many students, who have consistently scored very low on these tests, become candidates for dropping out of school before reaching grade 9. General education students who enter high school (grade 9) and receive very low proficiency test scores, and/or do not have the five required regent exam scores at or above “55”, will not qualify for graduation. In CD9, even with all secondary schools functioning in “good standing”, findings show as many as 14 percent of the 2001 cohort students (who entered grade-9 five years earlier), had left the system and the Target Area’s highest rated, most selective (non specialized) high school, FDAI. These students reportedly left and enrolled in GED Programs. Among all members, of the 4-school grouping, 18 percent of 2001 cohort students had either dropped out or left school to enter GED programs. *In terms of the 2002 cohort students, approximately 25 percent dropped out. As was also noted, the graduation-to-drop out (g-t-d/o) ratio was 2.5 to 1. That is, by the end of 2005-06, for every 25 graduates, there had been 10 students who had dropped out.* Many more students had also left school to enroll in GED programs. We submit that all of these findings are unacceptable. These students cited here represent “the tip of the citywide marginalization iceberg”. The sad irony is that in the case of CD9’s secondary schools, these students disappeared without even the benefit of the public school system having to formally acknowledge its failure. In fact, data from schools in good standing, are generally cited to document school and system “good news and successes”.

With respect to problem #2, and as previously noted in this report:

- Level 2 scores, which indicate only “**partially** meeting learning standards”, are currently treated as *passing* on myriad statewide tests;

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

- Regent exam scores of “55 and 65” are *passing* for earning local and regents diplomas respectively; and
- School graduation rates as low as 55 percent are officially “acceptable”, and schools which achieve such scores, are recognized to be in “*good standing*”;

Again, we submit that these policies are not acceptable in CD9, where a larger percentage of high school students passed proficiency tests and regents exams than did their citywide counterparts; and all the CD9 secondary schools significantly exceeded the very low state sanctioned graduation standards for public schools across the city. The 4-school grouping’s senior (2002 cohort) class had a 71% graduation rate; 16 percentage points above “55”, that infamous floor acceptability. Given the longstanding orientation of federal, statewide and New York City graduation data analyses to simple quantitative records and comparisons, these CD9 “statistics” would only be celebrated. The tragedy of 29%, nearly “3 in 10”, of these students *not graduating* would not be recognized, much less, responded to, appropriately. The goal for schools and districts has been to be in “good standing”. While there is a stated NCLB federal goal of 100 percent student proficiency by 2013, “good standing” has not translated into qualitative improvements in student learning or even teacher training and preparation. Most importantly, in the context of this report, it has also not produced needed policy implementation and prescriptive breakthroughs in student learning and teacher training and professional development. Again, while such contradictions exist in CD9, they simply become more glaring when considered on a citywide scale. That is, across the city there are secondary schools actually posting graduation rates in that 55% range, and recognized as being in “good standing”. This is shocking. As we will address in PHASE II of this report, a transformative “shock to the System” is appropriate.

With respect to both problems #1 & #2: Coupled, these two problems have a seemingly contradictory, counter-intuitive relationship. That is, in a system with significantly large percentages of students consistently scoring low on tests and exams and not completing high school, one might intuit that this is due, in large part, to rigorous tests and diploma requirements. Yet this is not the case. Proficiency Test rigor is generally not considered to be increasing by many experts. Perhaps pressured by the continuing large numbers of

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

students with low and very low standardized test results; and many schools with sizeable drop out rates, school authorities have been guilty of watering down sections of “official” performance criteria. Some critics of public school policy even charge that the levels of difficulty of some grade-specific proficiency tests and regents exams have diminished⁴⁴. We have not identified the evidence. We do submit however, that rather than a simple matter of test rigor, the causality is more likely traceable to a mix of *public policy, pedagogical, curricular and instructional* problems. Any true correction of /solution set to problems #1 and #2 above, must comprehensively address all of these problems. Again, these matters will be included among the PHASE II Recommendations.

Strong *academic performance and achievement* are, of course, the goals or “end results” most often identified with a successful educational career. It is the responsibility of NYC DOE to deliver the elements for a successful educational career to each of its students.

Educational Achievement Gap

We submit that taken as a whole, these same problems are at the root of perhaps the most damaging phenomenon in education today: the *educational achievement gap (EAG)*. The “achievement gap” is not an unfamiliar term in the US. For years, the EAG has been enmeshed in the educational travails of NYS, NYC and CD9. It has had an especially harsh impact on huge segments of our student population. Yet for all its notoriety, the EAG is generally mis-defined and misunderstood. *Specifically, the “gap” in “educational achievement gap”, typically refers to significant and sustained disparities or discrepancies in academic performance and achievement between / among distinct student groups.* This is at best only partially accurate. Any appropriate framing of EAG, must focus more on the source(s) of the deficiency, rather than on the victims. Students are not responsible for the EAG. We conclude that “society (ies)” in general, and “government(s)” in particular, are the most responsible parties –the sources-- in the creation and solving of the EAG. ***So in this report, the “gap” refers as much to societal***

³⁹ Substantiation of these statements is forthcoming

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

and governmental disparities in delivering equitable and excellent educational services to all of its students.

In New York City, there are widely recognized *educational achievement* discrepancies among a variety of student groups. Empirical information regarding profound educational achievement differences involving the four largest racial/ethnic student groups continues to mount. Substantially higher percentages of Asian students and White students are performing well academically, than are African ancestry (Black) and Latino students. This has sustained for generations of students; with no significant signs of improvement. Thus it is fair to declare that city, state and federal responses have failed to deliver. Furthermore, substantially higher percentages of Black and Latino students comprise student categories associated with unsuccessful educational careers. Recent local and national studies document both the academic and troubling social and economic problems and affects of this “gap” on Latino and Black students. Thirty percent or more of Latino and Black students do not graduate; and many more are earning “local high school” (non regents) diplomas. Directly affecting their personal lives, Black and Latino students are increasingly being criminalized for a variety of school-based disputes as well. This is occurring at such an alarming (and disparate) rate that the “school-to-prison-pipeline” is now a commonly referred to phenomenon. Even in this report, which is hardly exhaustive, graphic examples of the disparate delivery of educational services are found both in CD9-specific settings (especially in the middle and elementary schools discussions) and citywide (especially in the Specialized High Schools discussion). NYC DOE’s *educational achievement gap* manifests itself in a variety of ways. In addition to race/ethnicity-specific disparities, overwhelming discrepancies persist in the delivery of services to “*students with greater financial need*”, and to “*students with disabilities*”. It must be noted that the majority of students in both of these groups are also disproportionately Black and Latino.

Core Institutional Weaknesses and Educational Problems

Generally, it is government through its institutions and officials which is charged with developing public policy; and responsible for policy *oversight* and *implementation*.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Again, this NYC *educational achievement gap (EAG)* refers to a failure of government to provide a huge segment of its public school students with an equitable and excellent education. The EAG, which is systemic, is the result of a confluence of three distinct types of institutional problems: (1) a **failure of social philosophy**; (2) a mix of **governmental failures** (public policy); (3) a mix of **educational failures** (pedagogical, curricular and attitudinal).

1. Admittedly, *a failure of social philosophy* is not likely to be cited by most analysts as a core problem in the creation and sustaining of NYC's educational achievement gap. Social Philosophy ("S Ph") is identified here first because we recognize it to be fundamental. S Ph is perhaps, the most comprehensive compilation of a society's values and priorities. A society's social philosophy is reflected in how it is organized; how and for whom its systems and institutions function. Core changes in societal institutions come only with/after core changes in social philosophy. In the case of NYC, we submit that larger societal attitudes which (at the least) tolerate sustained disparities in public education services to Black and Latino students; "students with greater financial need", and to "students with disabilities", persist. While there is a growing, coherent public voice (and analysis) on how to ACTUALLY close the EAG, there is no priority for real change among the powerful. Thus long held supremacist and classist views continue to prejudice public policy; undermine the quality of our institutions, and distort the impartiality of our laws.⁴⁵ Adding to the dire situation of the affected students is Mayor Bloomberg's imposition of a social philosophy thoroughly committed to a heavy privatization of public education.
2. **Governmental failures** in delivering excellent educational services to those groups of students most negatively impacted by the EAG are of central importance. Before addressing NYC DOE's crucial role (as government's public education institution), let us point out certain city and state government matters which enable and compound the

⁴⁵ Long after views of racial and class superiority-inferiority have been officially "overcome", they may remain a potent force within a society's culture; **impeding** the implementation laws & legislation; the effectiveness of public service institutions; and equal opportunity of historically oppressed and exploited peoples.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

problem. One of many Bush Administration’s NCLB (federal) contributions to the problem –more testing- is also cited within the discussion of DOE policy and practice failures.

