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1. Deliver support operations, instructional programs \& scheduling of class sections \& course sections even more efficiently than 2011-2012, to help sustain instructional programs to the full extent possible, due to a particularly challenging fiscal climate.
2. Expect more of our students, in regard to high expectations for quality of academic schoolwork completed during school hours.
3. Celebrate student \& staff success in public fashion.
4. Model the habit of civility through our interactions with Peru CSD colleagues and others we engage with as part of our public service as employees or volunteers.
5. Expect more of ourselves, in regard to using to best advantage whatever time and resources we can put together among ourselves for professional development and continued improvement of programs \& services, as part of 'Race to the Top' engagement.
6. Expect more of ourselves, in regard to boosting the percent of lesson time we actively engage students via consistent, thoughtful use of our 'cross-campus toolkit' of practical, proven, research-based instructional strategies.
7. Bolster our efforts to actively engage parents via phone, at home and school.
8. De-clutter our workspaces, our file cabinets and our shelves, as part of de-cluttering our curriculum, our practices and our work lives for now and our future.

# PERU CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMUNITY 

## Proposed Budget Slated for May 15, 2012 Vote



School Board President Rod Driscoll, above, will retire this year after 10 years of public service. Most of that time has been spent as board president.

## $\$ 1.05 \mathrm{M}$ in Budget Cuts \& Reductions

The range of instructional programs and support services provided on campus this school year will be sustained into next school year, in a more cost-efficient manner in order to provide such programs and services with fewer district employees July 1st
forward.
Roughly \$1,050,600 in cost reductions were enacted by the Board as a result of the winter/ spring budget development process. Cost reductions for July 1st forward are distributed
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## $\$ 1.05 \mathrm{M}$ in Budget Cuts \& Reductions

From Page 1

across all support operations, instructional program areas. Examples of cost reductions slated for July 1st forward:

1. Employ one less Assistant Principal, via attrition.
2. Employ one less operations supervisor, via retirement.
3. Further reduce the number of school bus runs, thereby employing fewer drivers.
4. Increase class sizes closer to statewide averages at the high school, thereby requiring fewer class sections and somewhat reduced staffing for each content area.
5. Decrease the current roster of 47 grades K-6 class sections by three, resulting in 44 grades K-6 elementary grades class sections, thereby requiring three fewer K-6 teachers.
6. Further reduce the number of clerical positions and buildings \& grounds positions.
7. Further reduce special education expenditures across campus.
The scope of cost reductions for July 1st includes eleven (11) full-time positions and three part-time positions. In addition, at least nine fulltime positions will be reduced to part-time positions. Some of these job reductions will be through retirement of long-serving employees.

## Estimated School Tax Bill Increase
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Based on the state budget plan enacted by the Governor and Legislature, the school board estimates a $2.84 \%$ increase of the school district's total property tax levy for 2012-2013. The proposal calls for an estimated tax rate increase of $2.84 \%$, from $\$ 18.29$ to $\$ 18.81$ per assessed
$\$ 1,000$ of property value. The adoption of this budget requires a tax levy increase equal to the statutory tax levy increase limit of this fiscal year and therefore does not exceed the state tax cap and must be approved by a simple majority of the qualified voters present and voting.

## Providing the Community With A Solid Return on Investment

Peru Central intends to continue our focus on balancing student needs within budgetary constraints, and providing the community with good 'return on investment.' Next school year, reflecting employee and other stakeholder suggestions, the school district will continue:

- Delivering support operations, instructional programs \& scheduling of class sections \& course


Pictured are the Top 10 percent of the 2012 graduating class, as measured by grade point average. These students are slated for county-wide recognition and Peru school board recognition this spring, prior to graduation. sections even more efficiently, to help sustain instructional programs to the full extent possible, in the face of diminishing revenues and an annual property tax cap threshold.

- Expecting more of our students, in regard to quality of academic schoolwork completed during school hours.
- Celebrating student \& staff success.
- Using whatever time and resources we can put together among ourselves for professional development and continued improvement of programs \& services.
- Boosting the percent of lesson time we actively engage students via consistent, thoughtful use of our 'cross-campus toolkit' of practical, proven, researchbased instructional strategies.
- Bolstering our efforts to actively engage parents via phone, at home and school.
- Implementing new federal \& state mandates for annual teacher and Principal evaluation.
- Sustaining Peru Central's emphasis on student achievement \& continuous improvement.


## EXCEL Capital Project Budget \& General Fund Budget

Funding for voter-authorized capital projects must be kept separate and apart from general operating monies that fund instructional programs and associated personnel. Peru Central can't transfer \& use capital project state aid for day-to-day expenditures.


Details regarding the proposed budget are available at the district clerk's office at 643-6002, the school district's Web site at www.perucsd.org and at school offices.

## Annual Budget Hearing Tuesday, May 8, 2012 <br> 7 p.m., Community Room

Details on the proposed budget are available via school offices, the district clerk's office at 643-6002 and the school district's Web site at www.perucsd.org.
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## POSTAL PATRON

## Peru Central School District

## Key Points

## Regarding the 2012-2013 Budget

| Function or Program | 2012-2013 School Year Planning and Forecast |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reduced Costs \& Expenditures | Planned \$1.05M of reduced costs \& expenditures July 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ forward |
| Sustain Advanced HS Courses | By following through on each of the key points highlighted below |
| Sustain Extra-Curricular Activities | By following through on each of the key points highlighted below |
| Ingenuity in the Face of Adversity | Provide solid programs during this time of diminished revenues |
| Public Service | Emphasize the importance of public service role |
| Class Sizes Across Campus | Modestly increase class sizes as whenever feasible \& suitable |
| Extra-Curricular \& Athletics | All such student activities to be trimmed to the extent feasible |
| Instructional Programs | Continue increasing cost efficiency so as to sustain programs |
| Attrition | Preferred method of reduced employment, over layoff method |
| Particular Courses \& Programs | All programs sustained, all programs even more efficient |
| Support Operations | All key support operations sustained, all operations are trimmed |


A. Paưl Scott, Interim Superintendent of Schools

1. Continuing to strengthen student achievement and instructional programs.
1.1. Continue moving ahead with the Peru CSD 'Race to the Top' scope of work to advance student achievement, advance professional practice and update staff evaluation protocols.
1.2. Continue the progress evident in recent years with increasing the graduation rate.
1.3. Actively promote expanded high school student engagement with our SUNY dualenrollment academic partnership with Clinton Community College as part of this region's 'cradle to career' constellation of inter-agency partnerships to promote student success.
1.4. Re-establish the monthly set of public reports from student club presidents \& officers.
2. Updating school procedures and practices to reflect increased expectations among stakeholders for accountability and service, in consultation with those who will implement such practices.
2.1. Engage with first-year implementation of the state-mandated 'Dignity for All Students' Act.
2.2. Commission each school's shared decision making committee with focusing collective school-based efforts among stakeholders at least two student achievement goals and at least two conduct goals for the 2012-2013 school year.
2.3. Engage the governing team [Board and new Superintendent of Schools] in fall 2012 strategic examination of the Peru CSD policy handbook's key policies in section 1000 [community relations], 2000 [governance], 3000 [administration] and 4000 [instruction].
3. Providing quality support services as necessary to meet the district's mission and to maintain good stewardship of district facilities and grounds.
3.1. Complete by October 2012 the grades cross-campus renovations \& modernization within the scope of the voter-approved EXCEL capital project.
3.2. Move ahead with various information technology plan priorities, including a revised Web site home page to encourage \& support school community use of the Peru CSD Web site.
4. Ensuring fiscal responsibility and cost-effectiveness associated with expenditure of funds to support the goals above.
4.1. Sustain the school district's multi-year approach to budgeting and continuous improvement.
4.2. Engage with other area Boards of Education and this region's BOCES to move ahead with regional discussions on public education's future in the Champlain Valley region.

#  <br>  

To:<br>From: A. Paul Scott, Interim Supe<br>Interested Employees \& R sidents of Peru Central School District A. Paul Scott, Interim Supe ftendent of Schools

The school district receives many questions regarding budget development and prospective budget reduction plans. This set of 'budget questions and responses' provides responses to some of the more common questions received.

## Does New York State provide school districts with a viable option for a four-day school week?

No. State aid is based on a 180-day school calendar. Also, regional career-technical education programs and regional special education programs are scheduled in this region on a five-day per week basis.

## Lots of suggestions were offered this year and last year. Does the district consider those suggestions?

Yes. Suggestions received are examined and considered, as part of budget development. Some suggestions will almost certainly be implemented. Other suggestions may be impractical or would be more costly than our current methods. Example: Transporting all students to and from school on a single bus run in prior years would certainly have required more school buses, and would result in many of our 'full time' school bus driver positions being cut to 'part-time' bus driver positions. The cost of adding more school buses to our fleet, coupled with the associated increases in school bus maintenance budgets, along with the likely shortage of available part-time bus drivers had made that suggestion impractical. It's normal in rural school districts of our size to have multiple bus runs. That's a more efficient method than having all students transported on a 'single run' basis.

However, recent changes in State Education Department guidelines for how school districts should structure school bus routing transportation resulted in the school board commissioning a state-aided comprehensive study of transportation services at Peru CSD. The school district expects to receive the study results and recommendations sometime during May or June 2012. How the school district goes about establishing bus runs September 2012 forward may change as a result of that comprehensive study of transportation services. The intent of the study is to determine how transportation can be provided even more cost efficiently, in a safe manner.

## Why is this an exceptionally difficult budget year for school districts?

We're still impacted by the after-effects of the 'Great Recession', which was the worst overall decline in the economy at the national \& state levels since the Great Depression.

In addition, the recovery from this recessionary period has been - and is forecasted to continue being - relatively 'jobless', particularly for local governments and essential public services such as public education, emergency services and law enforcement, when compared with recessions of the $20^{\text {th }}$ Century.

Federal stimulus monies were used the past three years to help 'prop up' state budgets across the nation. Those stimulus monies are mostly spent. The near-term future for the nation's states is formidable: A few years ahead of reduced state revenues, at the very time when demand for public services is increasing [unemployment insurance, health care funding, public education and higher education].

For rural school districts like Peru Central, the lion's share of revenues is in the form of state aid. When Albany freezes or cuts state aid, Peru Central has a more difficult budget year than normal. It's expected state aid will be exceptionally scarce for the coming school years.

Additional evidence of state aid scarcity is found in an April $20^{\text {th }}$ New York State Education Department memorandum that included the following two statements regarding financial forecasts for New York State public education:

1. There is strong evidence that the financial crisis facing school districts will not be alleviated to any significant degree in the future.
2. Many of our school districts may have difficulty meeting financial obligations and will risk cutting programs and personnel to the point of not being able to provide a sound, basic education to our students.

## Does Peru CSD look at each and every budget item, in addition to reducing employment?

Yes. Peru CSD examines each and every budget - on a regular basis. During the past several school years, Peru CSD has reduced expenditures across all programs and support services. Overall, Peru CSD has reduced planned expenditures by several millions of dollars since year 2009, which includes the $\$ 1.05 \mathrm{M}$ of cost reductions slated for July 1,2012 forward. That's part of striving to stretch every available dollar, and operating even more efficiently.

## Did the school district ask for cost reductions and operations efficiency suggestions?

Yes. In fact, during February 2010, February 2011, and yet again winter 2012, Peru CSD employees and various other school community members contributed dozens of ideas focused on consolidating, streamlining and operating even more efficiently.

Many district employees and various other members of the school community submitted ideas via the voluntary stakeholder budget suggestions survey process.

## What are those cost reductions?

Well over 150 different suggestions have been received across the past three years. In short, suggestions have included reducing staffing whenever possible, cutting back on overtime, consolidating bus runs, increasing class size and many dozens of other suggestions.

## Does the district have guidelines for class size?

Yes. Our collective bargaining agreement specifies average class sizes for each of the elementary grade levels, and for each of the subject areas in middle school and in high school. Generally, particularly in the primary grades, we do not maximize average class sizes.

The school district and the faculty association agreed years ago on maximum average class sizes as follows:

| Grade Level | Average Class Size |  | Grade Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kindergarten | 22.9 | Grades 7 | 22 |
| Grade 1 | 23.9 | Grade 8 | 22 |
| Grade 2 | 24.9 | $7-8$ Art, Health, Music | 26 |
| Grade 3 | 24.9 | Most English \& Social Studies | 26 |
| Grade 4 | 24.9 | Most Math \& Science | 26 |
| Grade 5 | 26.9 | Art, Music and Business | 26 |
| Grade 6 | 26.9 | Industrial Technology | 20 |

The school district will continue to use attrition as the preferred method for moving ahead with any staffing reductions, to the extent there is sufficient attrition to do so. It's anticipated the scope of cost reductions for July $1^{\text {st }}$ forward will be beyond the reductions available exclusively via attrition.

