

**Preliminary LAP Designation: Appeal based on erroneous data categorization and extraordinary circumstances.**

<b>BEDS_CD</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>DBEDS</b>	<b>DNAME</b>
132101060010	WAPPINGERS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	132101060000	WAPPINGERS CSD

**Category 1: Subgroups indicated with "Yes" have failed to make AYP in 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 (after applying progress filters)**

Subgroup / Category	District Rationale For Appeal
<b>White Science</b>	As per the attached report titled "132101060010 LAP Designation Appeal Response Updated Support" we looked at our white students who took both our grade 8 science test along with a regents exam as well as our white honors students who successfully passed the Earth Science Regents but refused to take the grade 8 science assessment. What we found was 30 white students who passed the Earth Science Regents refused to sit for the grade 8 science assessment. If we were to assume that these 30 students could pass the grade 8 science assessment based on the fact they passed the Earth Science regents and factored in their potential scores as a level 3 our PI would be adjusted to 176 which is greater than our performance target for the 2014-15 school year. This is the basis for our appeal for this category / subgroup.
<b>Yes</b>	

**Category 2: EM AYP, HS AYP Progress Filter: Met 10 point gain or met 10 percent gap reduction in Performance Index**

Subgroup / Category	District Rationale For Appeal
<b>White Science</b>	While our PI has dropped 15 points from 2013 to 2015 (From 122 to 107) our participation has dropped from 99.03% in 2013 to 54.92% in 2015. The Opt Out movement has created a huge gap in reliability to measure our accountability within this LAP Category.
<b>No</b>	

**Category 3: EM AYP, HS AYP Progress Filter: For subgroups indicated with "Yes", the subgroup's 2014-15 Performance Index (PI) was greater than the Effective Annual Measurable Objectives (EAMO)**

Subgroup / Category	District Rationale For Appeal
<b>No ELA SWD</b>	132101060010 had a participation rate of 45.71%% for this subgroup in the 14-15 School Year. We are appealing this determination based on our large % of student opt outs for this sub-group. The high number of opt outs calls to question the reliability of using this measure as a basis for determining the efficacy of our instructional program in this subject area.
<b>No</b>	
<b>No ELA Black</b>	The NYSED 2014-15 Report Card published on data.nysed.gov shows that this sub group of students actually met this performance category. The PI received was a 76 with an EAMO of a 65.
<b>No</b>	
<b>No ELA Hisp</b>	The NYSED 2014-15 Report Card published on data.nysed.gov shows that this sub group of students actually met this performance category. The PI received was a 77 with an EAMO of a 72.
<b>No</b>	
<b>ELA ED</b>	132101060010 had a participation rate of 52.26% for this subgroup in the 14-15 School Year. In the prior year our ED Students had a participation rate of 93.98% and were able to meet their EAMO target. We are appealing this determination based on our large % of student opt outs for this sub-group. The high number of opt outs calls to question the reliability of using this measure as a basis for determining the efficacy of our instructional program in this subject area.
<b>No</b>	
<b>Math SWD</b>	The NYSED 2014-15 Report card published on data.nysed.gov indicates 132101060010 made AYP with respect to performance with the notation of: ( † Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30.) We cannot figure out how we are being cited for missing AYP in this report for this subgroup when your state data portal is suggesting otherwise. In addition we are appealing this determination based on our large number of student opt outs for this sub-group. These opt outs calls to question the reliability of comparing actualy PI vs the EAMO.
<b>No</b>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No Grade 8 Science: SWD</b></p>	<p>132101060010 had a participation rate of 58.67% for this subgroup. In the prior year our SWD's had a participation rate of 94.3% and were able to meet their progress target. We are appealing this determination based on our large % of student opt outs for this sub-group. The high number of opt outs calls to question the reliability of using this measure as a basis for determining the efficacy of our instructional program in this subject area.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No Grade 8 Science Hisp</b></p>	<p>According to the NYSED Data Portal we actually made AYP for this sub group. Although our PI was 157 and our EAMO was 161 we met our progress target of 132. We are appealing this determination based on our large number of student opt outs for this sub-group. We feel given the number of students who actually took the exam that we are fortunate to have at least met our progress target. But the high number of opt outs calls to question the reliability using this measure as a basis for determining the efficacy of our instructional program in this subject area.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No Grade 8 Science White</b></p>	<p>132101060010 had a participation rate of 54.92% for this subgroup for the 14-15 School Year. We are appealing this determination based on our large number of student opt outs for this sub-group. The high number of opt outs calls to question the reliability of using this measure as a basis for determining the efficacy of our instructional program in this subject area.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No Grade 8 Science ED</b></p>	<p>71 out of our 135 students classified as ED took this assessment in 2014-15. 21 of these 71 ED students are SWD's. 19 of these 21 ED/SWD are either White or Hispanic. 36 of the remaining 50 students are non classified students who are either White or Hispanic. We feel this category has been cited as a duplicate of the previously mentioned 3 sub-groups, we have no further information to provide.</p>