- *Centralized Mayoral Control, Anti-democratic flaw:* We submit that the current New York City “control structure” for *public education policy and operations* is fundamentally flawed. That is, centralized power in which one individual—the mayor-- appoints and directly controls/oversees the Public Schools Chancellor is wrongheaded. While this may be a common option for private-sector “chief executives”, such concentrated control of education policy and operations is contrary to the democratic nature of “*public education*”. Democratic structures are needed in which representatives of primary public education stakeholders—parents & students, educators and the community-at-large—each have a say. There must be independent processes for selection of these representatives as well.
- *Important Legislation, No Political Will:* In the last decade state and federal lawmakers have passed, legislation addressing the issue of cultural inclusion. Focused on the history of African ancestry and Latino students, those most impacted by the EAG, this legislation has gone largely ignored. Sometimes called “Black History” or “Underground Railroad” Legislation, the formal names are the *Freedom Trail Program Act* and the *National Network to Freedom Act*. They were passed in 1997 in New York State and federally in 1998, respectively. Subsequently, New York State passed another bill into law in 2005, the Amistad Act (6362-B), which exceeds the historical time frames of the Freedom Trail Program Act. The legislation calls for the empanelling of an oversight commission. To date, no such “*Amistad Commission*” has been empanelled.⁴⁶ The four city administrations in power since the legislation

⁴⁶ The New York State Legislature and then the United States Congress passed bills into law through The Freedom Trail Program Act and the National Network to Freedom Act in 1997 and 1998 respectively which mandated instruction in all schools (private and public) from grades three (3) through twelve (12). *Professional development*, in order for educators to learn what and how to teach this subject matter, was strongly recommended in the Schomburg Report. Neither the legislation nor those recommendations have been implemented comprehensively. Subsequently, New York State passed another bill, the Amistad Act (6362-B) into law in 2005 that exceeds the historical time frames of the Freedom Trail Program Act. However, no would-be *Amistad Commission* has ever been empanelled.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

passed (two headed by Giuliani and two headed by Bloomberg), have lacked the political will to comprehensively implement these laws. Core curricula developed to take advantage of the cultural material featured in these laws, are important elements cited in the PHASE II Recommendations.

- *Use of “CFE” Funds to Close EAG, No Evidence:* The final governmental failures area that we will discuss here involves the additional \$5.4 billion in annual educational funds (phased in over 4-yr period) that NYC DOE begins to access from New York State in 2007-08. Often referred to as “CFE (Campaign For Fiscal Equity) funds, the money is the result of court ordered re-direction of state education dollars annually due to NYC, but allocated throughout the rest of the state.⁴⁷ With the closing of the EAG as an explicit goal, these long overdue CFE funds would be an ideal repository from which to draw, for a much needed financial infusion. However, as we discuss next, NYC DOE’s leadership has expressed no such goal.
- *New NYC-DOE Policies Result In Business As Usual:* Under Bloomberg-Klein, the once lethargically moving, multi billion dollar public education system appears (**on the surface**) a symbol of institutional change. In five years, DOE has undergone two periods structural makeover. With the dual justifications of *chronically poor academic performance* by an increasing percentage of students, and (*corrupt, wasteful and inefficient operations* –especially field operations, Bloomberg-Klein has been busy. We concur that both items cited are critical parts of “the problem with DOE”. However, DOE’s responses have been off the mark. Its leadership is not focused on *eliminating* the EAG.

So far the policy changes and ensuing re-organization *have* effectively eliminated the city’s school districts and regions as strong administrative units, while increasing both the fiscal & administrative responsibilities, as well as the educational (curricular,

⁴⁷ The Campaign For Fiscal Equity is crucially important 14-year grassroots effort and organization; self-described as: ...a coalition of parent organizations, community school boards, concerned citizens, and advocacy groups. We seek to reform New York State's school finance system to ensure adequate resources and the opportunity for a sound basic education for all students in New York City. Our efforts will also help secure the same opportunity for students throughout the state who are not currently receiving a sound basic education ... <http://www.cfequity.org/>

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

instructional and professional development) controls of school principals. Former regional and district policy and oversight positions, held by NYC DOE “superintendents”, have, for the most part, been completely recast as *educational consultants*; vying with nine private corporations to provide schools with instruction and professional development services. (See: *NYC Re-Organization* section of this report.) Since the most recent changes are just commencing in the 2007-08 year, their effects are to be determined. However, this corporate, *CEO* operating approach has not proven to be especially effective in narrowing the disparate delivery of services to those student groups most damaged by the EAG. At best the multiple restructurings may improve certain efficiencies such as, teacher response time (for review and analysis) to proficiency test data; or produce more variety in professional development providers. However, it is unlikely to make the overarching, systemic improvements needed. What seems more likely is continued very uneven delivery of services.

- *Weak Parental Involvement Policy*: It appears that the Bloomberg-Klein --therefore DOE-- failure to support development of a *system oversight model* which includes a *potent, independent and organized parental role*, will hurt the task of closing the EAG, more than the restructurings will help. We submit, that such a model offers added protection that a school system stays “on mission”. **Consider the present situation of NYC**: NYC is a city and school system whose leadership is not meaningfully closing / addressing the EAG. Instead, Bloomberg-Klein publicizes small improvements in test scores and graduation rates. These are superficial increases, which offer little correlation to the fundamental changes required to impact the EAG. However, a strong, organized voice from parents and other student advocates could make a real difference setting the record straight. Such a *parent involvement model* would enable parents-- those most concerned with the students-- to not only re-frame inappropriate claims of success, but also continue to struggle for the actual goal.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

As things currently stand, principals select and pay the salaries of a school *parent coordinator*. Parents Associations are required in the schools as well. Parent representation on each school's *school leadership team (SLT)* is mandated. However, the Bloomberg-Klein revisions to *Regulation A-655* of "The Chancellor's Regulations" have been roundly criticized for both parent-specific input problems and a general weakening of the SLT's actual authority –vis a vis the school principal- in school policy. The strong, comprehensive critique by stakeholders of the revisions-- which came after a period of their formal input-- serves to underscore Bloomberg-Klein's philosophical commitment to centralized, individual control of education policy. Nonetheless, we conclude that school-specific parent involvement is still very important in the struggle for educational excellence. However, we further conclude that the ability of the "*whole body of Parents*" to help effect DOE policy and to specifically "close the EAG", would be much greater with an independent parent network, organized at district, region, borough and citywide levels.

- *Proficiency & High Stakes Testing Failures*: For many, many generations of students, the role of standardized testing has become increasingly important in defining both educational excellence and failure. With the Bush Administration's NCLB, the invasiveness of standardized testing into classroom *learning time* has been compounded. Satisfactory performance on these multi-grade tests (of students' grade level "proficiency") in certain core subject areas, are a requirement for receipt of federal education funding. As a result, the nationally pervasive practice of "teaching to the test" has intensified and spawned a huge test prep "side industry" in itself. The side industry is primarily focused on students who are more likely to score in the low proficiency range—level 1 and level 2. Large percentages of such students have been from the same groupings affected by DOE's EAG failures: Black and Latino students, low income students and students with disabilities. Thus it would seem that the additional resources allocated to prepare these students for the various tests, is evidence of DOE's support of these students. Over time, however, these programs produce only "marginal" gains in scoring, and do not effectively "empower" the students academically; or effectively "produce life-long learners". Time before and