Are other New York State public school districts making budget reductions similar to what Peru CSD has taken action on this budget season?

Yes, particularly among the state's less wealthy school districts and rural school districts. Nationally, almost every one of the nation's fifty states face substantial revenue shortages for public education.

Most school districts nationwide are facing a tough budget season this year, and likely the next several school years, too.

## What are examples of non-mandated classes/programs K-12?

A. Kindergarten is not mandated. Neither are athletics or after-school clubs.
B. Information technology instruction is non-mandatory, although use of such technology is imbedded in state standards and core curricula.
C. Dual-credit coursework via academic partnerships with Clinton Community College, Advanced Placement [AP] courses, advanced science classes, advanced math classes, business education classes, the Model UN class section, advanced LOTE classes such as

French 5 and Spanish 5, art electives such as sculpture or photography, are nonmandatory yet typical of what has been customary at Peru Central and other public school districts, regionally, statewide and nationally.

To paraphrase what one former State Legislator said to me five or six years ago:
'New York State has not mandated what communities would choose on their own, it mandates what communities might not choose to provide on their own.'

Why does the district office provide residents who come to budget development meetings with extensive print copies of the documents associated with the agenda?

To advance the interests of open access to updated information for residents who choose to attend, offer comment and otherwise engage with the school board's public session budget development process. Such an open access approach was piloted in 2005, in cooperation with the school board. The extent of such open access has been expanded each year since. The school board and administration appreciate the encouraging comments from school community members regarding this open access initiative.

## Did the school district reduce administrative staffing?

Yes. One administrative position is eliminated as of July $1^{\text {st }}$ forward. Also, last school year, one of the administrative positions was reduced from full-time to part-time, similar to what is being done with some teaching positions. The school district needs to consider any and all potential cost reductions for our programs and support services. All positions and functions are 'on the line', as part of diligently considering cost reductions. When Peru CSD benchmarked our school district with our nearby school districts, here are the facts we discovered:
A. Peru CSD continues to have the largest student enrollment of any school district in our BOCES region.
B. Peru CSD continues to have the leanest administrative staffing pattern among our bordering school districts enrolling more than 1,500 students, based on the number of administrators and based on administrator-to-student ratio. That number includes the Superintendent of Schools and the School Business Administrator.

## How do I get additional information regarding budget matters at Peru CSD?

The school district publishes a community report twice per year. In addition, there's extensive information available via the school district's Web site at www. perucsd.org.

## Peru Central School District

## Weathering the Storm: America's Public Schools and the Recession

> The American Association of School Administrators [AASA] is the national-level professional association of school superintendents.

During March 2012, the AASA published the results of a February 2012 national survey of how the Great Recession impacted on current school year budgets and spending, and the forecast for next school year. That survey engaged 528 public school districts across the nation. AASA reports that while national economic indicators demonstrate the recession ended, the reality is that public school districts "continue to feel the effects of the longest recession in our nation's history." AASA reports that the impending across-the-board cuts [9.1\%] within the federal budget would decimate and significantly undermine what fragile economic stability has recently been reported at the state and local level. The cuts mentioned by AASA stem from last summer's Budget Control Act, which among other things created a joint Congressional Committee tasked with identifying \$1.2 trillion in savings over ten years.

AASA stated that the results of this year's survey demonstrate that school administrators across the nation remain committed to providing the best educational opportunities they can, given limited available resources. AASA stated this report "illustrates that the economic recovery taking hold at the federal level has yet to resonate as loudly at the state and local level."

AASA reported this study made evident that school administrators support Congress taking action to avoid the blunt action of automatic, across-the-board cuts. Nationwide, the two rounds of one-time 'stimulus' monies enacted by the federal government, ARRA monies and Education Jobs Act monies, will come to an end this school year. That is what is causing a "'funding cliff" for America's public school districts in 2012-2013.

Two tables summarizing various data from the AASA report are attached. Thanks!

Table 1: Categories of Reduced Employment: Percent of Districts Nationwide

| Category | 2010- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 2011- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 2012- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | Reduced at <br> Peru CSD 2010, <br> 2011 or 2012? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Teacher Aides \& Assistants | $49.1 \%$ | $51.0 \%$ | $35.8 \%$ | $\square$ |
| Core Subject Classroom <br> Teachers | $45.7 \%$ | $40.9 \%$ | $35.6 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Buildings \& Transportation Staff | $37.3 \%$ | $33.4 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Administration | $31.9 \%$ | $27.0 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Art, Music, Phys. Ed. Teachers | $23.8 \%$ | $25.3 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Clerical Staff | $18.2 \%$ | $18.6 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Library Media Specialists | $16.8 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Special Education Teachers | $15.3 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Foreign Language Teachers | $11.3 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $\nabla$ |
| Nurses | $8.4 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |  |

* This column refers to the percent of districts forecasting reduced employment. More than three-quarters [81.4\%] of the school districts responding to the February 2012 survey described their district as inadequately funded. 65.5\% of the school districts forecasted reductions in force [eliminating positions] for 2012-2013.

Table 2: Categories of Forecasted Budget Cuts: Percent of Districts Nationwide

| Category |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Reduced support personnel positions for 2012-2013 school year | $\mathbf{5 8 \%}$ |
| Increased class sizes for the 2012-2013 school year | $\mathbf{5 7 . 2 \%}$ |
| Deferred school maintenance for the 2012-2013 school year | $\mathbf{5 5 . 5 \%}$ |
| Reduced instructional materials for the 2012-2013 school year | $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ |
| Field Trips Eliminated for the 2012-2013 school year | $\mathbf{4 3 . 2 \%}$ |
| Reduced extra-curricular activities for the 2012-2013 school year | $\mathbf{3 9 . 4 \%}$ |
| New transportation efficiencies for the 2012-2013 school year | $\mathbf{3 8 . 4 \%}$ |

## 

## 米 H


[1] Peru CSD continues to compare favorably with bordering school districts in regard to fiscal accountability, as evidenced in annual benchmarking studies. Top priorities for programs, support services and continuous improvement are the focus throughout each year's budget cycle. All programs and services are examined thoughtfully by administration and the school board with an eye toward program effectiveness and efficiency, increased student success and conduct, enhanced efficiency of day-to-day support operations, and more effectively promoting a safe, secure learning environment.
[2] The relatively 'jobless' economic recovery from the Great Recession we're experiencing nationally and statewide is a reason why the Board of Education and the administration are focused on sustaining Peru CSD's multi-year approach to revenues and expenditures.
[3] Federal and state reports make very clear the increasing importance of strong public education programs to the future of our nation, our children, our community, our regional economy, and the region's workforce development initiatives.
[4] Peru CSD intends to 'stay the course' with our conservative approach to budgeting revenues and our conservative approach to budgeting expenditures. That's intended to better position our school district \& our taxpayers to continue 'weathering the storm' associated with this period of extraordinary fiscal adversity.


# NYS 2012 Fiscal Accountability Report: General Education Per Pupil Spending 



## NYS 2012 Fiscal Accountability Report: Special Education Per Pupil Spending



# Total Expenditures Per Student Clinton County School Districts 

March 27, 2012 NYSED School Report Card Fiscal Accountability Supplement Snapshot Summary by A. Paul Scott, Interim Superintendent, Peru CSD

Includes Transportation, Debt Service and District-Level Administration NYSED's 2012 Report Card Uses 2009-2010 Expenditures Data

The eight public school districts in Clinton County enroll roughly 11,235 students. District enrollment in those eight school districts ranges from a low of roughly 470 students at Chazy Rural School to roughly 2,000 students at Peru Central School District. Peru CSD [district 4 below] is at the county-wide midpoint of per-student total expenditures.


# The New York State School Report Card Fiscal Accountability Supplement <br> for <br> Peru Central School District 

New York State Education Law and the Commissioner's Regulations require the attachment of the NYS School Report Card to the public school district budget proposal. The regulations require that certain expenditure ratios for general education and special education students be reported and compared with ratios for similar districts and all public schools. The required ratios for this district are reported below.

| 2009-2010 School Year |  | General Education | Special Education |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This <br> School <br> District | Instructional Expenditures | \$18,934,829 | \$9,337,486 |
|  | Pupils | 2,128 | 358 |
|  | Expenditures Per Pupil | \$8,898 | \$26,082 |
| Similar <br> District Group | Instructional Expenditures | \$7,931,685,291 | \$3,040,144,023 |
|  | Pupils | 818,103 | 112,811 |
|  | Expenditures Per Pupil | \$9,695 | \$26,949 |
| Total of All School Districts in NY State | Instructional Expenditures | \$30,088,158,593 | \$11,362,166,093 |
|  | Pupils | 2,709,505 | 422,576 |
|  | Expenditures Per Pupil | \$11,105 | \$26,888 |

Similar District Group Description: Average Need/Resource Capacity
Instructional Expenditures for General Education are K-12 expenditures for classroom instruction (excluding Special Education) plus a proration of building level administrative and instructional support expenditures. These expenditures include amounts for instruction of students with disabilities in a general education setting. District expenditures, such as transportation, debt service, and district-wide administration, are not included.

The pupil count for General Education is K-12 average daily membership plus $\mathrm{K}-12$ pupils for whom the district pays tuition to another school district. This number represents all pupils, including those classified as having disabilities and those not classified, excluding only students with disabilities placed out of district. For districts in which a county jail is located, this number includes incarcerated youth to whom the district must provide an education program.
Instructional Expenditures for Special Education are K-12 expenditures for students with disabilities (including summer special education expenditures) plus a proration of building-level administrative and instructional support expenditures. District expenditures, such as transportation, debt service, and district-wide administration, are not included.
The pupil count for Special Education is a count of $\mathrm{K}-12$ students with disabilities for the 2009-10 school year plus students for whom the district receives tuition from another district plus students for whom the district pays tuition to another district. Students attending the State schools at Rome and Batavia, private placements, and out-of-state placements are included.
Instructional Expenditures Per Pupil is the simple arithmetic ratio of Instructional Expenditures to Pupils. The total cost of instruction for students with disabilities may include both general and special education expenditures. Special education services provided in the general education classroom may benefit students not classified as having disabilities.

| 2009-2010 School Year | This School <br> District | Similar District <br> Group | Total of All School <br> Districts in NY State |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Expenditures Per Pupil | $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 , 7 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 , 2 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 9 , 9 2 1}$ |

Total Expenditures Per Pupil is the simple arithmetic ratio of Total Expenditures to Pupils. Total Expenditures include district expenditures for classroom instruction, as well as expenditures for transportation, debt service, community service and district-wide administration that are not included in the instructional Expenditure values for General Education and Special Education. As such, the sum of General Education and Special Education Instructional Expenditures does not equal the Total Expenditures.

The numbers used to compute the statistics on this page were collected on the State Aid Form A, the State Aid Form F, the School District Annual Financial Report (ST-3), and from the Student Information Repository System (SIRS).

# The New York State School Report Card Information about Students with Disabilities 

## for

## Peru Central School District

New York State Education Law and the Commissioner's Regulations require the attachment of the NYS School Report Card to the public school district budget proposal. The regulations require reporting students with disabilities by the percent of time they are in general education classrooms and the classification rate of students with disabilities. These data are to be compared with percentages for similar districts and all public schools. The required percentages for this district are reported below.

| Student Counts as of <br> October 6, 2010 | This School District |  | Similar District <br> Group | Total of All School <br> Districts in NY State |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Placement -- <br> Percent of Time Inside <br> Regular Classroom | Count of <br> Students with <br> Disabilities | Percentage of <br> Students with <br> Disabilities | Percentage of <br> Students with <br> Disabilities | Percentage of <br> Students with <br> Disabilities |
| $80 \%$ or more | 197 | $\mathbf{6 3 . 8 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 2 \%}$ |
| $40 \%$ to 79\% | 47 | $15.2 \%$ | $19.8 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 9 \%}$ |
| Less than 40\% | 62 | $20.1 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 0 \%}$ |
| Separate Settings | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 0 \%}$ |
| Other Settings | 2 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 \%}$ | $2.3 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9 \%}$ |

The source data for the statistics in this table were reported through the Student Information Repository System (SIRS) and verified in Verification Report 5 . The counts are numbers of students reported in the least restrictive environment categories for school-age programs (ages 6-21) on October 6, 2010. The percentages represent the amount of time students with disabilities are in general education class-rooms, regardless of the amount and cost of special education services they receive. Rounding of percentage values may cause them to sum to a number slightly different from $100 \%$.

