Huntington High School: Academic Results and Plan for Improvement
Goals

- Explain why Huntington High School appeared on the “list” as a School in Need of Improvement
- Show how we are “really” doing as a school in comparison to similar schools
- Define “Similar School”
- Explain NYSEDs Differentiated Accountability Methodology
- Describe plans for improvement
Why a SINI?

In order to ensure annual yearly progress (AYP), schools must demonstrate that progress is being made toward satisfactorily meeting the New York State standards. In order to demonstrate AYP on a yearly basis, the following criteria must be satisfied:

- Participation rate for each accountability group of at least 40 graduating seniors tested must be at least 95% for the cohort on the English Language Arts and Math assessments.
- Performance index for each accountability group of at least 30 students must be equal to or greater than the yearly defined effective Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) on the ELA and Math assessments.
- One of our accountability groups with 30 or more students did not meet the effective AMO for two consecutive years on both the ELA and Math assessments, so the high school has been identified as a School in Need of Improvement (SINI) FOR THAT ACCOUNTABILITY GROUP.
- Accountability groups include:
  - Students with disabilities
  - Hispanic/Latino
  - African American
  - Asian or Pacific Islander
  - Limited English Proficiency
  - Economically Disadvantaged
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- 2003: HHS 87%, Similar Schools 87%
- 2004: HHS 83%, Similar Schools 84%
- 2005: HHS 85%, Similar Schools 85%
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus AB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Micro</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post Secondary Plans of Graduates (2006 Cohort)

Post Secondary Plans of 2010 Graduates
(2006 Cohort)

- 4-Year College in/outside NYS
- 2-Year College in NYS
- Other Postsecondary School in/outside NYS
- Enlist in the Military
- Seek Employment
- Other Plans
- Unknown

60%
29%
3%
3%
2%
2%
1%
Class of 2010 Honors & Awards

- 4 National Merit Commended Students
- 3 National Merit Semi–finalists
- 2 African American Merit Semi–finalists
- 1 National Merit Finalist
- 1 Siemens Intel Semi–Finalist
What is a Similar School?

- Schools identified as “similar schools” are selected “to find a balance between having too many groups with too few schools in each, and too few groups, where schools are less fairly comparable.”
- The groupings attempt to help everyone to more fairly evaluate a school’s performance in the context of other school’s efforts.
- The New York State grouping model used for the NYS School Report Card is based on the following three factors:
  - Grade Range of Students served by the School
  - School district capabilities
  - Needs of the school student population
- As with any mechanistically derived comparison value, all comparisons made using “similar schools” should be made in a spirit of inquiry. There are many other factors that can contribute to differences in performance among schools; there may be very good reasons for these differences. Every group average will be higher than some schools in the group and lower than others. Only large differences from the group average involving more than a few pupils’ performance are likely to be statistically significant. Any differences from the group values should be explored with concern and interest. They should not be used to make immediate judgments about the school’s programs and overall performance.
- Readers of the New York School Report Card may well be reminded that the most similar school is the school itself.
### Public Schools In Similar Group #51 – Suffolk County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Enrollment (K-12)</th>
<th>ELL Percent</th>
<th>Free-Lunch Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Bay Shore Union Free School District</td>
<td>Bay Shore Senior High School</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Greenport Union Free School District</td>
<td>Greenport High School</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Huntington Union Free School District</td>
<td>Huntington High School</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>South Country Central School District</td>
<td>Bellport Senior High School</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>South Huntington Union Free School District</td>
<td>Walt Whitman High School</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In January 2009, the United States Department of Education approved New York State’s participation in the Differentiated Accountability pilot program under the No Child Left Behind Act. In May 2009, the NYS Board of Regents approved emergency adoption of Commissioner’s Regulations to implement Differentiated Accountability (DA) beginning with the 2009–10 school year.

A goal of the Differentiated Accountability system is to better match the support and interventions provided to schools to improve student achievement with the academic reasons that led to the school’s identification for improvement under No Child Left Behind.

Under Differentiated Accountability, the categories of school improvement identification were consolidated and the interventions for schools that are identified are differentiated, but the methodology for determining school Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) based on current performance and participation criteria did not change.
Accountability designations based on both the number and type of student groups failing to make AYP and the length of time such failure has persisted.

Three distinct, two–year, phases of intervention: Improvement, Corrective Action and Restructuring.

Three distinct categories within phases: Basic, Focused and Comprehensive.

Accountability measures for schools at the elementary/middle level are English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science; at the secondary level, they are ELA, mathematics, and graduation rate.

A school may be in a different accountability phase for each measure. The school’s overall status is its most advanced New York State accountability phase and its highest category within that phase.

The supports and interventions for schools that are designated into a particular phase/category have been modified for implementation beginning in 2009–10.
Differentiated Accountability Model

Phase

- IMPROVEMENT
- CORRECTIVE ACTION
- RESTRUCTURING

Category

- BASIC
- FOCUSED
- COMPREHENSIVE

Diagnostic

- SCHOOL QUALITY REVIEW
- CURRICULUM AUDIT

Plan/Intervention

- IMPROVEMENT PLAN
  CREATE AND IMPLEMENT
- CORRECTIVE ACTION
  PLAN & IMPLEMENTATION
  OF CURRICULUM AUDIT

Oversight & Support

- SED empowers districts: gives them the support and assistance necessary to take primary responsibility for developing and implementing improvement strategies
- SED provides TA to districts: sustaining greater latitude and more responsibility for addressing schools
- ASSIGNMENT OF Joint Intervention Team and Distinguished Educator
  External personnel to revise and assist school implement the most rigorous plan or, as necessary, PHASE-OUT/CLOSURE

SED & its agents work in direct partnership with the district

Intensity of Intervention
Criteria for Placement in Categories

- **Basic (Improvement Phase Only):** Identified for the performance of a single student group on a single accountability measure.

- **Focused:** Not identified for the performance of an “all student” group.

- **Comprehensive:** Identified for the performance of an “all student” group or the failure of all groups except the “all student” group.
What is our plan for improvement?

- Under the direction of Dr. Leonardi, HHS Principal, the School Leadership Team will complete the SQR Quality Indicators survey.
- An on-site review will be conducted by the School Quality Review (SQR) Team that includes district representatives and a representative from NYSED.
- Recommendations from the SQR will be incorporated in a Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) for the high school developed by the principal and School Leadership Team that will be implemented and monitored by the SQR Team.
- Addition of support classes at the high school in Integrated Algebra, 9th & 10th English, and Living Environment to ensure “at risk” students are well prepared to pass the Regents exam at the first sitting.