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

after school is set aside for mostly private, for-profit entities to “teach to the test”. This is precious time that could be better spent on more integrated learning and enrichment; especially if the pressure to “force feed” this material to certain students was resisted by NYC. Although the NCLB testing commences in grade-3, students are identified much earlier. As we discuss, the orientation on high stakes standardized testing as a foundational metric of *educational excellence* is flawed. A comprehensive re-focusing of core policy, teacher preparation, curricular and instruction elements combine in large part, to produce the solution set. Furthermore, a by-product of any comprehensive, student-empowering re-focusing of the educational core, should resolve much of the test-proficiency problem. An impact of suggested changes will be that formerly low scoring students are able to handle such tests successfully and without intimidation. Without this re-focusing by DOE (New York State and nationally), the EAG will continue, more or less unabated. Today, DOE can be said to embrace NCLB’s centralized, top-down, test-heavy approach. In NYC, and we suspect nationally, such an orientation to educational success is harmful to far more students than it is beneficial. Again the conclusion here is that what is needed is federal, state and municipal leadership on “*re-focusing*” *such areas as teacher training and cultural competency, teacher attitudes and reflection, classroom instruction & student motivation, curriculum and cultural relevancy*. In closing this section, the reporters recognize that periodic standardized testing can be a generally beneficial diagnostic tool, when used to confirm that *well prepared students* grasp or understand selected subject “content”. Empirical data spanning many years, indicate that these conditions clearly do not exist for large percentage of NYC’s public school students. In fact, in NYC, NCLB-induced testing cynically serves to perpetuate a status quo of educational winners and losers. We say “cynically”, because a stated NCLB goal is to have 100 percent grade level proficiencies for students by 2013. With so many students, victimized by the EAG, we can only conclude that the (societal) purpose of “high stakes testing” in general, is *gate-keeping*; that is a means of processing the educational “winners” onward and upward. There are high stakes tests for public school admittances in programs for the “talented & gifted” (T&G) for the primary grades, to affirmative action high school prep programs, to the

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

specialized high schools exam. Within the public schools context, a new Klein-Bloomberg admissions policy process for T&G programs, purports to finally remove previously unacknowledged *personal preference student-admits* from the program roles by only accepting students who score 95 percent and above on designated standardized test. Some may feel this surprise acknowledgement and policy shift adds luster to the very thin patina of “*equity and fairness*” surrounding high stakes testing. While it is more appropriate for public school admittance into highly coveted programs to actually be based on stated, transparent criteria, in the scheme of things there are much larger groups of students in great need of equity and fairness. Students from groups most damaged by EAG must also be empowered.

- *An Ignored Majority*: There were over 1 million NYC public school students in each of the past several years. Latino students and African ancestry (Black) students comprise more than seventy percent of the public school student population. In recent years, a steadily growing Latino student population has risen to 37 percent, while a slowly declining Black student population hovers around 34 percent. White students and Asian students each comprise about 14.5 percent of the public school population. Less than 1 percent of the public school student population is Indigenous⁴⁸. DOE policies seem to reinforce the existing, highly stratified public school system. DOE’s public school system is a pyramidal-like structure in which the highest performing students are overwhelmingly beneficiaries are overwhelmingly White or Asian students and lower performing students, overwhelmingly Latino and Black students, have been made profound losers. The most glaring of disparities can be seen in the concentration of resources, services and opportunities which are available to “T&G” student groupings on the one hand, and the chronicle of deficits inuring to marginalized students on the other hand. Superior physical conditions / facilities / equipment; greater financial supports; more highly educated and /or experienced teachers are common ways that beneficial differences are manifested for students in T&G Schools/programs. Students in other “selective” programs and schools typically

⁴⁸ Data suggest that the impact of the EAG on the majority of Indigenous students is generally similar to its impact on the majorities of the African ancestry and Latino student groups.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

share great advantage over the vast majority of students. We see examples in CD9 and citywide. In CD9, the baseline of Columbia University and other resources are superior to most other middle schools and secondary schools. BTW, through its Delta Program parents historically had a parents association, school enrichment budget far superior to other area schools. On a citywide scale, the quantity and quality of the specialized high schools' (and those schools most closely resembling) corporate, cultural institutional and parent association resources, are hugely disparate to those in other city secondary schools. Parent association annual budgets for enrichment uses in some of the specialized high schools, have been known to exceed hundreds of thousands of dollars. Compounding the financial disparities, are the household incomes of T & G students as compared to household incomes of students in lower performing schools and programs. The average percentage of students eligible for free or partially subsidized lunch in the specialized high schools in 2005-06 was less than 18 percent; and nearly 62 percent for the "4-school grouping" representative of the relatively strong CD9 area schools. Even neighborhood-based, selective, college sponsored middle and high schools similar to Columbia Secondary School (CSS) averaged roughly between 40 and 50 percent.

As we discussed earlier, the relatively small segment of students who are T & G-designated, are targeted and effectively tracked for "success". They are the "tail wagging the dog". Of the approximately twelve thousand students in the SHSAT schools, 84 percent were either Asian (52%) or White (32%) and 16 percent were either Black (9%) or Latino (7%). This meant that in relationship to their proportion of the public school population, Asian students were about 13.5 times and 19 times more heavily enrolled than Black and Latino students respectively. White students were about 8 times and 12 times more heavily enrolled than Black and Latino students respectively.

3. We have concluded that many of the failures giving rise to the educational achievement gap (EAG) originate in the broader society's core ideas, values and priorities and find form in ourselves and our institutions. We recognize, therefore,

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

that the struggle to eradicate the basis for this racist and classist “...most damaging phenomenon”, must be waged on many fronts. However, we recognize that *teacher training & development as well as school and classroom failures* are, at the crux of the educational achievement gap. In that context, we now discuss a selection of pedagogical, instructional, affective and curricular problems which collectively sustain the EAG.

- *Pedagogical and Teacher Training & Professional Development Failures Schools of Education:* Collectively, Schools of Education continue to be the central source of new teachers; and the fundamental preparer of school teachers. Increasing numbers of college graduates with liberal arts, math, science and technical majors are however, also being recruited to become new public school teachers. A selection of programs including the nationally recognized “Teach For America (TFA)” initiative, focus on engaging such non-education majors to commit at least a few years to teaching in school systems and schools where the chronic effects of the EAG are very apparent. A part of the TFA focus on these college students (very recent grads) is that there is a need for more teachers than are produced through the Schools of Education. Also TFA, which has been known for reaching out to the most highly regarded colleges and universities, is attempting to attract especially bright college students who will presumably bring important “content knowledge” from a variety of subject areas (majors) as well. Of course, TFA “fellows” must eventually receive formal pedagogical theory (teacher training in instructional concepts and methods) to shape and contextualize their virtual “baptisms by fire” into teaching. The problems of instructional and classroom management inexperience clashing with the challenging behavior attributed to most classes in “underperforming” schools are humbling to many of these new teachers. The need formal courses as well as mentoring and timely insights. Thus Schools of Ed., sooner or later, play that fundamentally important training role. This reporter has concluded --after a similar initial experience as a novice substitute teacher, twenty subsequent years of fulltime professional experience, more than one hundred education-specific

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

graduate credits and a mountain of anecdotal observations— that Ed. school involvement is better sooner rather than later. However, there are persisting problems which must be rectified. Student-centered pedagogy and the crucial significance of *affective elements* on instruction & curriculum, and especially student learning must be embraced universally. Teacher training and preparation must also introduce issues of transformative education, organizing and policy implementation to teachers-in-training and reinforced and deepened for veteran educators. Today, these areas are neither universally strong nor frequently presented / taught as parts of a coherent “whole”. In fact, there is overwhelming empirical evidence supporting this conclusion. *Schools of Education As Part of the Solution:*

Schools of Education which are tuned-in to a “community’s” needs could become important parts of the solution⁴⁹. They can become, platforms for the development and sharing of alternative approaches to teacher training; curriculum development and instruction; school leadership and administration, most notably, educational policy development and implementation. Such schools could provide the space in which practitioners are enabled to think deeply about and explore / collaborate how to focus attention on that broad body of students (overwhelmingly Latino and African ancestry) who are today being *disappeared* from Education.