## School-age Students with Disabilities Classification Rate

| 2010-11 School Year | This School <br> District | Similar District <br> Group | Total of All School <br> Districts in NY State |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Special Ed Classification Rate | $\mathbf{1 4 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0 \%}$ |

This rate is a ratio of the count of school-age students with disabilities (ages 4-21) to the total enrollment of all school-age students in the school district, including students who are parentally placed in nonpublic schools located in the school district. The numerator includes all school-age students for whom a district has Committee on Special Education (CSE) responsibility to ensure the provision of special edu-cation services. The denominator includes all school-age students who reside in the district. In the case of parentally placed students in nonpublic schools, it includes the number of students who attend the nonpublic schools located in the school district. Source data are drawn from the SIRS and from the Basic Education Data System (BEDS).

## Similar District Group Description: Average Need/Resource Capacity

Similar District Groups are identified according to the Need-to-Resource-Capacity Index. More information about this categorization is on the Internet at: http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/accountability/2011-12/NeedResourceCapacitylndex.pdf

## (

 TheProperty Tax Cap

Although New York State now has what is commonly called a " 2 percent property tax cap," "he law does not necessarily restrict proposed tax levy increases to 2 percent. Rather, its main purpose is to determine the level of voter support that is needed for a school budget to pass.

The New York State School Boards Association has provided the answers to some FAQs to help explain the tax cap law.

## Does the tax cap mean my annual property tax can't increase more than 2 percent?

Not necessarily. New York's property tax cap law establishes a tax levy limit for each school district. The tax levy limit allows school districts to increase their property tax levy from one year to the next by 2 percent or the rate of inflation, whichever is less, based on a multi-step formula. School districts are then allowed to take certain exemptions that may boost their tax levy limits to more than 2 percent or the inflation rate. If a school district's proposed tax levy increase is within its limit, a simple majority of voters is needed for budget approval. If a school district's proposed tax levy increase exceeds the tax levy limit, a supermajority of voters - 60 percent or more - would be required for budget passage.

## What may school districts exempt from their tax levy limit?

There are a limited number of specific exemptions to the tax cap that school districts may take. They include growth in "brick and mortar" development that increases the value of a school district's full taxable property, contributions toward employee pensions above a certain amount, expenditures for some court orders, and the local portion of capital expenditures.

## Does the tax levy indicate how much my taxes will rise?

No. The tax levy is the amount of money the school district can raise through property taxes. The amount an individual will pay to contribute to the levied amount is the tax rate. Tax rates paid by individual taxpayers may differ greatly from one household to another, based on such things as equalization rates and assessed property values, and may exceed 2 percent.

## What if voters reject the proposed tax levy?

If voters in the district reject the proposed budget, the school board may put up the same or a revised budget for a second vote, or adopt a contingency budget with a tax levy no greater than what was levied the previous year. If voters reject the spending plan twice, schools must adopt a budget with the same tax levy as the prior year - essentially a zero percent cap.


## Peru CSD Tax Levy Chart of May 1, 2012



## Peru CSD Tax Rates Chart of May 1, 2012



## 

## 




Peru CSD credits the St. Louis, Missouri Public School District's 2003-2004 annual report for the design concept associated with this chart, rather than the customary 'pie charts' associated with expenditures \& revenues.

|  |  | Budget $2009-10$ | Actual <br> 2010-11 <br> Budget | Actual 2011-12 <br> Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Proposed } \\ 2012-13 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | \% Chg |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Real Property Taxes \& Tax Items Real Property Tax Levy | \$14,006,759 | \$14,489,598 | \$15,009,858 | \$15,436,620 | 2.84\% | 1 |
| 2 | Other Payments in Lieu of Taxes | \$225,300 | \$275.300 | \$177,800 | \$28,000 | -84.25\% | 2 |
| 3 | Interest \& Penalties | S4. 000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4.000 | 0.00\% | 3 |
| 4 |  | \$14,236,059 | \$14,768,898 | \$15,191,658 | \$15,468,620 | 1.82\% | 4 |
| 5 | Charges for Services |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 6 | Admissions | \$10,000 | \$10.000 | \$10.000 | \$10.000 | 0.00\% | 6 |
| 7 |  | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | 0.00\% | 7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 9 | Other Districts \& Governments |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| 10 | Tuitions - Other Districts | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | 0.00\% | 10 |
| 11 | Health Services - Other Districts | \$75,000 | \$55,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | 0.00\% | 11 |
| 12 | Transportation for BOCES | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$0 | -100.00\% | 12 |
| 13 | Youth Services, Other Govermments | \$5.800 | \$5.800 | \$5.800 | \$5.800 | 0.00\% | 13 |
| 14 |  | \$205,800 | \$205,800 | \$205,800 | \$105,800 | -48.59\% | 14 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 16 | Use of Money and Property |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| 17 | Interest and Earmings | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$100,000 | \$75,000 | -25.00\% | 17 |
| 18 | Rental of Real Property | S200,000 | \$200,000 | \$100,000 | \$75,000 | -25.00\% | 18 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| 20 | Sale of Property \& Compensation for Loss |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| 21 | Sale of Scrap and Excess Materials | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 | 0.00\% | 21 |
| 22 | Sale of Transportation Equipment |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |
| 23 | Insurance Recoveries | \$7.500 | \$7,500 | \$7.500 | \$7,500 | 0.00\% | 23 |
| 24 |  | \$8,000 | S8,000 | \$8,000 | \$8,000 | 0.00\% | 24 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |
| 26 | Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| 27 | Refund of Prior Year Expenses | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | 0.00\% | 27 |
| 28 | Gifts and Donations | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | 0.00\% | 28 |
| 29 | Other | \$250.000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | \$250.000 | 0.00\% | 29 |
| 30 |  | \$406,000 | \$406,000 | \$406,000 | \$406,000 | 0.00\% | 30 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |
| 32 | Interfund | \$18.000 | S 18.000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | 0.00\% | 32 |
| 33 |  | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | 0.00\% | 33 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| 35 | State Aid |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| 36 | Basic Formula |  |  |  |  |  | 36 |
| 37 | Foundation | \$16,290,799 | \$16,290,799 | \$16,290,799 | \$16,388,543 | 0.60\% | 37 |
| 38 | Building | \$3,017,494 | \$3,246,164 | \$4,119,312 | \$3,700,277 | -10.17\% | 38 |
| 39 | Excess Cost |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |
| 40 | PrivatelHigh Cost | \$475,900 | \$482,777 | \$742,670 | \$777,727 | 4.72\% | 40 |
| 41 | BOCES | \$1,070,130 | \$1,171,591 | \$1,166,013 | \$1,070,781 | -8.17\% | 41 |
| 42 | Sound Basic |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| 43 | Textbook |  |  |  |  |  | 43 |
| 44 | Software, Library, Textbook | \$185,391 | \$177,731 | \$171,202 | \$168,208 | -1.75\% | 44 |
| 45 | Computer | \$44,869 | \$43,414 | S40,745 | \$39,371 | -3.37\% | 45 |
| 46 | Transportation | \$2,028,180 | S2,036,860 | \$2,074,791 | \$2,094,672 | 0.96\% | 46 |
| 47 | Other | \$2,222 | \$2,222 | \$2,222 | \$2,222 | 0.00\% | 47 |
| 48 | Additional State Aid - Job Stabilization Funds |  | \$37,176 | \$842,275 | S0 | -100.00\% | 48 |
| 49 | GAP Elimination Adjustment Restoration |  | So | \$130,893 | \$168,636 | 28.84\% | 49 |
| 50 | GAP Elimination Adjustment |  | -\$2.044.001 | - $\$ 4.308 .897$ | -53,859,614 | -10.43\% | 50 |
| 51 |  | \$23,114,985 | \$21,444,739 | \$21,272,025 | \$20,550,823 | -3.39\% | 51 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 |
| 53 | Federal Aid |  |  |  |  |  | 53 |
| 54 | Medicaid Assistance | \$150.000 | \$200.000 | \$150,000 | \$150.000 | 0.00\% | 54 |
| 55 |  | \$150,000 | S200,000 | \$150,000 | S150,000 | 0.00\% | 55 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56 |
| 57 | Appropriated Fund Balance |  |  |  |  |  | 57 |
| 58 | Employee Benefit Reserve Fund |  |  | 5500,000 | \$500,000 | 0.00\% | 58 |
| 59 | Appropriated Fund Balance | \$3.799.719 | \$5.089.676 | \$3.724.968 | \$3,000.000 | -19.46\% | 59 |
| 60 |  | \$3,799,719 | \$5,089,676 | \$4,224,968 | \$3.500,000 | -17.16\% | 60 |
| 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61 |
| 62 | Interfund Transfer |  |  |  |  |  | 62 |
| 63 | Interfund Transfer - Debt Service |  |  |  | \$200,000 |  | 63 |
| 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 |
| 66 | Total Revenue | \$42,148.563 | \$42,351.113 | \$41.586,451 | \$40,492,243 | -2.63\% | 66 |



Peru CSD credits the St. Louis, Missouri Public School District's 2003-2004 annual report for the design concept associated with this chart, rather than the customary 'pie charts' associated with expenditures \& revenues.

## Peru Central School District

| School District Contact Person: | Randolph B. Sapp |
| :--- | :--- |
| School District Telephone Number: | $\underline{518-643-6004}$ |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Budgeted } \\ & 2011-12 \\ & \text { (A) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Proposed Budget } \\ 2012-13 \\ \text { (B) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Percent Change (C) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Proposed Spending | 41,586,451 | 40,492,243 | -2.63\% |
| School Tax Levy Limit ${ }^{1}$ |  | 15,414,892 |  |
| Permissible Exclusions to the School Tax Levy Limit ${ }^{1}$ |  | 21,728 |  |
| Proposed School Year Tax Levy <br> (not including Permissible Exclusions to the School Tax Levy Limit) ${ }^{1}$ |  | 15,414,892 |  |
| Proposed School Year Tax Levy (including Permissible Exclusions to the School Tax Levy Limit ${ }^{\text { }}$ ) | 15,009,858 | 15,436,620 | 2.84\% |
| Public School Enrollment | 2,054 | 2,000 | -2.63\% |
| Consumer Price Index |  |  | 3.2\% |

${ }^{1}$ Note that these items apply only to Column (B) - Proposed Budget 2012-13 for this year.
${ }^{2}$ If the Proposed School Year Tax Levy in 2012-13 (including Permissible Exclusions to the School Tax Levy Limit in 2012-13) exceeds the sum of the School Tax Levy Limit for 2012-13 and Permissible Exclusions to the School Tax Levy Limit in 2012-13, approval of 60\% or more of the qualified voters present and voting is required.

|  | Actual <br> $2011-12$ <br> $(D)$ | Estimated <br> $2012-13$ <br> (E) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Adjusted Restricted Fund Balance | $1,363,242$ | $1,250,000$ |
|  |  | $3,794,062$ |

Board of Education

Board of Education 1010
School board travel, workshops and conference registration fees at association meetings, along with
school law handbooks and other publications published by NYSSBA and NYS Bar Association.

District Clerk 1040
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Attends regular and special meetings to record school board actions and prepares meeting minutes. } & \mathbf{8 5 , 7 2 0} & \$ 5,720\end{array}$
Prepares legal notices, advertisements and oversees voting associated with annual and special meetings.

District Meetings 1060
Hourly pay for individuals providing service at annual and special votes, supplies and materials and
any other appropriate expenditures associated with the voting process.

## Total Board of Education

## Central Administration

## Chief School Administrator 1240

Salaries associated with Superintendent of Schools and the Secretary to the Superintendent of $\$ 225,175 \quad \$ 226,331$ Schools, along with chief school officer materials, supplies, publications, travel and registration fees for the Superintendent's engagement with local and regional workshops and confereaces sponsored by the state school boards association, state council of school superintendents and the BOCES. Includes negotiated increases in compensation and potential salary of new Superintendent of Schools.

## Total Central Administration

## Finance

## Business Administration 1310

Salaries for the School Business Administrator and business office staff, excluding the treasurer, along with materials, supplies, contractual costs and BOCES services. Projected increase reflects the increase in BOCES services associated 0.5 FTE personnel position. The cost associated with this position is offset with BOCES aid. The District currently shares the individual in this position with the Saranac Central School District.

## Auditing 1320

Costs associated with services of an external, independent auditor to examine and assess school $\$ 26,764 \quad \$ 26,764$ district financial practices. Includes monies to establish the state-mandated function of 'internal auditor' for each public school district, as part of enhanced fiscal accountability.