Schools of Education may provide system-wide strategies that enable educators to become reflective practitioners empowered to teach in ways that motivate and engage youngsters to learn how to learn and grow as problem solvers, critical thinkers and life long learners. They should also take up the question of the role of teachers in educational transformation. Ed Schools must help teachers see themselves as intellectuals, action researchers, student advocates and agents of change at the classroom level and at the public policy level. Schools of Education can be key in the needed consciousness raising and skill development. Among their offerings should be courses which focus on effective kinds of teacher

⁴⁹ Generally, Schools of Education have this potential. Many, if not most however, shy from “the cutting edge” of community-based change.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

collaborations. They should answer the “How to Organize” question as well as clearly citing the “Need for Organizing” among themselves; with parents and students; within issues-based multi-stakeholder formations. Teachers must see parents and students as allies. Their vision of the goal of educational excellence must be burnished within themselves individually and as a profession. Yet the role and responsibility of government as an equitable deliverer of excellent educational services, must also be understood by our teachers-in-training. Their’s is a challenge of providing transformative public education for the majority of students; not simply for relatively small elite sectors. Success on this “quest” will require struggle at the citywide, school and classroom levels. As indicated earlier, important in realizing these goals is the ability to understand the importance of stakeholder participation. However, teachers and school administrators also need to re-focus on their missions as educators and advocates of children / students. They must re-orient their collective resources and power to translate the lessons learned into public policy paradigms. The role of our Schools of Education in re-framing the current, blurred mission of our teaching professionals, will be instrumental in facilitating much needed paradigm shifts in education and in society.

Going from articulation to action, teachers must recognize themselves to be engaged intellectuals, who are on the frontlines of where educational theory meets professional praxis. The germination of the ideas re-defining this dynamic role for teachers – this paradigm shift-- must begin and take root in our Schools of Education. It is there that the respect for all students, the understanding of the practical values of regular reflection—personal and collaborative—must be internalized. It is in “Ed. School” that one must be sensitized to the importance of attitudes of teacher and student in the learning-achievement equation. As important as content knowledge and experience are to the classroom teacher, the capacity (ies) to respect, attend (listen and pay attention to students), reflect, motivate and sustain are at the heart of the new teacher lessons for long term success. While each of these capacities is crucial, the infusion of *cultural*

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

competency is invaluable.⁵⁰ Cultural competency will enable the teacher to utilize both her affective and cognitive capacities more effectively. Cultural competency is premised on respectful acknowledgement of differences and similarities among for peoples. To be culturally competent, an educator must acquire knowledge and develop a sense of understanding of her students' cultural antecedents as well as contemporary experience. The teacher-in-training or a newly "enlightened" veteran teacher in a professional development setting, can learn to utilize historical and present day cultural information as a rich frame of reference in relating to and connecting with students. Cultural competency can be "a difference maker" in general communications; piquing a student's interest; motivating and constructively challenging students, as well as in formal learning settings (inside and outside the classroom).

- *Instructional and Classroom Failures:* The most experienced teachers are frequently teaching the highest performing students. The lower performing students generally have the least experienced teachers. The most academically disengaged or "challenged" students should actually be "engaged" by committed, skilled, respectful, culturally competent teachers. These teacher characteristics should be typical in the descriptions of the most experienced teachers. It is unfortunate that these characteristics do not describe nearly enough veteran teachers or new teachers. "Teacher- intellectuals" are needed. That is, teachers who understand the benefits of knowing and utilizing student-empowering practices. Central in this pedagogy is the "teacher-researcher". That is, the teacher who formally (and informally) investigates, employs and reflects on instructional strategies, methods and practices. Collaborative as well as individual reflection and feedback are crucial. Student-centered praxis is an especially powerful approach (for students) that teacher intellectuals understand can hasten students' development along the path of "lifelong learning". Today the

⁵⁰ Culturally competent educators see differences among students as assets. They create caring learning communities where individual and cultural heritages, including languages, are expressed and valued. esb.ode.state.oh.us/Word/GLOSSARY%20FOR%20DRAFT%20STANDARDS_10_18_05_FINAL.doc Issues of cultural competency are integral parts of the outstanding chapters in the Joyce E King edited book, "BLACK EDUCATION A Transformative Research and Action Agenda for the New Century", published for the American Educational Research Association by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

classroom teacher's view of herself as a teaching intellectual, whose instructional responsibilities and praxis are student-centered does not appear to be widely held.

As we have already concluded, such characteristics must be become foundational in Education schools and institutionalized in classrooms across the grades. Effective student-centered instruction is a means of enabling *more* students to become *more* active, *earlier*, as *knowledge retrievers* --rather than passive *information receivers*-- in the dynamic process of learning. This concept while not new, only occasionally finds consistent practice (support) in our public school (classroom) settings; and those settings are more likely to be among students in talented and gifted or other high achieving "tracks". *Lack of practical experience, teaching to the test, and of course, challenging student behavior* are among the many excuses teaching "pragmatists" may offer for failures to utilize student-centered instruction. The result is an all too commonly occurring, "*instructional superficiality*". This is a tendency to rarely engage in deep teaching; that is, in-depth classroom teacher-student interaction in which students attend, absorb, apply, reflect-on, and retain material. Teacher-guided (rather than teacher-centered) experiences which produce whole-class, collaborative-group, as well as, individualized learning, are core daily classroom objectives in student-centered, "deep teaching" environments. Such environments in our public schools are rare outside of the high performing schools or programs. Working in "the real world" of those "teacher pragmatists" can be challenging. Many new teachers, who by definition do not have the experience, are not likely to get strong student-centered mentoring help or "modeling" from their veteran colleagues. Many veteran educators have inconsistently the more demanding teacher intellectual practice. Perhaps jaded by very limited successes over the years, most veteran teachers persist in taking the "sage-on-the-stage", path of least resistance. That is they simply become lecturers (often from the front of the room).

However, among the many elements that must be in place is that students must be attentive, individually and as a class. Thus in settings where students have habitual classroom deportment that is non interfering with classmates and focused

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

on the instructor or material, students are far more enabled to learn; and subsequently build on that learning. The consistency in demanding and producing high quality classroom and home assignments is uneven across the student populations. Students, who pose little or no significant behavioral or motivational challenges, do well and receive positive reinforcement to continue. This positive effect compounds over time. Conversely, the compounding negative effects of being students in school and classroom environments in which department regularly interferes with attentiveness and learning can, over time, be profoundly damaging. Teacher weaknesses in “deep teaching” and classroom management become magnified. The emotional-attitudinal and intellectual capacities to motivate and constructively challenge students towards excellence are deeply diminished. Where there is significant student resistance to the repeated classroom practices, there has been little in the way of a satisfactory systemic response. Students who are challenging are not necessarily insightfully engaged. Poor proficiency test scores are less evidences of students’ lack of intelligence, than a metric of the need for alternative, foundational pedagogic and curricular approaches. Repeated *teaching to the test* remediation classes are only helpful in allowing the flow of certain funding to continue. Such classes, both in theory and practice, offer little evidence of qualitatively improving subject area comprehension or reaching, motivating and empowering student populations which are in crisis.

There is continued competition for opportunities for collaborative teaching and reflection among colleagues. The understandable potential teacher scheduling conflicts are exacerbated by general lacks of commitment to such practices. In subject areas such as math and English language arts, “coaches⁵¹” are sometimes the only school-base professionals who are officially or practically encouraging collaborative colleague input. Without principals, as school leaders, and of course teachers, as practitioners another important element of “teacher as intellectual”

⁵¹ Coaches are school-based veteran teachers who provide pedagogic and subject-specific curricular support to teachers. They do not have supervisory authority, however better coaches are accessible and avail colleagues of lesson modeling, co-teaching and collaborative teacher-reflection services.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

praxis is being undermined. This praxis supports both cognitive and affective classroom considerations and involves regular formal and informal sessions. In the sessions there are: (a) delineation of goals-- instructional or behavioral—and planned approaches to achieve the goals; (b) regular reflection to assess progress (successes and failures), and summations & feedback. Again, keep in mind that these are individual as well as collaborative sessions. The next steps --short and longer term-- evolve from the teaching and the reflections assessing student learning. Student-centered instruction is often contrasted with teacher-centered lecturing. In fact, it entails much more. It should involve deft, culturally competent uses of student's environments to enable them to better understand their environment and other environments; learn how to learn. That is, gain abilities, acquire knowledge of individual facts or areas and consciously learn to look for the interrelationships of things. Creating opportunities for students to work collaboratively (cooperative learning) –in small and medium sized “teams” are effective for learning and socialization. Individual projects, both –self initiated and teacher directed are also useful in developing self confidence and a sense of completion. Most teachers are aware of these basic approaches. It is often difficult for basic approaches to be successfully undertaken. Student behavior and attitudes toward school in general, and toward their teacher(s) and/or subject(s) in particular, are cited as obstacles in the school and classroom learning environments. We conclude that while disruptive behavior is a major problem, it is behavior manifested and modeled by students but borne out of a broken system that has failed to serve one generation of students after another. Many observers and critics argue that the system is not broken, but operating as it is intended. In any case changes at the classroom level will do little to help a city wide, statewide and national problem. The solution set involves systemic and comprehensive policy and practices which are manifested in schools by principals, as school leaders, and in classrooms by teachers, as adult leaders. School behavior is rooted in students' individual and collective recognition of the importance of learning in that school environment. Behavior is learned and becomes habitual. Year in and year out, successful students compound the benefits of good school and classroom

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

deportment. They not only learn particular information, but actually increase their capacities to behave, work hard and thus learn qualitatively more.