District Treasurer 1325
Salary of the district's treasurer, along with conference expense and appropriated supplies and $\$ 49,853$
$\$ 51,051$ materials to support the treasurer's receiving, recording and reporting of district accounts. Includes negotiated increase in compensation.

## Tax Collection 1330

Salary and appropriate supplies and materials associated with the individual who accepts, records and provides receipts for payment of school property tax bills.

## Total Finance

Record Management 1460Stipend for essential services to maintain the district's records from year to year. Includes the costof supplies and materials associated with proper filing and organizing of district records in
designated records storage spaces.
Public Information \& Services 1480Publication of quarterly and special edition 'Community Report' documents, along with other key$\$ 6,695$$\$ 6,695$public information documents such as district goals booklets and reports on progress toward district goals.

## Total Staff

## Central Services

## Operation of Plant 1620

Salaries contractual, supplies, equipment and utilities costs associated with heating, lighting, $\$ 1,674,228$ \$1,667,853 cleaning, mowing, plowing, and other custodial aspects of campus buildings and grounds. Reflects a decrease of a 1.0 FTE position within department.

## Maintenance of Plant 1621

Salaries and contractual supplies and materials cost associated with day-to-day repair, updating and monitoring of heating, cooling, plumbing, electrical, safety and ventilation systems across our campus.

## Central Printing and Mailing 1670

Printing, mailing and vendor payments associated with student report cards, progress reports and $\$ 26,632 \quad \$ 31,632$ other school-related publications such as the district's code of conduct. Increase partially related to increase in mailing rates.

## Central Data Processing 1680

Contract services via BOCES for essential data processing tasks such as our K-12 student data
management system that are more cost effective via a shared basis through BOCES than if done independently.

## Total Central Services

$\$ 2,262,497 \quad \$ 2,266,424$

## Special Items

## Unallocated Insurance 1910

Insurance coverage such as liability and motor vehicle, school district association dues, water district tax bills, BOCES capital project and administrative charges, along with monies available for immediate response to crises or unplanned events.

School Association Dues 1920

## Assessment on School Property 1950

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Payment associated with fixed costs of water and sewer district. } & \$ 60,000 & \$ 60,000\end{array}$
Refund of Real Property Taxes 1964
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Capacity to address changes in commercial/residential assessments. } & \$ 65,000\end{array}$

## BOCES Admin Cost 1981

$\$ 411,364$
$\$ 436,553$

## Unclassified 1989

Fees charged by banks to bandle bond coupons when the district makes principal and interest
$\$ 3,000$
$\$ 3,000$
Total Special ItemsTotal General Support
Instructional Administration \& Improvement
Supervision - Regular School K-12 2020
Salaries for administrators who directly supervise staff associated with the district's K-12
instructional program, along with salaries of the various school office clerical staff employed by thedistrict. This budget includes school office materials, supplies and contractual monies. Thedecrease in this budget is largely attributed to the decrease of a vice-principal position in the MiddleSchool.
In-service Training - Instruction 2070
District monies to supplement federal and state grants, focused on in-service training that strengthens professional practice on campus. Our school district subscribes to the CVES professional development cooperative service, sharing the costs with other school districts throughout the BOCES region, to provide the teachers of our children with appropriate and necessary staff training for statemandated curriculum and many new state tests. The training costs are part of the district's federal and state obligation to set conditions for annual yearly progress of students and employees, as measured by student achievement on state tests.

Total Administration \& Improvement

## Teaching

## Regular School 2110

K-12 instructional staff salaries. Also inchudes instructional equipment, supplies, materials, salaries for teacher aides and school monitors, along with contractual expenses, such as leases on copiers. A significant number of FTE's (7.8) were reduced in this area as a result of decreased revenue.

## Program for Students with Disabilities 2250

Includes salaries, equipment, supplies, materials, and out-of-district tuitions for students identified
via the Committee on Special Education as eligible and in need of special education services.
Reductions in this area can be attributed to projected decreases in BOCES related services.

## Occupational Education Grades 10-12 2280

Tuition payments for occupational education course subscriptions via Champlain Valley Education Services, this region's BOCES.

## Total Teaching

## Instructional Media

School Library \& Audiovisual 2610
Salaries for school library media specialists and clerical staff of our three school library media centers, along with monies for library books, materials and contractual services. Decrease associated with the reduction of a 0.4 FTE Library Media Specialist and a part-time clerical position within the District's iibraries.

## Computer-Assisted Instruction 2630

State-aided computer hardware and software to provide instructional support throughout the K-12 campus. Includes instructional salaries, BOCES/NERIC services, supplies and materials and contract expenses associated with this function on campus.$\$ 1,128,365 \quad \$ 1,095,102$
\$1,205,948 \$1,172,685 $\$ 340,675$
$\$ 311,072$

| $\frac{2011-12}{\$ 704,587}$ | $\frac{2012-13}{\$ 740,252}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 3,806,258$ | $\$ 3,878,631$ |

\$77,583

,
$\$ 15,648,280 \quad \$ 15,698,531$
里
\$603,781 \$638,181
\$944,456 \$949,253

## Pupil Services

Guidance - Regular School 2810

Salaries of guidance counselors and the clerical staff associated with guidance offices. Also included are the supplies, materials and contractual expenses associated with K-12 guidance services. Decrease associated with the retirement of a senior counselor who's position will not be filled and the retirement of two (2) senior clerical members early in the 2011-12 school year.

## Health Services - Regular School 2815

Salaries of school nurses and associated clerical assistants in the health offices. Also included are the supplies, materials and contractual expenses such as school physician services associated with this district function.

Psychological Services - Regular School 2820
Salaries for school psychologist services beyond what is required for the special education program. Also included are key supplies and materials. Decrease related to salary being coded to another budget code - no reduction in Psychologist.

## Social Services - Regular School 2825

Contractual expense for the on-campus services of a social worker employed by an outside agency.
Budget adjustment to better reflect actual expenditure.

## Co-Curricular Services 2850

Stipends and associated expenses for high school class advisors and the advisors of the various clubs associated with our elementary and secondary grades extra-curricular activities. Increase associated with stipend adjustment related to recently negotiated personnel agreement.

## Interscholastic Athietics 2855

Stipends for coaches and assistance coaches of the district's athletic teams. Also budgeted are priority athletic equipment, materials, supplies and contractual expenses such as fees for referees and other officials.

## Total Pupil Services

## Total Instruction

## Pupil Transportation

## District Transportation Services 5510

Salaries of transportation supervisor, bus dispatcher, drivers, bus monitors, head mechanic, mechanics and essential supplies, training, materials, and contractual items necessary to provide reasonably dependable and safe transportation for the students we serve. Projected decreases related to the redcution of a 1.0 FTE supervisor position, the consolidation of bus runs and reduction in field

## Garage Building 5530

Supplies, materials, heat, utilities and other essential purchases associated with maintaining a well organized and reasonably clean transportation garage and work area for members of the district's transportation services team.

Total Pupil Transportation
$\$ 1,963,813 \quad \$ 1,796,851$

## Community Services

Youth Program 7310
Cost of transportation associated with the annual summer swim recreation program, a school-town partnership.
$\frac{2011-12}{\$ 637,094} \quad \frac{2012-13}{\$ 469,987}$
$\$ 380,031 \quad \$ 396,400$
$\$ 49,050 \quad \$ 4,268$
$\$ 6,924$
$\$ 10,024$
$\$ 56,819$
$\$ 66,121$
$\$ 233,798 \quad \$ 234,222$
$\$ 1,363,716 \quad \$ 1,181,022$
$\$ 19,162,400 \quad \$ 19,001,491$
$\$ 1,912,413 \quad \$ 1,745,451$
$\$ 51,400$
$\$ 1,800$

## Census 8070

The district census is generally a biennial procedure to update demographic and enrollment $\$ 6,371$ $\$ 0$

|  | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Community Services | \$8,171 | \$1,800 |
| Undistributed |  |  |
| Employee Benefits <br> Payroll-related payments such as employee health insurance, retirement systems, social security, workers' compensation, unemployment insurance, prescription insurance and vision insurance. |  |  |
| State Retirement 9010 | \$654,149 | \$711,761 |
| Teachers Retirement 9020 <br> Adjustment associated with an improved alignment of appropriation with projected expenditure. | \$1,890,308 | \$1,648,550 |
| Social Security 9030 | \$1,378,064 | \$1,235,841 |
| Worker's Compensation 9040 | \$127,298 | \$127,298 |
| Cife Insurance 9045 |  |  |
|  | \$4,439 | \$4,439 |
| Unemployment Insurance 9050 |  |  |
|  | \$163,969 | \$163,969 |
| Hospital \& Medical Insurance 9060 |  |  |
| Adjustment associated with an improved aligoment of appropriation with projected expenditure. | \$7,858,474 | \$7,695,163 |
| Other Benefits 9089 |  |  |
| . | \$178,347 | \$178,347 |
| Total Employee Benefits | \$12,255,048 | \$11,765,368 |
| Debt Service <br> Capital construction bonds, bond anticipation notes for motor vehicle purchases, revenue anticipation notes and other aspects of administering and managing the district's debt services. |  |  |
| Serial Bonds 9711 |  |  |
| Projected principal payments associated with voter approved capital project work. The decrease is associated with refinancing our long term debt at improved interest rates and obtaining an outstanding rate on our newly issued long term debt. This can be partially attributed to the District's improved Standard \& Poor's credit rating. | \$4,071,324 | \$3,782,376 |
| Statutory Bonds - School Buses 9722 | \$167,598 | \$116,085 |
| BAN - Capital Project 2008 |  |  |
| Increase with the District moving back to using BANs to finance school bus purchases. | \$0 | \$46,641 |
| Revenue Anticipation Notes 9770 |  |  |
|  | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Other Long Term Debt 9789 |  |  |
| Debt associated with this budget line has been retired. | \$48,839 | \$0 |
| Total Debt Service | \$4,337,761 | \$3,995,102 |
| Total Undistributed | \$16,592,809 | \$15,760,470 |
| Transfers to Other Funds |  |  |
| Projected Transfer to Special Aid Fund and School Lunch Service Fund. | \$53,000 | \$53,000 |
| Grand Total | \$41,586,451 | \$40,492,243 |

$\qquad$

DETAIL APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS


## DESCRIPTION

2011-12 BUDGET

2012-13 NEW BUDGET

| -------------------- |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

A $1010.400-08-0000$
A $1010.401-08-0000$
A $1010.402-08-0000$
A $1010.403-08-0000$
A $1010.450-08-0000$
A $1010.490-08-0000$
A $1010.491-08-0000$
Contractual
Mues/Memberships
Publications/Subscriptions
Travel \& Conference
Materials/Supplies
BOCES Services
BOCES Services - Nonaideable
$1010 \ldots$ BOARD OF EDUCATION

| 1,000 | 1,000 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 900 | 900 |
| 500 | 500 |
| 1,735 | 1,735 |
| 875 | 875 |
| 2,100 | 2,100 |
| 500 | 500 |
| 7,610 | 7,610 |
|  |  |
| 4,660 | 4,660 |
| 200 | 200 |
| 500 | 500 |
| 360 | 360 |
| 5,720 | 5,720 |
| 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 2,400 | 2,400 |
| 243 | 243 |
| 3,643 | 3,643 |
| 16,973 | 16,973 |



[^0]ᄎ *********************************
DETAIL, APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

|  | $2011-12$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| ACCOUNT | DESCRIPTION |
| - | BUDGET |




155, 601

| A 1670.400-08-0000 | Contractual | 3,000 | 8,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A 1670.450-08-0000 | Materials/Supplies | 23,632 | 23,632 |
|  | 1670...CENTRAL PRINTING \& MAILING * | 26,632 | 31,632 |
| A 1680.404-08-0000 | Software Maintenance/Updates | 3,514 | 6,814 |
| A 1680.490-08-0000 | BOCES Services | 105,000 | 101,700 |
|  | 1680...CENTRAI DATA PROCESSING * | 108,514 | 108,514 |
|  | 16...CENTPAL SERVICES ** | 135,146 | 140, 1.46 |
| A 1910.400-08-0000 | Unallocated Insurance | 131,015 | 138,632 |
| A 1910.401-08-0000 | Uninsured Student Deductible | 26,558 | 28,117 |
|  | 1910... UNALIOCATED INSURANCE * | 157,573 | 166,749 |
| A 1920.400-08-0000 | School Association Dues | 7,650 | 8,950 |
|  | I920...SCHOOL ASSOCIATION DUES | 7,650 | 8,950 |
| A 1950.400-08-0000 | Property Assessments Water Distr | 60,000 | 60,000 |
|  | 1950...ASSESSMENTS ON SCHOOL PROPE * | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| A 1981.490-08-0000 | BOCES Services | 411, 364 | 436,553 |
|  | 1981...BOCES ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS * | 411,364 | 436,553 |
| A 1989.400-08-0000 | Unclassified Reimbursements Ins. | 3,000 | 3,000 |
|  | 1989...UNCLASSIFIED * | 3,000 | 3,000 |
|  | 19...SPECIAL ITEMS ** | 639,587 | 675.252 |
|  | 1...GENERAL SUPPORT *** | 2,576,867 | 1,650,313 |
| A 2020.150-08-0000 | Administrators Salaries | 652,109 | 568,675 |

DETAIL APPRORRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

$\qquad$ **********************************

DETAIL APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

|  | $2012-13$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ACCOUNT | $2011-12$ | BESCRIPTION | BUDGET |

TOTAL ADMINISTRATION COMPONENT
3,689,037
3,799,296
************** PROGRAM COMPONENT ****************


| A 2070.150-08-0000 | Instructional Salaries |
| :---: | :---: |
| A 2070.151-08-0000 | In-Service Training Salaries |
| A 2070.400-05-0805 | Travel \& Conf. - CFES Adirondack |
| A 2070.403-09-0000 | Travel and Conference - PAT Reti |
| A 2070.403-11-6000 | Travel and Conference - HPEAR |
| A 2070.450-08-0000 | Materials \& Supplies |
| A 2070.490-08-0000 | BOCES Services |
|  |  |
|  | $2070 . \ldots$ INSERVICE TRAINING-INSTRUCT |
|  |  |
|  | $20 \ldots$ ADMIN \& IMPROVEMENT |

A 2110.120-06-0000
A 2110.120-06-0902
A 2110.120-06-0903
A 2110.120-06-0910
A 2110.121-06-0000
A 2110.121-06-0902
A 2110.121-06-0903
A 2110.121-06-0910
A 2110.130-09-0000
A 2110.130-09-0902
A 2110.130-09-0903
A 2110.130-09-0910
A 2110.130-09-0913
A 2110.140-08-0000
A 2110.140-10-0000
A 2110.140-11-0000 A 2110.160-08-0000 A 2110.160-08-0901 A 2110.160-08-0902 A 2110.160-08-0904 A 2110.161-08-0000 A 2110.200-08-0000 A 2110.400-01-0000 A 2110.400-04-0000 A 2110.400-04-0050 A 2110.400-05-0000 A 2110.400-05-0050 A 2110.400-05-0058 A 2110.400-05-0503 A 2110.400-05-0802 A 2110.400-05-0805 A 2110.400-07-0000 A 2110.400-08-0000 A 2110.400-08-0804 A 2110.400-11-0100 A 2110.400-11-0400 A 2110.400-11-0500 A 2110.400-11-0700 A 2110.406-01-0000 A 2110.406-04-0000

| Teacher Salaries K-3 | 2,083,622 | 2,022,095 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Health Insurance Buyout - K-3 | 77,000 | 77,000 |
| Retirement Benefits - K-3 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Salaries Homebound - K-3 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Teacher Salaries 4-6 | 1,433,987 | 1,610,821 |
| Health Insurance Buyout - 4-6 | 47,350 | 47,350 |
| Retirement Benefits - 4-6 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Salaries Homebound - 4-6 | 1,000 | 2,500 |
| Teacher Salaries 7-12 | 4,055,380 | 4,031,382 |
| Health Insurance Buyout - 7-1.2 | 70,000 | 70,000 |
| Retirement Benefits - 7-12 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Salaries 7-12 Homebound | 56,414 | 56,414 |
| Salaries 7-12 PM School | 50,000 | 41,900 |
| Substitutes - District wide | 365,600 | 346,400 |
| Substitutes - Parochial | I. 050 | 1,050 |
| Substitutes - Health Services | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Support Staff Salaries | 252,468 | 258,779 |
| Support Staff O/T | 900 | 900 |
| Health Insurance Buyout | 27,163 | 27.163 |
| Prescription Drug Allocation | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Substitute Salaries | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Equipment \& Furniture K-12 Repla | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Contractual - Primary | 3,800 | 3,800 |
| Contractual - Intermediate | 3,638 | 3,638 |
| Contractual - Intermediate Music | 888 | 888 |
| Contractual - High School | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Contractual - HS Music | 2,400 | 2,400 |
| Contractual - HS Student Trips | 6,500 | 500 |
| Contractual - HS Graduation | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| Contractual - Freshmen Transitio | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| Contractual - CFES Adirondack Sc | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Contractual - Middle School | 2.150 | 2,150 |
| Contractual - District Wide | 22,500 | 20,100 |
| Contractual - Gifted \& Talented | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Contractual Primary PE | 200 | 200 |
| Contractual Intermediate PE | 200 | 200 |
| Contractual - HS Phys. Ed. | 1,400 | 1,400 |
| Contractual - MS Phys. Ed. | 300 | 300 |
| Service Contracts - Primary | 5,750 | 5,750 |
| Service Contracts - Intermediate | 5,555 | 5,555 |

DETAIL APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

|  |  | $2012-I 3$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| ACCOUNT | DESCRIPTION | BUDGET |




DETAIL APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY EUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

|  | $2012-13$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| ACCOUNT | $2011-12$ | BESCRIPTION |



DETAIL APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

| ACCOUNT | DESCRIDTION |
| :--- | ---: | | $2011-12$ |
| :---: |
| BUDGET |



*********************************
DETAIL APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS


$$
17,906,389
$$

A 5510.160-13-0000
A 5510.160-13-0906
A 5510.160-14-0000
A 5510.160-14-0902
A 5510.160-14-0903
A 5510.160-14-0904
A 5510.160-14-0913
A 5510.160-14-0915
A 5510.160-14-0917
A 5510.160-14-0920
A. 5510.161-14-0915

A 5510.162-14-0000
A 5510.162-14-0901
A 5510.200-14-0000
A 5510.400-14-0000
A 5510.401-14-0000
A 5510.403-14-0000
A 5510.404-14-0000
A 5510.405-14-0000
A 5510.450-14-0000
A 5510.451-14-0000
A 5510.452-14-0000
A 5510.453-14-0000
A 5510.454-14-0000
A 5510.455-14-0000 A 5510.490-14-0000 A 5510.491-14-0000

## BOCES Services Non-Aideable

A 5530.200-14-0000
A 5530.400-14-0000
A 5530.401-14-0000
A 5530.402-14-0000
A 5530.403-14-0000
A 5530.404-14-0000 A 5530.405-14-0000 A 5530.406-14-0000 A 5530.407-14-0000 A 5530.450-14-0000 A 5530.451-14-0000Retirement Benefits
Prescription Drug Allocation

| Salarjes Snowplowing |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Cleaner Salary | 2 |  |
| Bus Drivers \& Mechanics Salary | 1,12 |  |
|  | Health Insurance Buyout | 4 |Salaries - Monitors

Salaries - Sports TripsSalaries - Sub Bus Drivers \& Mec

## Equipment

Contractual
Insurance on Buses
Travel \& Conference
Software Maintenance/Agreement
Bus Repairs
Materials/Supplies
Diesel Fuel
Gasoline
Tires and Tubes

$$
5+2+2+2
$$21,874$1,128,252 \quad 1,047,575$

| 40,744 | 40,744 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 30,000 | 30,000 |

Salaries - Regular Trip PM Schoo 20,000$\begin{array}{ll}26,845 & 26,845 \\ 36,138 & 36,138\end{array}$

| 24,774 | 18,774 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 85,000 | 72,000 |

Salaries - Substitute Monitors 17, 17,000
Transportation Supervisoris Offi $148,414 \quad 80,596$
Trans Supervisor's Office $O / T$

| 500 | 500 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 20,000 | 20,000 |
| 2,000 | 2,000 |


| 2.000 | 2.000 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 24,000 | 24.000 |

$24.000 \quad 24.000$
$1.800 \quad 1.800$

8,000

| 8,000 | 19,500 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 19,500 | 5,355 | 189,000 189,000

4,500

| 9,000 | 9,000 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 31,500 | 31,500 |

$6,750 \quad 6,750$
$10,000 \quad 10,000$
1,000

$$
1,745,451
$$


$\qquad$
***************************t*****
DETAIL APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

|  |  | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\therefore \mathrm{CCOUN} T$ | DESCRIPTION | BUDGET | NEW BUDGET |


| A 7310.160-08-0000 | Support Staff Salaries |  | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7310....YOUTH PROGRAM | * | 1,800 | 1,800 |
|  | 73... | ** | 1,800 | 1.800 |
|  | 7. | *** | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| A 8070.160-08-0000 | Census Salaries |  | 6,240 | 0 |
| A 8070.400-08-0000 | Contractual |  | 41 | 0 |
| A 8070.450-08-0000 | Materials/Supplies |  | 90 | 0 |
|  | 8070...CENSUS | * | 6,371 | 0 |
|  | 80... | ** | 6,371 | 0 |
|  | B.... COMMUNITY SERVICES | *** | 6,371 | 0 |


| A 9010.800-22-0000 | NYS ERS - Program |  | 413,618 | 587,203 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 9010....STATE RETIREMENT | * | 413,618 | 587,203 |
| A 9020.800-22-0000 | NYS TRS - Program |  | I, 744,565 | 1,477,101 |
|  | 9020....TEACHERS' RETIREMENT | * | 1,744,565 | 1,477,101 |
| A 9030.800-22-0000 | Social Security - Program |  | I,169,976 | 1,019,569 |
|  | 9030... SOCIAL SECURITY | * | 1,169,976 | 1,019,569 |
| A 9040.800-22-0000 | Workers Comp - Program |  | 91,892 | 79,307 |




$$
\star * * * * * * * * * * * * * \text { CAPITAL COMPONENT } * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
$$

| A $1620.160-13-0000$ | Custodial Salaries | 719,674 | 713,299 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| A 1620.160-13-0901 | Salaries - Overtime | 17,500 |  |
| A $1620.160-13-0902$ | Health Insurance Buyout | 13,500 | 13,456 |

PAGE 10
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$

DETAII APPROPRIATION BUDGET REPORT BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

|  | $2012-13$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| ACCOUNT | DESCRIPTION | 2011-12 |
| BUDGET |  |  |


$\qquad$

DETAIL ADDROPRIATION BUDGET REPOET BY FUNCTION WITH COMPONENT ANALYSIS

|  |  | $2012-13$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| ACCOUNT | DESCRIPTION | 2011-12 |
| $-\cdots$ BUDGET | NEWDGET |  |



# ChiEF School Officer Salary Disclosure Statement 

Successor Superintendent to Start July 1, 2012: Salary and Employer Contributions
As of July $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$, Dr. Patrick Brimstein becomes Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Brimstein will pay $15 \%$ of his insurance coverage costs.

| Salary for Dr. Brimstein for 2012-2013 | $\$ 145,000.00$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Social Security | $\$ 11,093$ |  |  |
| NYS Teacher's Retirement System | $\$ 17,400$ |  |  |
| Workers' Compensation | $\$ 431.66$ |  |  |
| $85 \%$ of Health Insurance Plan | $\$ 16,818$ |  |  |
| $85 \%$ of Vision Insurance | $\$ 250$ |  |  |
| Reimbursement for disability, life or annuity upon substantiation of <br> payment | $\$ \mathbf{\$ 1 9 3 , 9 9 2 . 6 6}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total of 2012-2013 salary and employer contributions |  |  |  |

#  M 2012 S 



The New York State Education Department 2012 School District Report Card for Peru CSD is a thirty-three page document, plus dozens of school-specific detail sheets for each of our four grade spans [Primary, Intermediate, Middle and High School]. The snapshot report is below.


Overall Accountability Status:

Good Standing.

Top Priority for
Strengthening:

Increase achievement among students with disabilities, particularly in English language arts, as measured by NYS ELA tests.


Overall Accountability Status:

Improvement Year 1 Basic.

Top Priority for Strengthening:

Increase achievement among students with disabilities, particularly in English language arts, as measured by NYS ELA tests.


This snapshot report is intended to provide interested individuals with a summary of the state's Spring 2012 report on student achievement at Peru CSD during the 2010-2011 school year, as measured by state tests published by or contracted through the New York State Education Department.