At the school and classroom levels, the physical concerns of *school size, class size and classroom management* must be addressed. Classes which are too large and energetic, with a significant number of unfocused students are challenging. However, we conclude that the strong supports of the previously cited affective elements of respect, attentiveness, cultural competency and student motivation are even more important. If and when the confluence of public policy, progressive pedagogical practices, affective skills and capacities proliferate, school and classroom improvements will begin to take root. However, we submit that the inclusion of a culturally relevant curriculum will make the critical difference in the academic and personal development of many students who today are underperforming. Unfortunately this “perfect storm” of liberating education policy and practice is not yet imminent.

Curricular Failures: Culturally relevant curricula which provide the very large Latino and African ancestry student populations are a critical part of the solution set of reversing the EAG. As consistently stated, a comprehensive array of improvements is needed. Nonetheless, the present failings of curricula in the areas *cultural relevancy* and *social justice* are especially troubling. We have discussed briefly that federal and state legislation is in place which mandates such curricular changes. There has been a solid body of research documenting the empowering potential of curricula of cultural inclusion for all students; especially to those who have been historically excluded from or undervalued in history.⁵² Perhaps most importantly, culturally relevant curricula help students locate themselves in the continuum of history, and in turn, value themselves in the present. For many students, this *valuing in the present* is key. Given the mis-information that is

⁵² Numerous scholars such as Molefi Asante, the late Dr. Asa Hilliard, Dr. Gloria Ladson Billings, Dr. Lisa Delpit, Dr. Joyce E. King, Dr. Marta Vega and a variety of Professional Associations, such as the Commission On Research In Black Education (CORIBE) <http://www.coribe.org/> are producing important works on both Culturally Relevant Curricula and Cultural Competency. Bibliography to be provided.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

pervasive, this amounts to a “re-evaluation” of both their people and themselves. Culturally relevant curricula and culturally competent pedagogy compound the opportunities for all students to gain much needed information and context as they mature and progress through the grades. All students benefit in learning about those relevant, yet often suppressed or undervalued historical and contemporary dynamics which have shaped society. We contend that such contextual knowledge, infused with social justice curricular and socially-inclusive, student-centered pedagogy are empowering to all students and ultimately to society. Integrated studies and pedagogy in which issues of history, social justice, civic and personal responsibility are linked with practical lessons and projects which present “the-community-as-classroom”, encourage social awareness and social action. Students engaged in such initiatives tend to value themselves as individuals and in healthy societal contexts. They are unlikely to allow themselves or others to be marginalized.

Specialists have produced extensive culturally relevant curricula, curriculum guides, formats and outlines spanning the entire grade range. In 2004, after nearly forty years of struggle, the city of Philadelphia mandated the teaching of Black History from elementary school through high school. However, despite a deepening reservoir materials and a few very significant institutional breakthroughs, it has been the rule rather than the exception, for officials to ignore the “implementation option”. As a result, the persistence refusal of officials to take appropriate action, gives rise to suspicions that the EAG is intentional. The benefits of culturally relevant courses to older students --who may have spent years languishing in schools and classes, often unmotivated, bored and generally experiencing a real disconnect in the **relevance** of being there-- are potentially life-changing; and certainly enhancing to their educational careers. The benefits to younger students, less jaded by the academic and affective impacts of the EAG, are going to be profound. As indicated, we anticipate Black and Latino students will have generally more favorable concepts of themselves as the combined affects of culturally relevant curricula and culturally competent educators take

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

hold. Notably, academics and related personal performance areas will improve significantly as well. In a few programs today, the benefits are manifesting themselves. In such varied settings as places in the public school system derisively called “last chance high schools”, where the students had been among those most underserved before finding a home, to newly forming independent Black schools, we see students no longer grappling with the “R word”, that is, “relevancy”. They have a sense of why they are in school and more importantly, a sense of their relationship to their community (ies) and to the global community. The students’ abilities to unwrap their talents, set and realize goals, will not only re-shape public education’s racist and classicist pyramid, it will also impact society as a whole.

PHASE II: SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In producing this report at the request of GCA, we undertook an array of educational research, investigations and analyses. Initially we sought to understand (a) the character of secondary education in CD9 (and NYC in general); (b) NYC DOE relevant administrative structures; (c) the actual “pathway” for a child from “toddlerhood” to successful admission into a high school similar to the just opened Columbia Secondary School For Math, Science and Engineering (CSS), and (d) what programs and initiatives, internal and external to Columbia, are especially relevant in moving along that pathway. We recognized item “c” above to be the pivotal element of GCA’s request. Specifically, we felt that GCA was particularly interested in a pathway for the “average or typical public school child” found in CD9, greater Harlem (or even New York City). This focus framed our subsequent inquiries and research. We realized that under present NYC public schools conditions, that “average or typical” child, whether in CD9 or citywide, has little likelihood of gaining admission to a selective, college preparatory secondary school. We found that 94 percent of the public school students in CD9 were Latino or Black as are about 72 percent of the students citywide. We found that most of these students were caught in a school system which underserved or “undereducated” them—generation-

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

after-generation. At the same time, empirical evidence graphically demonstrated that other students were overwhelming beneficiaries; apparently tracked for success. These students are the “elite” high academic performers. They are overwhelmingly Asian and White—two groups comprising less than 6 percent of CD9, and less than 30 percent of citywide students. Not only are these students exceptionally well educated, they are also largely not in financial need. These students comprise the bulk of the students in the elementary and middle school talented and gifted (T & G) schools and programs, as well as most of the students in the city’s selective college prep middle and secondary schools. Their anointed place at the top of the public education “system’s” pyramid is also confirmed by the system’s own data. The data shows that of the students enrolled in the city’s eight specialized high schools using the *Specialized High Schools Admissions Test (SHSAT)*⁵³, 84 percent are Asian and White. We found that in relationship to their proportion of the public school population, Asian students were about 13.5 times and 19 times more heavily enrolled in these schools than Black and Latino students respectively. White students were about 8 times and 12 times more heavily enrolled than Black and Latino students respectively. Preliminary researches of several other highly regarded, honors-type public high schools produced similar findings. Unfortunately, these disparities have other, more harmful manifestations in the Latino and African ancestry student populations. Academically, the vast majority of Latino and Black students seemed tracked for mediocrity or failure. In the CD9 middle schools— feeders to secondary school—huge numbers of Latino and African ancestry students are recipients of math and English proficiency scores of “level 1” (not proficient at grade level) and “level 2” only (partially proficient). Thirty percent or more of Latino and Black students do not graduate; and many more are earning “local high school” (non regents) diplomas. Directly affecting their personal lives, Black and Latino students are increasingly being criminalized for a variety of school-based disputes as well. This is occurring at such an alarming (and disparate) rate that the “school-to-prison-pipeline” is now a commonly referred to phenomenon. We recognize these and other differences in the educational careers of specific student groupings as manifestations of the *educational achievement*

⁵³ There are nine Specialized High Schools. La Guardia High School admits its students on the basis of Arts auditions.

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

gap (EAG). A “gap” defined by the disparity in the “*system’s*” delivery of educational services. The responsibilities for causing and addressing the EAG are with society, its institutions, and its officials; not with any groupings of students.

Finally, the report identifies a confluence of societal, NYC and DOE policies and practices as being at the root of the EAG. The causes are systemic and only a multi faceted response, geared to change the “system” would be appropriate. Thus this report ultimately morphed into an examination of relevant data and a discussion of these core problems. Admittedly, the report and recommendations may reflect an expanded, more comprehensive addressing of the request for a “pathway” than GCA originally envisioned. In any case, we trust that the material will be useful.

The recommendations below are an outline of selected policy implementation efforts intended to meaningfully address the EAG and facilitate the struggle for much needed institutional change(s); changes which will provide the “average public school child” with far more equitable, if long overdue, access to the “pathway” of educational opportunity. We understand that *quality public education is a human right* and that *stakeholders must be important parts of “the process” of change.* However, progressing from “articulation to action” always seems to be a challenge. In this case, the task of developing and converting these important social ideas into new, liberating public policies will be especially formidable. Toward that end, we respectfully present the following detailed outline. It is intended to assist NYC students (parents, educators and community advocates in the struggle) to transform public education and their futures.

RECOMMENDATIONS OUTLINE

1. NYC Governmental / Public Education Policy Implementation

- a. *Eliminate Centralized Mayoral Educational-control Structure*
- b. *Democratize Schools Chancellor Selection Process*
- c. *Support Vertical Parent(and other Stakeholder) Involvement in DOE Policy*
 - i. *Include financial recognition / underwriting of (employed & unemployed) parents official training and working time*
- d. *Focus Public Educational Policies & Practices on Eliminating the EAG*
 - i. *Re-focus educational excellence priority to embrace the most underserved groups of students—Latino Students & Black*

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

Students; Students with Disabilities; Students from Low Income Households

- ii. *Integrate student-centered pedagogy and instruction; culturally competent teacher-principal preparation; culturally relevant curricula from Pre K-12*
- iii. *Aggressively provide parental training & support resources in “child-nurturing” and “parenting for your child’s success” initiatives*

2. NYC DOE Classroom Curriculum & Instruction Policy Implementation

- a. *Officially Incorporate Culturally Relevant Curricula (Pre K-12)*
 - i. *Indigenous Peoples History & Cultural Experiences: Western Hemisphere*
 - ii. *African Ancestry (Black) History & Cultural Experiences*
 - iii. *Latino History & Cultural Experiences*
 - iv. *Asian History & Cultural Experiences*
 - v. *Continuous European Immigrant History to US & Western Hemisphere*
- b. *Mandate Student Competencies for Graduation in:*
 - i. *Nature & Impact of the Enslavement of Africans in Development of US (& Europe);*
 - ii. *Nature & Impact of the Genocide of Indigenous Peoples in Formation & Expansion of US (et al)*
 - iii. *Nature & Impact of Immigration on US Development*
 - iv. *Nature & Impacts of Globalization on Global Community (ies)*
 - v. *Global Communities: Sustainable Strategies*
- c. *Integrate Social Justice Curricula with Culturally Relevant Curricula*
- d. *Emphasize student-centered Pedagogy in Teacher Preparation and Professional Development; valuing*
 - i. *Cultural competency*
 - ii. *Social Awareness & “Community-as-Classroom” Practices*
 - iii. *Teacher-researcher collaboration*
 - iv. *Authentic Assessment student evaluations*
 - v. *Affective student reinforcement practices (strengthening self concepts and motivation)*

3. NYC DOE Teacher Recruitment and Retention Policy Implementation

- a. *Restructure Teacher Recruitment to Include Significant Representations of Latino and African Ancestry New Teachers*
- b. *Work collaboratively with Latino and African Ancestry organizations to publicize and recruit Latino & Black college students*

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

- c. *Examine the accuracy of allegations of DOE’s disproportionate losses of Black and Latino veteran teachers and administrators in recent years*
 - i. *If accurate, investigate reasons for, and*
 - ii. *Ways of correcting/reversing such policies and practices*

4. NYC DOE Teacher Preparation (Training) & Professional Development Policy Implementation

- a. *Design new-teacher training practices which embrace student-centered Pedagogy (as presented in #2 above)*
- b. *Design veteran teacher professional development practices which include student-centered Pedagogy (as presented in #2 above)*

5. NYC DOE Principal Training & Development and School Leadership Policy Implementation

- a. *Design Principal (& AP) training practices which embrace student-centered pedagogy*
- b. *Design Principal (& AP) training practices which reinforce integrated approaches to elimination of EAG*
- c. *Design Principal (& AP) training practices which incorporate collaborative school leadership, consensus building and student-staff-parent esprit de corps*

6. Schools of Education & Collegiate Paradigm Shift: Integrated Approaches

- a. *Undertake Research reflecting the comprehensive, interconnected nature of the EAG (and other society-crippling problems) Recommendations #1-5 above*
- b. *Develop Project Initiatives reflecting Recommendations #1-5 above*
- c. *Develop Courses reflecting Recommendations #1-5 above*
- d. *Engage Community-based, School-based and Higher Education Partners to Implement items “6a, 6b and 6c”*

7. Columbia-specific Efforts (in addition to Recommendation #6)⁵⁴

- a. *Examine a selection of successful CU-supported pre-schools, elementary school, middle school level enrichment programs, as well as CSS to assess*

⁵⁴ For items “7b & 7c” see: APPENDIX SEVEN: Selected NYC School and Community-based Proponents Of Culturally Relevant Curricula & Culturally Competent Pedagogy

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

the specific capacities to strengthen student motivation & academic performance.

- b. *Attempt to engage a selection of community-based, activist organizations involved in the struggle to eliminate the EAG; Especially*
 - i. *Groups working to institutionalize African ancestry, Latino and Indigenous History and Cultural relevancy to NYC PreK-12 curricula*
 - ii. *Groups working to establish **non-charter** public (elementary, middle and secondary) schools targeted to liberating the “broad middle” of average and lower achieving NYC students*
- c. *Examine the experiences of at least two NYC public schools expressly employing Culturally Competent Pedagogy and a Culturally Relevant Curriculum*
 - i. *Especially interested in non-selective programs serving students who were / are previously considered “average or lower performing”*
- d. *Undertake expanded research on the EAG focusing on secondary schools citywide*
- e. *Undertake expanded research on the EAG focusing on a selection of middle schools and elementary schools citywide*

Each of the outlined areas is important in its own right. Individual implementations will produce significant and empowering results. However, a collective implementation of the “whole” will prove to be even “greater than the sum of its parts”. The impact will not only be comprehensive, but also transformative to millions of young lives.

AFTERWORD: COLUMBIA IN CONTEXT

Columbia and CD9

Columbia University (CU) is literally one of the diverse “communities” within the greater CD9 community. During its lengthy presence in the area, CU has, at times been viewed by area residents as a “blessing” and a “curse”. It is the area’s largest employer; and also the largest real estate holder. In the past twenty years, CU has launched so-called community development initiatives that have conflicted with deeply held opinions and positions by other community members. CU’s current efforts to implement a major university expansion and mixed development within CD9 have again placed it in the center of a roiling local struggle. Profound, “life changing” contemporary urban issues such as resident and business dislocation; gentrification; scarcity of affordable housing,

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

and extensive utilization of eminent domain, have combined to produce a passionate local opposition of residents, small business owners and even, some CD9 board members.

Columbia & Teachers College As Part of the Solution

CU and its highly regarded graduate school of education, Teachers College (TC) are not only world renowned, but also among a handful of institutions of higher education with the potential to adequately address the comprehensive changes that this report recommends. GCA, itself as well as the CU schools of Government and Architecture & Planning as well as TC could make major contributions on the implementation of the Recommendations.

CU-TC is located within a city and community in which the crisis in public education is a debilitating problem for a “majority” of students. CU-TC’s resources and influence within the Academy --and especially within New York City-- is unequalled. As such, its potential to constructively collaborate on the much needed transformation of local public education is unprecedented.

However, it is ironic that the very students that the *GCA Consultant Request* would most directly focus on helping to empower, may be the children of some of those local residents most “at risk” of dislocation by Columbia’s redevelopment project. In any case, the groups are representative of one another. *The contradiction between this report’s proposed pathway “from toddlerhood” toward educational opportunity for all students, and CU’s actual behavior in CD9 is profound.* One indication is that the very types of groups and affiliations from which this report recommends that CU gains insight and with which it seeks to work collaboratively, represent the same grassroots interests as does CU’s core opposition on the redevelopment project. We submit that to seriously join the struggle to transform public education, CU would also have to transform its own political and socio-economic praxis.

APPENDIX ONE: Excerpt of GCA request for consultant services, “Research and General Advice on Secondary Education”

GCA Consultant Services Statement

Staff in Columbia University’s Office of Government and Community Affairs (GCA) are presently acting both as advisors on issues related to a new Math Science and Engineering secondary school, and in related community benefit discussions concerning secondary education in the West Harlem community. Given our needs to become more knowledgeable about secondary education in general, we have identified a consultant to assist us.