## This District's Report Card

The New York State District Report Card is an important part of the Board of Regents' effort to raise learning standards for all students. It provides information to the public on the district's status and the status of schools within the district under the State and federal accountability systems, on student performance, and on other measures of school and district performance. Knowledge gained from the report card on a school district's strengths and weaknesses can be used to improve instruction and services to students.

State assessments are designed to help ensure that all students reach high learning standards. They show whether students are getting the knowledge and skills they need to succeed at the elementary, middle, and commencement levels and beyond. The State requires that students who are not making appropriate progress toward the standards receive academic intervention services.

## Use this report to:

## . Get District Profile information.

This section shows comprehensive data relevant to this district's learning environment.

## Review District Accountability Status.

This section indicates whether a district made adequate yearly progress (AYP) and identifies the district's accountability status.

## View School Accountability Status.

This section lists all schools in your district by 2011-12 accountability status.

## Review an Overview of District Performance.

This section has information about the district's performance on state assessments in English, mathematics, and science.

## For more information:

Office of Information and Reporting Services
New York State Education Department
Room 863 EBA
Albany, NY 12234
Email: dataquest@mail.nysed.gov

## District Profile

This section shows comprehensive data relevant to this school district's learning environment, including information about enrollment, average class size, and teacher qualifications.

Enrollment

| Pre-K | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8} \mathbf{- 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9} \mathbf{- 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0} \mathbf{- 1 1}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Kindergarten | $\mathbf{0}$ | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 1 | 145 | 146 | 150 |
| Grade 2 | 144 | 141 | 144 |
| Grade 3 | 171 | 144 | 146 |
| Grade 4 | 163 | 145 | 143 |
| Grade 5 | 151 | 166 | 152 |
| Grade 6 | 167 | 159 | 177 |
| Ungraded Elementary | 33 | 145 | 160 |
| Grade 7 | 160 | 37 | 8 |
| Grade 8 | 179 | 157 | 151 |
| Grade 9 | 193 | 163 | 163 |
| Grade 10 | 175 | 187 | 170 |
| Grade 11 | 159 | 150 | 177 |
| Grade 12 | 130 | 156 | 150 |
| Ungraded Secondary | 28 | 160 | 156 |
| Total K-12 | 2146 | 2079 | 2049 |

## Average Class Size

|  | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Common Branch | 21 | 20 | 21 |
| Grade 8 | 16 | 16 | 20 |
| English | 17 | 16 | 18 |
| Mathematics | 18 | 17 | 21 |
| Science | 18 | 16 | 20 |
| Social Studies |  |  |  |
| Grade 10 | 20 | 18 | 21 |
| English | 19 | 17 | 20 |
| Mathematics | 20 | 18 | 22 |
| Science | 19 | 19 | 21 |
| Social Studies |  |  |  |

## Enrollment Information

Enrollment counts are as of Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) day, which is typically the first Wednesday of October of the school year. Students who attend BOCES programs on a part-time basis are included in a district's enrollment. Students who attend BOCES on a full-time basis or who are placed full time by the district in an out-of-district placement are not included in a district's enrollment. Students classified by districts as "pre-first" are included in first grade counts.

## Demographic Factors

|  | 2008-09 |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |
| Eligible for Free Lunch | 558 | 26\% | 461 | 22\% | 505 | 25\% |
| Reduced-Price Lunch | 238 | 11\% | 182 | 9\% | 160 | 8\% |
| Student Stability* |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | N/A |
| Limited English Proficient | 3 | 0\% | 4 | 0\% | 6 | 0\% |

Racial/Ethnic Origin

| American Indian or Alaska Native | 4 | $0 \%$ |  | 2 | $0 \%$ |  | 1 | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Black or African American | 47 | $2 \%$ |  | 45 | $2 \%$ |  | 44 | $2 \%$ |
| Hispanic or Latino | 22 | $1 \%$ |  | 23 | $1 \%$ |  | 24 | $1 \%$ |
| Asian or Native | 30 | $1 \%$ |  | 27 | $1 \%$ |  | 26 | $1 \%$ |
| Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2041 | $95 \%$ |  | 1977 | $95 \%$ | 1950 | $95 \%$ |  |
| Multiracial | 2 | $0 \%$ |  | 5 | $0 \%$ |  | 4 | $0 \%$ |

* Available only at the school level.


## Attendance and Suspensions

|  | 2007-08 |  | 2008-09 |  | 2009-10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |
| Annual Attendance Rate |  | 95\% |  | 95\% |  | 94\% |
| Student Suspensions | 114 | 5\% | 101 | 5\% | 87 | 4\% |

## Demographic Factors Information

Eligible for Free Lunch and Reduced-Price Lunch percentages are determined by dividing the number of approved lunch applicants by the Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) enrollment in full-day Kindergarten through Grade 12. Eligible for Free Lunch and Limited English Proficient counts are used to determine Similar Schools groupings within a Need/Resource Capacity category.

## Attendance and Suspensions Information

Annual Attendance Rate is determined by dividing the school district's total actual attendance by the total possible attendance for a school year. A district's actual attendance is the sum of the number of students in attendance on each day the district's schools were open during the school year. Possible attendance is the sum of the number of enrolled students who should have been in attendance on each day schools were open during the school year. Student Suspension rate is determined by dividing the number of students who were suspended from school (not including in-school suspensions) for one full day or longer anytime during the school year by the Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) day enrollments for that school year. A student is counted only once, regardless of whether the student was suspended one or more times during the school year.

# Email Received by Peru CSD Friday, April 27, 2012 

Dear Colleagues,
I regret to inform you of an error discovered within the release of our School Report Cards from a few weeks ago. The 2010-11 values under the "Percent with No Valid Teaching Certificate" and "Percent Teaching out of Certification" rows (found on page 4 of the Accountability and Overview Report) need to be switched with one another. All other data reported within the School Report Cards remains unchanged. I apologize for the error.

The email was sent by Jeff Baker, Data Director for the Northeastern Regional Information Center.
[The email also stated the corrected report cards would be available by noon on Wednesday, May $2^{\text {nd }}$. The Web edition of this Budget Detail Book will be updated to reflect the information in the text of that email message]

## Teacher Qualifications

|  | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Teachers | 196 | 196 | $\mathbf{1 8 5}$ |
| Percent with No Valid <br> Teaching Certificate | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Percent Teaching Out <br> of Certification | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Percent with Fewer Than <br> Three Years of Experience | $7 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Percentage with Master's Degree <br> Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate | $27 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Total Number of Core Classes | 486 | 447 | 408 |
| Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified <br> Teachers in This District | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified <br> in High-Poverty Schools Statewide | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Percent Not Taught by Highly Qualified <br> in Low-Poverty Schools Statewide | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Total Number of Classes | 717 | 650 |  |
| Percent Taught by Teachers Without <br> Appropriate Certification | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |

Teacher Turnover Rate

|  | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turnover Rate of Teachers with Fewer <br> than Five Years of Experience | $16 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Turnover Rate of All Teachers | $12 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

## Staff Counts

|  | 2008-09 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Other Professional Staff | 22 | 21 | 16 |
| Total Paraprofessionals* | 54 | 60 | 58 |
| Assistant Principals | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Principals | 4 | 4 | 4 |

[^1]
## Teacher Qualifications Information

The Percent Teaching Out of Certification is the percent doing so more than on an incidental basis; that is, the percent teaching for more than five periods per week outside certification.

Core Classes are primarily K-6 common branch, English, mathematics, science, social studies, art, music, and foreign languages. To be Highly Qualified, a teacher must have at least a Bachelor's degree, be certified to teach in the subject area, and show subject matter competency. A teacher who taught one class outside of the certification area(s) is counted as Highly Qualified provided that 1) the teacher had been determined by the school or district through the HOUSSE process or other state-accepted methods to have demonstrated acceptable subject knowledge and teaching skills and 2) the class in question was not the sole assignment reported. Credit for incidental teaching does not extend beyond a single assignment. Independent of Highly Qualified Teacher status, any assignment for which a teacher did not hold a valid certificate still registers as teaching out of certification. High-poverty and low-poverty schools are those schools in the upper and lower quartiles, respectively, for percentage of students eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch.

## Teacher Turnover Rate Information

Teacher Turnover Rate for a specified school year is the number of teachers in that school year who were not teaching in the following school year divided by the number of teachers in the specified school year, expressed as a percentage.

## Staff Counts Information

Other Professionals includes administrators, guidance counselors, school nurses, psychologists, and other professionals who devote more than half of their time to non-teaching duties. Teachers who are shared between buildings within a district are reported on the district report only.

## Understanding How Accountability Works in New York State

The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act requires that states develop and report on measures of student proficiency in 1) English language arts (ELA), in 2) mathematics, and on 3) a third indicator. In New York State in 2010-11, the third indicator is science at the elementary/middle level and graduation rate at the secondary level. Schools or districts that meet predefined goals on these measures are making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

For more information about accountability in New York State,
visit: http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/accountability/.


## 1 English Language Arts (ELA)

To make AYP in ELA, every accountability group must make AYP. For a group to make AYP, it must meet the participation and the performance criteria.

## A Participation Criterion

At the elementary/middle level, 95 percent of Grades 3-8 students enrolled during the test administration period in each group with 40 or more students must be tested on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) in ELA or, if appropriate, the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT), or the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in ELA. At the secondary level, 95 percent of seniors in 2010-11 in each accountability group with 40 or more students must have taken an English examination that meets the students' graduation requirement.

## B Performance Criterion

At the elementary/middle level, the Performance Index (PI) of each group with 30 or more continuously enrolled tested students must equal or exceed its Effective Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) or the group must make Safe Harbor. (NYSESLAT is used only for participation.) At the secondary level, the PI of each group in the 2007 cohort with 30 or more members must equal or exceed its Effective AMO or the group must make Safe Harbor. To make Safe Harbor, the PI of the group must equal or exceed its Safe Harbor Target and the group must qualify for Safe Harbor using the third indicator, science or graduation rate.

## 2 Mathematics

The same criteria for making AYP in ELA apply to mathematics. At the elementary/middle level, the measures used to determine AYP are the NYSTP and the NYSAA in mathematics. At the secondary level, the measures are mathematics examinations that meet the students' graduation requirement.

## 3 Third Indicator

In addition to English language arts and mathematics, the school must also make AYP in a third area of achievement.
This means meeting the criteria in science at the elementary/middle level and the criteria in graduation rate at the secondary level.
Elementary/Middle-Level Science: To make AYP, the All Students group must meet the participation criterion and the performance criterion.

## A Participation Criterion

Eighty percent of students in Grades 4 and/or 8 enrolled during the test administration period in the All Students group, if it has 40 or more students, must be tested on an accountability measure. In Grade 4, the measures are the Grade 4 elementary-level science test and the Grade 4 NYSAA in science. In Grade 8 science, the measures are the Grade 8 middle-level science test, Regents science examinations, and the Grade 8 NYSAA in science.

## B Performance Criterion

The PI of the All Students group, if it has 30 or more students, must equal or exceed the State Science Standard (100) or the Science Progress Target.

Qualifying for Safe Harbor in Elementary/Middle-Level ELA and Math: To qualify, the group must meet both the participation criterion and the performance criterion in science.

Secondary-Level Graduation Rate: For a school to make AYP in graduation rate, the percent of students in the 2006 graduation-rate total cohort in the All Students group earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2010 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard ( $80 \%$ ) or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target.

Qualifying for Safe Harbor in Secondary-Level ELA and Math: To qualify, the percent of the 2006 graduation-rate total cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2010 must equal or exceed the Graduation-Rate Standard ( $80 \%$ ) or the Graduation-Rate Progress Target for that group.

## Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability

## $12^{\text {th }}$ Graders

The count of $12^{\text {th }}$ graders enrolled during the 2010-11 school year used to determine the Percentage Tested for the Participation part of the AYP determination for secondarylevel ELA and mathematics. These are the first numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the secondary-level ELA and mathematics pages.

## 2007 Cohort

The count of students in the 2007 accountability cohort used to determine the Performance Index for the Test Performance part of the AYP determination for secondary-level ELA and mathematics. These are the second numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the secondary-level ELA and mathematics pages.

## Accountability Cohort for English and Mathematics

The accountability cohort is used to determine if a school or district met the performance criterion in secondary-level ELA and mathematics. The 2007 school accountability cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2007-08 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2007-08 school year, who were enrolled on October 6, 2010 and did not transfer to a diploma granting program. Students who earned a high school equivalency diploma or were enrolled in an approved high school equivalency preparation program on June 30, 2011, are not included in the 2007 school accountability cohort. The 2007 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 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 AMOs for each grade level will be increased as specified in CR100.2(p) (14) and will reach 200 in 2013-14. (See Effective AMO for further information.)