In **Phase 1** of this work, the consultant will advise GCA staff on secondary education issues and institutions including administrative structures of districts, character of surrounding area schools; apprise GCA staff of existing educational support programs (both Columbia and external) and identify weak areas. Given the consultant’s expertise in curriculum development, the consultant will also apprise staff of significant issues and developments in this area.

In **Phase 2** of this work, the consultant will undertake research for a report that will demonstrate an educational pathway – from toddler-hood to eligibility for the new Math, Science & Engineering Secondary School or parallel programs (including non-competitive programs). The pathway would include existing support programs, and recommend expanding those or developing new ones. In other words, how does a child get from infancy to high school successfully? What resources can parents access and how do they identify these resources? Identify obstacles along the path, with suggestions of how to overcome them. The track should include existing Columbia programs and partnerships and suggest other partnerships or new programs where gaps exist. It should be scalable; for instance, the program could begin as a pilot and be expanded once underway. Although the target area would be Community Board 9, focusing on the area north of 116 Street, one hopes that the report would inform discussion of these issues in the broader Harlem communities.

APPENDIX TWO: NEW YORK STATE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ART (ELA) & MATHEMATICS TEST PROFICIENCY / SCORING LEVELS

MATH Level 1: Not Meeting Learning Standards

Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

Level 2: Partially Meeting Learning Standards

Student performance demonstrates a partial understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

Level 3: Meeting Learning Standards

Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

Level 4: Meeting Learning Standards with Distinction

Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

ELA Level 1: Not Meeting Learning Standards

Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the ELA knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

Level 2: Partially Meeting Learning Standards

Student performance demonstrates a partial understanding of the ELA knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

Level 3: Meeting Learning Standards

Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the ELA knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

Level 4: Meeting Learning Standards with Distinction

Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the ELA knowledge and skills expected at this grade level.

APPENDIX THREE: Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability

Accountability Cohort

The 2002 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2002–03 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2002–03 school year, who were enrolled on October 6, 2005 and did not transfer to a diploma granting program. Students who earned a high school equivalency diploma or enrolled in an approved high school equivalency preparation program by June 30, 2006, are not included in the 2002 school accountability cohort. The 2002 district accountability cohort consists of all students in each school accountability cohort plus students who transferred within the district after BEDS day plus students who were placed outside the district by the Committee on Special Education or district administrators and who met the other requirements for cohort membership. Cohort is defined in Section 100.2 (p) (16) of the Commissioner's Regulations.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) indicates satisfactory progress by a district or a school toward the goal of proficiency for all students.

Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)

The Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) is the Performance Index (PI) value that signifies that an accountability group is making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will be proficient in the State's learning standards for English language arts and mathematics by 2013–14. The secondary-level AMO will be increased as specified in CR100.2 (p) (14) and will reach 200 in 2013–14. (See Effective AMO for further information.)

Continuously Enrolled Students

At the elementary/middle level, continuously enrolled students are those enrolled in the school or district on BEDS day (usually the first Wednesday in October) of the school year until the test administration period. At the secondary level, all students who meet the criteria for inclusion in the accountability cohort are considered to be continuously enrolled.

Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO)

The Effective Annual Measurable Objective (Effective AMO) is the Performance Index (PI) value that each accountability group within a school or district is expected to achieve to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The Effective AMO is the lowest PI that an accountability group of a given size can achieve in a subject for the group's PI not to be considered significantly different from the AMO for that subject. If an

accountability group's PI equals or exceeds the Effective AMO, it is considered to have made AYP. A more complete definition of Effective AMO and a table showing the PI values that each group size must equal or exceed to make AYP are available at www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts.

Performance Index (PI)

Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group, indicating how that group performed on a required State test (or approved alternative) in English language arts, mathematics, or science. Student scores on the tests are converted to four performance levels, from Level 1 (indicating no proficiency) to Level 4 (indicating advanced proficiency). At the elementary/middle level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$ At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$ A list of tests used to measure student performance for accountability is available at: www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts

Progress Target

For accountability groups below the State Standard in science or graduation rate, the Progress Target is an alternate method for making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or qualifying for Safe Harbor in English language arts and mathematics based on improvement over the previous year's performance.

Safe Harbor

Safe Harbor provides an alternate means to demonstrate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for accountability groups that do not achieve their Effective Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in English or mathematics.

Safe Harbor Targets

The original 2005–06 safe harbor targets were calculated using the following equation: $2005-06 \text{ PI} + (200 - \text{the } 2005-06 \text{ PI}) \times 0.10$ The resulting targets were adjusted so that their proportion of the 2005–06 AMO was the same as the original target's proportion of the 2004–05 AMO.

Science Progress Target

The elementary/middle-level 2005–06 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2004–05 PI. The 2006–07 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2005–06 PI. The 2006–07 target is provided for

NYC Public Education Report * S.E.E.D.S. Institute for Self-Determination & Sustainability (SISDS) by Akinlabi E. Anthony Mackall and J. L. Wright

groups whose PI was below the State Science Standard in 2005-06.

Science Standard

The criterion value that represents a minimally satisfactory performance in science. In 2005–06, the State Science Standard at the elementary/middle level is a Performance Index (PI) of 100. The Commissioner may raise the State Science Standard at his discretion in future years.

Source: New York State Report Card, District #5 “Accountability and Overview Report” p.6
<https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2006/AOR-2006-310500010000.pdf>

APPENDIX THREE - A: SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY STATUS TERMS

Understanding Your School Accountability Status

The list below defines the school status categories applied to each accountability measure under New York State's accountability system, which is divided into a Federal Title I component and a State component. Accountability measures for schools at the elementary/middle level are English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science; at the secondary level, they are ELA, mathematics, and graduation rate. A school may be assigned a different status for different accountability measures. The overall status of a school is the status assigned to the school for the accountability measure with the most advanced designation in the hierarchy. If the school receives Title I funds, it is the most advanced designation in the Title I hierarchy, unless the school is in good standing under Title I but identified as SRAP under the State hierarchy. A school that does not receive Title I funding in a school year does not have a federal status in that year; however, all schools receive a state status even if they do not receive Title I funding. Schools in improvement status under Title I must provide school choice for their students; those in need of improvement in year 2 and beyond must also provide Supplemental Education Services to eligible students. Other consequences for schools not in good standing can be found at: www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/school-accountability/about.shtml

Federal Title I Status (Applies to all New York State schools receiving Title I funds)

New York State Status (Applies to all New York State public schools)

School in Good Standing

A school is considered to be in good standing if it has not been identified as a School in Need of Improvement, in Corrective Action, Planning for Restructuring, Restructuring, Requiring Academic Progress, or as a School Under Registration Review.

School in Need of Improvement (Year 1)

A school that has not made AYP on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years while receiving Title I funds is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for the following year.

School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) A school that has not made AYP on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) for the following year.

School in Need of Improvement (Year 2)

A School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2)

A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) for the following year.

School in Corrective Action

A School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was

identified is considered a School in Corrective Action for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3)

A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) for the following year.

School Planning for Restructuring

A School in Corrective Action that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Planning for Restructuring for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4)

A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4) for the following year.

School Restructuring (Year 1)

A School Planning for Restructuring that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 1) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 and above)

A School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4 and above) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 and above) for the following year.