## Continuous Enrollment

The count of continuously enrolled tested students used to determine the Performance Index for the Test Performance part of the AYP determination for elementary/middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science. These are the second numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the elementary/ middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science pages.

## 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 is the Performance Index (PI) value that each accountability group within a school or district is expected to achieve to make 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.p12.nysed.gov/irs.

## Graduation Rate

The Graduation Rate on the Graduation Rate page is the percentage of the 2006 cohort that earned a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2010.

## Graduation-Rate Total Cohort

The Graduation-Rate Total Cohort, shown on the Graduation Rate page, is used to determine if a school or district made AYP in graduation rate. For the 2010-11 school year, this cohort is the 2006 graduation-rate total cohort. The 2006 total cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 anywhere in the 2006-07 school year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in the 2006-07 school year, and who were enrolled in the school/ district for five months or longer or who were enrolled in the school/district for less than five months but were previously enrolled in the same school/district for five months or longer between the date they first entered Grade 9 and the date they last ended enrollment. A more detailed definition of graduation-rate cohort can be found in the SIRS Manual at www.p12.nysed.gov/irs.

For districts and schools with fewer than 30 graduation-rate total cohort members in the All Students group in 2010-11, data for 2009-10 and 2010-11 for accountability groups were combined to determine counts and graduation rates. Groups with fewer than 30 students in the graduation-rate total cohort are not required to meet the graduation-rate criterion.

## Limited English Proficient

For all accountability measures, if the count of LEP students is equal to or greater than 30, former LEP students are also included in the performance calculations.

## Non-Accountability Groups

Female, Male, and Migrant groups are not part of the AYP determination for any measure.

## Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability (continued)

## Participation

Accountability groups with fewer than 40 students enrolled during the test administration period (for elementary/middlelevel ELA, math, and science) or fewer than 40 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ graders (for secondary-level ELA and mathematics) are not required to meet the participation criterion. If the Percentage Tested for an accountability group fell below 95 percent for ELA and math or 80 percent for science in 2010-11, the participation enrollment ("Total" or " $12{ }^{\text {th }}$ Graders") shown in the tables is the sum of 2009-10 and 2010-11 participation enrollments and the "Percentage Tested" shown is the weighted average of the participation rates over those two years.

## Performance Index (PI)

A 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 to Level 4. (See performance level definitions on the Overview summary page.) At the elementary/middle level, the PI is calculated using the following equation:
$100 \times$ [(Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and $4+$ the Count at Levels 3 and 4) $\div$ Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students]
At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation:
$100 \times$ [(Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the Count at Levels 3 and 4) $\div$ Count of All Cohort Members]

A list of tests used to measure student performance for accountability is available at www.p12.nysed.gov/irs.

## Progress Targets

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

Science: The current year's Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the previous year's Performance Index (PI). Example: The 2010-11 Science Progress Target is calculated by adding one point to the 2009-10 PI.

Graduation Rate: The Graduation-rate Progress Target is calculated by determining a 20\% gap reduction between the rate of the previous year's graduation-rate cohort and the state standard. Example: The 2010-11 Graduation-Rate Progress Target $=[(80-$ percentage of the 2005 cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31,2009$) \times 0.20]+$ percentage of the 2005 cohort earning a local or Regents diploma by August 31, 2009.

Progress Targets are provided for groups whose PI (for science) or graduation rate (for graduation rate) is below the State Standard.

## Safe Harbor Targets

Safe Harbor provides an alternate means to demonstrate AYP for accountability groups that do not achieve their EAMOs in English or mathematics. The 2010-11 safe harbor targets are calculated using the following equation:
$2009-10 \mathrm{PI}+(200-$ the $2009-10 \mathrm{PI}) \times 0.10$
Safe Harbor Targets are provided for groups whose PI is less than the EAMO.

## Safe Harbor Qualification (*)

On the science page, if the group met both the participation and the performance criteria for science, the Safe Harbor Qualification column will show "Qualified." If the group did not meet one or more criteria, the column will show "Did not qualify." A " $\ddagger$ " symbol after the 2010-11 Safe Harbor Target on the elementary/middle- or secondary-level ELA or mathematics page indicates that the student group did not make AYP in science (elementary/middle level) or graduation rate (secondary level) and; therefore, the group did not qualify for Safe Harbor in ELA or mathematics.

## State Standard

The criterion value that represents minimally satisfactory performance (for science) or a minimally satisfactory percentage of cohort members earning a local or Regents diploma (for graduation rate). In 2010-11, the State Science Standard is a Performance Index of 100; the State GraduationRate Standard is $80 \%$. The Commissioner may raise the State Standard at his discretion in future years.

## Students with Disabilities

For all measures, if the count of students with disabilities is equal to or greater than 30, former students with disabilities are also included in the performance calculations.

## Test Performance

For districts and schools with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled tested students (for elementary/middle-level ELA, math, and science) or fewer than 30 students in the 2007 cohort (for secondary-level ELA and mathematics) in the All Students group in 2010-11, data for 2009-10 and 2010-11 for accountability groups were combined to determine counts and Performance Indices. For districts and schools with 30 or more continuously enrolled students/2007 cohort members in the All Students group in 2010-11, student groups with fewer than 30 members are not required to meet the performance criterion. This is indicated by a " -" in the Test Performance column in the table.

## Total

The count of students enrolled during the test administration period used to determine the Percentage Tested for the Participation part of the AYP determination for elementary/ middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science. These are the first numbers in the parentheses after the subgroup label on the elementary/middle-level ELA, mathematics, and science pages. For accountability calculations, students who were excused from testing for medical reasons in accordance with federal NCLB guidance are not included in the count.

## Understanding Your District Accountability Status

The list below defines the district status categories applied to each accountability measure under New York State's district accountability system, which is divided into a Federal Title I component and a State component. Accountability measures for districts are English language arts (ELA), mathematics, elementary/middle-level science, and graduation rate. A district may be assigned a different status for different accountability measures. The overall status of a district is the status assigned to the district for the accountability measure with the most advanced designation in the hierarchy. If the district receives Title I funds, it is the most advanced designation in the Title I hierarchy, unless the district is in good standing under Title I but identified as DRAP under the State hierarchy. A district that does not receive Title I funding in a school year does not have a federal status in that year; however, all districts receive a state status even if they do not receive Title I funding. Consequences for districts not in good standing can be found at: http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/accountability/.

## Federal Title I Status

(Applies to all New York State districts receiving Title I funds)

## New York State Status

(Applies to New York State districts)

## A District in Good Standing

- A district is considered to be in good standing if it has not been identified as a District in Need of Improvement or a District Requiring Academic Progress.
- District in Need of Improvement (Year 1)

A district that has not made AYP for two consecutive years on the same accountability measure is considered a District in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

## District Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1)

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

## District Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2)

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

## District Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3)

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

Title I funds.

## District in Need of Improvement (Year 4)

A District in Need of Improvement (Year 3) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a District in Need of Improvement (Year 4) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.
District in Need of Improvement (Year 5 and above) A District in Need of Improvement (Year 4 and above) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a District in Need of Improvement (Year 5 and above) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds.

## Summary

Overall Accountability
Status (2011-12)

## ^ Good Standing



Title I Part A Funding

| Years the District Received Title I Part A Funding |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ |
| YES | YES | YES |

On which accountability measures did this district make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and which groups made AYP on each measure?

| Student Groups | Elementary/Middle Level |  |  | Secondary Level |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | English <br> Language Arts | Mathematics | Science | English <br> Language Arts | Mathematics | Graduation Rate |
| All Students | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Black or African American | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Hispanic or Latino | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander |  | - |  |  | ${ }^{-}$ |  |
| White | $\dddot{\sim}$ | $\because$ |  | $\because$ | $\because$ |  |
| Multiracial | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Other Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities | $*$ | * |  | - | - |  |
| Limited English Proficient |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $\cdots$ | $\because$ |  | * | $\because$ |  |
| Student groups making AYP in each subject | * 3 of 4 | * 3 of 4 | $\checkmark 1$ of 1 | * 2 of 3 | v of 3 | $\checkmark 1$ of 1 |

## AYP Status

| Accountability Status Levels |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Federal | State |
| Good Standing | $\square$ Good Standing |
| Improvement (Year 1) | $\square$ Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) |
| Improvement (Year 2) | $\square$ Requiring Academic Progress (Year 2) |
| Improvement (Year 3) | - Requiring Academic Progress (Year 3) |
| Improvement (Year 4) | - Requiring Academic Progress (Year 4) |
| Improvement (Year 5 \& Above) | $\square$ Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5 \& Above |
| Pending - Requires Special Evaluation |  |

## Elementary/Middle-Level English Language Arts

| Accountability Statu |
| :--- |
| for This Subject |
| $(2011-12)$ |
| Accountability Meas |
| Prospective Status |

Good Standing

for This Subject
(2011-12)

| Accountability Measures | 3 of 4 | Student groups making AYP in English language arts |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Did not make AYP |

How did students in each accountability group perform on elementary/middle-level English language arts accountability measures?

| Student Group <br> (Total: Continuous Enrollment) | AYP | Participation |  | Test Performance |  | Performance Objectives |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Status | Met Criterion | Percentage Tested | Met Criterion | Performance Index | Effective AMO | Safe Harbor Target |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
| Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Students (956:925) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 100\% | $\checkmark$ | 143 | 118 |  |  |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (1:1) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Black or African American $(24: 21)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Hispanic or Latino (15:14) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (13:12) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| White (902:877) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 100\% | $\checkmark$ | 143 | 118 |  |  |
| Multiracial (1:0) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Other Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities (166:167) | $*$ | $\checkmark$ | 98\% | * | 69 | 114 | 94 | 82 |
| Limited English Proficient (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged (381:360) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 100\% | $\checkmark$ | 118 | 116 |  |  |
| Final AYP Determination | * 3 o |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female ( $447: 432$ ) |  |  | 100\% |  | 152 | 117 |  |  |
| Male (509:493) |  |  | 100\% |  | 135 | 117 |  |  |
| Migrant (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Symbols

- Fewer Than 40 Total/Fewer Than 30 Continuous Enrollment
$\ddagger \quad$ Did not qualify for Safe Harbor

NOTE: See Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.

## Elementary/Middle-Level Mathematics

| Accountability Status |
| :--- |
| for This Subject |
| (2011-12) |
| Accountability Measures |

A Good Standing

3 of 4 Student groups making AYP in mathematics

* Did not make AYP

Prospective Status

This district will be in good standing in 2012-13. [201]

## How did students in each accountability group perform on

 elementary/middle-level mathematics accountability measures?| Student Group <br> (Total: Continuous Enrollment) | AYP | Participation |  | Test Performance |  | Performance Objectives |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Status | Met Criterion | Percentage Tested | Met Criterion | Performance Index | Effective AMO | Safe Harbor Target |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
| Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Students (956:921) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 99\% | $\checkmark$ | 156 | 133 |  |  |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native $(1: 1)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Black or African American (24:21) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Hispanic or Latino (15:14) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (13:12) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| White (902:873) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 99\% | $\checkmark$ | 157 | 133 |  |  |
| Multiracial (1:0) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Other Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities (166:165) | * | $\checkmark$ | 96\% | * | 101 | 129 | 105 | 111 |
| Limited English Proficient (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged (381:357) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 99\% | $\checkmark$ | 133 | 131 |  |  |
| Final AYP Determination | * 3 of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female (447:430) |  |  | 99\% |  | 159 | 132 |  |  |
| Male (509:491) |  |  | 99\% |  | 155 | 132 |  |  |
| Migrant (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Symbols

- Made AYP
$\checkmark^{\text {SH }}$ Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
X Did not make AYP
- Fewer Than 40 Total/Fewer Than 30 Continuous Enrollment
$\ddagger \quad$ Did not qualify for Safe Harbor
nоте: See Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.


## Elementary/Middle-Level Science

| Accountability Status for This Subject (2011-12) | ヘ | Good Standing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accountability Measures | 1 of 1 | Student groups making AYP in science |
|  | $\checkmark$ | Made AYP |
| Prospective Status |  | This district will be in good standing in 2012-13. [201] |

How did students in each accountability group perform on elementary/middle-level science accountability measures?

| Student Group <br> (Total: Continuous Enrollment) | AYP |  | Participation |  | Test Performance |  | Performance Objectives |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Safe Harbor | Met Criterion | Percentage Tested | Met Criterion | Performance Index | State <br> Standard | Progress Target |  |
|  | Status | Qualification |  |  |  |  |  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
| Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Students (320:303) | $\checkmark$ | Qualified | $\checkmark$ | 97\% | $\checkmark$ | 187 | 100 |  |  |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black or African American (10:8) |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Hispanic or Latino (2:2) |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (4:3) |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| White (304:290) |  | Qualified | $\checkmark$ | 97\% | $\checkmark$ | 189 | 100 |  |  |
| Multiracial (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities (58:55) |  | Qualified | $\checkmark$ | 93\% | $\checkmark$ | 144 | 100 |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged $(122: 111)$ |  | Qualified | $\checkmark$ | 95\% | $\checkmark$ | 172 | 100 |  |  |
| Final AYP Determination | $\checkmark 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female (155:145) |  |  |  | 95\% |  | 188 | 100 |  |  |
| Male (165:158) |  |  |  | 98\% |  | 187 | 100 |  |  |
| Migrant (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Symbols

- Made AYP

X Did not make AYP

- Fewer Than 40 Total/Fewer Than 30

Continuous Enrollment
note: See Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.

## Secondary-Level English Language Arts

| Accountability Status |
| :--- |
| for This Subject |
| $(2011-12)$ |
| Accountability Measures |

- Good Standing

2 of 3 Student groups making AYP in English language arts
Did not make AYP
A district that fails to make AYP in English language arts at the elementary/middle and secondary levels for two consecutive years is placed in improvement status. If this district fails to make AYP at both the elementary/middle and secondary levels in 2011-12, the district will be District In Need of Improvement (Year 1) in 2012-13. If this district makes AYP at either the elementary/middle or secondary level in 2011-12, the district will be in good standing in 2012-13. [202]

## How did students in each accountability group perform on

secondary-level English language arts accountability measures?

| Student Group <br> (12th Graders: 2007 Cohort) | AYP | Participation |  | Test Performance |  | Performance Objectives |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Status | Met Criterion | Percentage Tested | Met Criterion | Performance Index | Effective AMO | Safe Harbor Target |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
| Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Students (150:149) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 99\% | $\checkmark$ | 187 | 174 |  |  |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black or African American (1:2) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Hispanic or Latino (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (1:1) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| White (148:146) | $\checkmark$ | $v$ | 99\% | $v$ | 188 | 174 |  |  |
| Multiracial (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities $(15: 18)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Limited English Proficient (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged (42:42) | * | $\checkmark$ | 100\% | * | 167 | 168 | 167 ${ }^{\text { }}$ | 170 |
| Final AYP Determination | * 2 of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female (75:70) |  |  | 100\% |  | 193 | 172 |  |  |
| Male (75:79) |  |  | 99\% |  | 181 | 172 |  |  |
| Migrant (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Symbols

Made AYP
$\checkmark$ SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target

X Did not make AYP

- Fewer Than 40 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Graders/Fewer Than 30 Cohort
$\ddagger \quad$ Did not qualify for Safe Harbor
nоте: See Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.


# District Accountability 

## Secondary-Level Mathematics

## Accountability Status for This Subject (2011-12) <br> Accountability Measures

Prospective Status

- Good Standing

3 of 3 Student groups making AYP in mathematics
Made AYP
This district will be in good standing in 2012-13. [201]

## How did students in each accountability group perform on

secondary-level mathematics accountability measures?

| Student Group <br> (12th Graders: 2007 Cohort) | AYP | Participation |  | Test Performance |  | Performance Objectives |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Status | Met Criterion | Percentage <br> Tested | Met Criterion | Performance Index | Effective AMO | Safe Harbor Target |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
| Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Students (150:149) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 99\% | $\checkmark$ | 187 | 171 |  |  |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black or African American $(1: 2)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Hispanic or Latino (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (1:1) | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| White (148:146) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 99\% | $\checkmark$ | 188 | 171 |  |  |
| Multiracial (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities $(15: 18)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Limited English Proficient (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged (42:42) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 98\% | $\checkmark$ | 167 | 165 |  |  |
| Final AYP Determination | $\checkmark 3$ of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female (75:70) |  |  | 99\% |  | 191 | 169 |  |  |
| Male (75:79) |  |  | 100\% |  | 182 | 169 |  |  |
| Migrant (0:0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Symbols

$\checkmark$ Made AYP
$\checkmark$ SH Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target

X Did not make AYP

- Fewer Than 40 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Graders/Fewer Than 30 Cohort
$\ddagger \quad$ Did not qualify for Safe Harbor
nоте: See Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.


## Graduation Rate

## Accountability Status for This <br> Indicator (2011-12) <br> Good Standing

Accountability Measures

|  | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prospective Status | Made AYP |

1 of 1 Student groups making AYP in graduation rate Made AYP

This district will be in good standing in 2012-13. [201]

How did students in each accountability group perform on graduation rate accountability measures?

| Student Group(2006 Graduation-Rate Tot | Graduation |  |  | Objectives |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Met | Graduation | State | Progress Target |
|  | AYP | Criterion | Rate | Standard | 2010-11 |
| Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Students (200) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 78\% | 80\% | 75\% |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native (0) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black or African American (4) |  | - | - | - |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (1) |  | - | - | - |  |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (2) |  | - | - | - |  |
| White (193) |  | $\checkmark$ | 77\% | 80\% | 76\% |
| Multiracial (0) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities (48) |  | $\boldsymbol{*}$ | 48\% | 80\% | 53\% |
| Limited English Proficient (0) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged (66) |  | * | 62\% | 80\% | 64\% |
| Final AYP Determination | $\checkmark 1$ |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Accountability Groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female (98) |  |  | 85\% | 80\% |  |
| Male (102) |  |  | 71\% | 80\% |  |
| Migrant (0) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Symbols

- Made AYP

X Did not make AYP

- Fewer than 30 Graduation-Rate Total Cohort
nоте: See Useful Terms for Understanding Accountability for explanations and definitions of terms and table labels used on this page.


## Aspirational Goal

The Board of Regents has set an aspirational goal that $95 \%$ of students in each public school and school district will graduate within five years of first entry into grade 9. The graduation rate for the 2006 total cohort through June 2011 (after 5 years) for this district is $80 \%$ and, therefore, this district did not meet this goal. The aspirational goal does not impact accountability.

## 2011-12 Accountability Status of Schools in Your District

This section lists all schools in your district by 2011-12 accountability status.

## In Good Standing

2 schools identified 50\% of total
PERU INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
PRIMARY BUILDING SCHOOL

## Improvement (year 1) Basic

2 schools identified $50 \%$ of total
PERU MIDDLE SCHOOL
PERU SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

## Summary of 2010-11 District Performance

Performance on the State assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science at the elementary and middle levels is reported in terms of mean scores and the percentage of tested students scoring at or above Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4. Performance on the State assessments in ELA and mathematics at the secondary level is reported in terms of the percentage of students in a cohort scoring at these levels.

|  | Percentage of students that scored at or above Level 3 | Total Tested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English Language Arts | 0\% 50\% | 100\% |
| Grade 3 | 58\% | 142 |
| Grade 4 | 57\% | 150 |
| Grade 5 | 51\% | 173 |
| Grade 6 | 59\% | 161 |
| Grade 7 | 43\% | 154 |
| Grade 8 | 47\% | 164 |
| Mathematics |  |  |
| Grade 3 | 54\% | 142 |
| Grade 4 | 52\% | 149 |
| Grade 5 | 51\% | 173 |
| Grade 6 | 77\% | 159 |
| Grade 7 | 69\% | 154 |
| Grade 8 | 64\% | 163 |
| Science |  |  |
| Grade 4 | 89\% | 149 |
| Grade 8 | 91\% | 156 |
| Secondary Level | Percentage of students that scored at or above Level 3 | 2007 Total Cohort |
|  | 0\% 50\% | 100\% |
| English | 80\% | 173 |
| Mathematics | 80\% | 173 |

## About the Performance Level Descriptors

## English Language Arts

## Level 1: Below Standard

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

## Level 2: Meets Basic Standard

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

## Level 3: Meets Proficiency Standard

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

## Level 4: Exceeds Proficiency Standard

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

## Mathematics

Level 1: Below Standard
Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

## Level 2: Meets Basic Standard

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

## Level 3: Meets Proficiency Standard

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

Level 4: Exceeds Proficiency Standard
Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the mathematics content expected at this grade level.

## How are Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) categories determined?

Districts are divided into high, average, and low need categories based on their ability to meet the special needs of their students with local resources. Districts in the high need category are subdivided into four categories based on enrollment size and, in some cases, number of students per square mile. More information about the categories can be found in the Report to the Governor and the Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools at www.p12.nysed.gov/irs.
In this section, this district's performance is compared with that of public schools statewide.

## This District's N/RC Category:

## Average Need Districts

This is a school district with average student needs in relation to district resource capacity.

## This District's Results in Grade 3 English Language Arts



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments

2010-11 School Year

| 2010-11 School Year |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |
| Tested | $2-4$ | $3-4$ |

2009-10 School Year

|  | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 3 Equivalent | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | - | - | - |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)t: Grade 3 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | Total |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 3 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

## This District's Results in Grade 3 Mathematics



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments



## This District's Results in Grade 4 English Language Arts



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments

2010-11 School Year

| 2010-11 School Year |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |
| Tested | $2-4$ | $3-4$ |

2009-10 School Year

| - | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent | 1 | - | - | - | 0 |  |  |  |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)t: Grade 4 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | Total |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 4 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

## This District's Results in Grade 4 Mathematics



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments

| Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |  | Total | Number | at |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 |  |

2009-10 School Year

[^2]
## Overview of District Performance

## This District's Results in Grade 4 Science



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

| Other | 2010-11 School Year |  |  |  | 2009-10 School Year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessments | Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |  | Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |  |
|  | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 |  | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |

## This District's Results in Grade 5 English Language Arts



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments

2010-11 School Year

| 2010-11 School Year |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |
| Tested | $2-4$ | $3-4$ |

2009-10 School Year

|  | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 5 Equivalent | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) $\ddagger$ : Grade 5 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | Total |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 5 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

## This District's Results in Grade 5 Mathematics



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments



2

## This District's Results in Grade 6 English Language Arts



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments

2010-11 School Year

| 2010-11 School Year |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |
| Tested | $2-4$ | $3-4$ |

2009-10 School Year

| ASSESSMEnts | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 6 Equivalent | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)t: Grade 6 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | Total |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 6 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

## This District's Results in Grade 6 Mathematics



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments



## This District's Results in Grade 7 English Language Arts



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.

| Other | 2010-11 School Year |  |  |  | 2009-10 School Year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessments | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): |  |  | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): |  |  |
|  |  | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |  | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 7 Equivalent | 1 | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)t: Grade 7 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Total
Total
Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 7

N/A
N/A
N/A
0
N/A
N/A
N/A

## This District's Results in Grade 7 Mathematics



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments



## This District's Results in Grade 8 English Language Arts



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments

2010-11 School Year

| 2010-11 School Year |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Total | Number scoring at level(s): |  |
| Tested | $2-4$ | $3-4$ |

2009-10 School Year

| ASSESSIIEILS | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 | Tested | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)t: Grade 8 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |


|  | Total |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recently Arrived LEP Students NOT Tested on the ELA NYSTP: Grade 8 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

## This District's Results in Grade 8 Mathematics



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

* These ranges are for 2010-11 data only. Ranges for the 2009-10 data are available in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Reports.


## Other <br> Assessments



## This District's Results in Grade 8 Science



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

| Other <br> Assessments | 2010-11 School Year |  |  |  | 2009-10 School Year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total <br> Tested | Number scoring at level(s): |  |  | Total Tested | Number scoring at level(s): |  |  |
|  |  | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |  | 2-4 | 3-4 | 4 |
| New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA): Grade 8 Equivalent | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Regents Science | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |

# This District's Total Cohort* Results in Secondary-Level English after Four Years of Instruction 



## NOTES

[^3][^4]
## This District's Total Cohort* Results in Secondary-Level Mathematics after Four Years of Instruction



## NOTES

The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

[^5]
[^0]:    PAGE 2

[^1]:    * Not available at the school level.

[^2]:    New York State Alternate Assessment
    (NYSAA): Grade 4 Equivalent

[^3]:    The - symbol indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than five students,
    data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students.

[^4]:    * A total cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 in a particular year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in that year, and were enrolled in the school/district for five months. 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.
    ** 2006 cohort data are those reported in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Report.

[^5]:    * A total cohort consists of all students who first entered Grade 9 in a particular year, and all ungraded students with disabilities who reached their seventeenth birthday in that year, and were enrolled in the school/district for five months. 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.
    ** 2006 cohort data are those reported in the 2009-10 Accountability and Overview Report.