School Restructuring (Year 2)

A School Restructuring (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 2) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

APPENDIX FOUR: *SIMILAR SCHOOLS* LISTINGS: NYC GROUPINGS⁵⁵

New York City Secondary Schools: N =356

Lower Range of Student Needs N = 67

67	All schools in this group are New York City secondary level schools. The schools in this group are in the lower range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG37 2006
----	--	---------------------------

Middle Range of Student Needs N = 151

151	All schools in this group are New York City secondary level schools. The schools in this group are in the middle range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG38 2006
-----	---	---------------------------

Higher Range of Student Needs N = 138

138	All schools in this group are New York City secondary level schools. The schools in this group are in the higher range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG39 2006
-----	---	---------------------------

New York City Middle Schools: N = 254

Lower Range of Student Needs N = 64

67	All schools in this group are New York City middle level schools. The schools in this group are in the lower range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG19 2006
----	---	---------------------------

Middle Range of Student Needs N = 64

151	All schools in this group are New York City middle level schools. The schools in this group are in the middle range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG20 2006
-----	--	---------------------------

Higher Range of Student Needs N = 126

138	All schools in this group are New York City middle level schools. The schools in this group are in the higher range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG21 2006
-----	--	---------------------------

⁵⁵ Source: New York State Report Cards *Similar Schools* link:
<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/reportcard/2006/similar-schools/home.shtml>

APPENDIX FOUR: *SIMILAR SCHOOLS* LISTINGS (continued)
New York City Elementary Schools: N = 723

Lower Range of Student Needs N = 162

67	All schools in this group are New York City elementary level schools. The schools in this group are in the lower range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG01_2006
----	---	---------------------------

Middle Range of Student Needs N = 204

151	All schools in this group are New York City elementary level schools. The schools in this group are in the middle range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG02_2006
-----	--	---------------------------

Higher Range of Student Needs N = 357

138	All schools in this group are New York City elementary level schools. The schools in this group are in the higher range of student needs for secondary level schools in New York City.	SG03_2006
-----	--	---------------------------

APPENDIX FIVE: NYC DOE Student Performance & Accountability⁵⁶

Elementary and middle school students in New York City take annual State exams, which help to determine whether they're achieving State standards in English Language Arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. High school students are required to pass five Regents exams to graduate. In addition to these State exams, the City provides an array of citywide tests to students, including the high school admissions tests, accelerated assessments for eighth grade students and the PSAT/NMSQT for those interested in applying to college. Click [here](#) to learn more about these various tests.

Starting in 2007-08, students will also take [Periodic Assessments](#) throughout the school year in English Language Arts and math. Periodic Assessments are tools designed by educators to support student instruction. They provide timely and detailed information on students' strengths and weaknesses, as well as their progress over time, to teachers, parents, and students. There are no stakes attached to the results for schools, principals, teachers, or students.

Also, beginning in the 2007-08 school year, the Department of Education is introducing new tools that will provide teachers, principals, and parents with detailed information about students and schools:

[Progress Reports](#) will grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F to help you understand how well your school is doing — and compare it to other, similar schools.

[Surveys](#), launched in Spring 2007, gather information from the people who know most about how well our schools are serving the learning needs of students: teachers, parents, and students. Results from the surveys will be part of a school's progress report grade.

[Quality Reviews](#) will provide more in-depth profiles of each school, based on 2-3-day visits by experienced educators who talk to parents, students, and staff, observe classrooms, and review how schools use information and set goals to improve learning for all students.

[ARIS](#) (Achievement Reporting and Innovation System) is a first-of-its-kind data management system that allows parents and educators to see and analyze important information on students' learning.

These new reports and tools will be online as soon as they are available. To find them, please go to [Find a School](#) and enter a school's name. This will bring you to the school's Web page. Click on "Statistics," which is a link on the left side of the page, to find useful information about your school's performance and quality.

The assessment and accountability programs and services are administered by the Office of Accountability, whose mission is to improve academic outcomes for all New York City public school students. We accomplish this by enabling principals, teachers, parents, and students to use evaluative and support tools, data, and research to accelerate learning.

⁵⁶ Source: NYC DOE Website, *Student Performance & Accountability* Link: <http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/default.htm>

APPENDIX SIX: HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATORY PROGRAMS



80 Maiden Lane • Suite 706 • New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-430-5980 • Fax: 212-430-5981 • www.theoliverprogram.org

Some placement programs like The Oliver Program:

Prep for Prep: www.prepforprep.org

NJ SEEDS: www.njseeds.org

TEAK: www.teakfellowship.org

City Prep: www.cityprep.org

INDEPENDENT HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATORY AND PLACEMENT PROGRAMS FOR 8TH GRADE STUDENTS

A BETTER CHANCE

www.abetterchance.org
New York Metro Office (NY, Northern NJ, Southern CT)
240 W 35th St
New York NY 10001-2506
Phone: (646) 346-1344
Fax: (646) 346-1311

SCHOLARSHIP GRANTING ORGANIZATIONS FOR HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

INNER CITY SCHOLARSHIP FUND
At the Archdiocese of New York
www.innercitysf.org/contactus/index.html
1011 First Avenue
New York, NY 10022-4132
Phone: (212) 753-8583
Fax: (212) 371-6461

JACK KENT COOKE FOUNDATION
Young Scholars Program
www.jackkentcookfoundation.org
44115 Woodridge Parkway, Suite 200
Lansdowne, Virginia 20176-5199
Phone: (703) 723-8000
Fax: (703) 723-8030

STUDENT/SPONSOR PARTNERSHIPS
www.sspshp.org
420 Lexington Ave, Suite 2930
New York, NY 10017 * Phone: (212) 986-9575 * Fax: (212) 986-9576

OTHER HIGH SCHOOL PLACEMENT RESOURCES

NYC DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

<http://www.nycenet.edu>

THE PARENT'S LEAGUE OF NEW YORK

www.parentsleague.org

115 East 82nd Street
New York, NY 10028
Phone: (212) 737-7385
Fax: (212) 737-7389

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

www.nysais.org

287 Pawling Avenue
Troy, NY 12180-5238
Phone: (518) 274-0184

THE ASSOCIATION OF BOARDING SCHOOLS

www.schools.com

4455 Connecticut Avenue
Suite A-200
Washington, DC 20008
Phone: (202) 966-8705
Fax: (202) 966-8708

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK

www.ny-archdiocese.org

Vicar for Education
1011 First Avenue
New York, NY 10022-4134
Phone: (212) 371-1000

THE NATIONAL COALITION OF GIRLS' SCHOOLS

www.ncgs.org

57 Main Street
Concord, MA 01742
Phone: (978) 287-4485

NEW YORK STATE CHARTER SCHOOLS THE CHARTER SCHOOLS INSTITUTE'S SATELLITE OFFICE IS LOCATED IN NEW YORK CITY:

www.newyorkcharters.org

Penn Plaza, Building 1
Suite 735
7th Floor
New York City, New York 10119
Phone: (212) 356-1860
Fax: (212) 356-1870 (fax)

YOUTH ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

The Partnership for After School Education (Resource List of all member after school programs in NYC)

www.pasesetter.org

120 Broadway, Suite 3048
New York, NY 10271
Phone: 212-571-2664
Fax: 212-571-2676

The Posse Foundation

www.possefoundation.org

14 Wall Street
Suite 8A-60
New York, NY 10005
Phone: 212-405-1691
Fax: 212-405-1697

Leadership Enterprise for a Diverse America

www.leda2003.org

39 Hamilton Terrace
New York, NY 10031
Phone: 212-234-1384
Fax: 212-234-1385

SEO Scholars Program (SEO – Sponsors for Educational Opportunity)

www.seo-usa.org

55 Exchange Place
New York, NY 10005
Phone: 212-979-2040

Legal Outreach Brooklyn

www.legaloutreach.org

157 Montague Street, 3rd Floor
Brooklyn, New York 11201
Phone: 718-797-3396
Fax: 718-797-2253

Harlem Educational Achievement Fund (HEAF)

www.heaf.org

2090 Seventh Avenue 10th Floor
New York, NY 10027
Ph: (212) 663-9732
Fax: (212) 663-9736

APPENDIX SEVEN: Selected NYC School and Community-based Proponents Of Culturally Relevant Curricula & Culturally Competent Pedagogy

I. Public Education Secondary Schools

Urban Assembly Academy For History and Citizenship - UAAHC (Male Education)
Attn: Kamau Ptah, Founder, Program Director
718-293-6768

Bushwick Community HS (Co-educational)
Attn: Tira Randall, Principal; Diane Lowman, Parent Association President
718-443-3083

II. Community-based and Activist Organizations

Black New Yorkers For Educational Excellence (BNYEE)
Attn: Dr. S. E. Anderson
212-252-2997

Board of Education For People of African Ancestry (BEPAA)
Attn: Solomon Goodrich / NYS Regent Adelaide Sanford, Retired
212-282-7287

Franklin H. Williams Caribbean Cultural Center African Diaspora Institute (CCCADI)
Attn: Dr. Marta Moreno Vega, Founder / Melody Capote, Dir External Affairs
212-307-7420

Roots Revisited
Attn: Michael Hooper, Founder
718-778-0009

Sankofa Community Empowerment
Attn: Brian Favors, Co-founder
917-291-5046