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The following report was produced on behalf of the DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education by GreatSchools, an independent, nonprofit organization which specializes in publishing education performance information for parents.

## MESSAGE FROM THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT

As a parent myself, as well as a former math teacher, I know that making decisions about your child's education is important. Giving parents all of the information they need -whether it is test score data or schools that have been identified for improvement - is a large portion of what we do. Our goal is to help empower parents to determine the right learning environment for their child.

The report cards included here are based on the results from the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS). DC CAS measures how well our students have mastered the knowledge and skills contained in the state's academic learning standards. The results are broken down for the district, each Local Education Agency (LEA), and each school within the LEAs. They also offer specific information to the public on each school's performance under the accountability system approved by the DC State Board of Education.

LEAs, schools and educators use the information on these report cards to evaluate their effectiveness in the classroom, plan curriculums, and build strategies to improve their outcome for the following year.

Thank you for your interest in this year's state report card. If you need help interpreting this data please visit www.osse.dc.gov.

Sincerely,


State Superintendent of Education
Washington, DC

More information about the District of Columbia's statewide accountability system is available online.

Visit www.osse.dc.gov to:

- Learn more about the DC CAS
- Learn more about the District of Columbia's Academic Learning Standards
- Or call the Office of the State Superintendent of Education at (202) 727-6436


## Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB, Public law 107-100), requires the District of Columbia to annually determine whether schools, districts, and the state have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of having all students meet rigorous state academic standards by the 2013-2014 school year. Each year, the performance of all students in the school, local education agency (LEA), and state is measured using the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS). The results are compared against annual performance targets to determine whether the school, LEA, or state is making AYP.

In order to meet AYP all specified student groups consisting of a minimum number of students must meet proficiency and participation goals. In addition, high schools must meet a graduation rate goal, while elementary and middle schools must meet an attendance rate goal. If any subgroup of students or the whole student body in a school does not meet the targets, or does not make sufficient progress toward the targets, the school is designated as not meeting AYP. The same requirements apply to each LEA and to the state.

THERE ARE TWO WAYS TO MAKE AYP:

1. Meet or exceed the AYP targets (testing and attendance/graduation rate) for the current year
2. Meet or exceed Safe Harbor² (sh) requirements for the current year

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS (DCPS) - ELEMENTARY GRADES

This LEA did not meet AYP because only 40 of 73 indicators were satisfied

| STUDENT GROUP | MET PROFICIENCY GOAL |  | MET PARTICIPATION GOAL |  | ATTENDANCE RATE ${ }^{1}$ | GRADUATION RATE ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | READING | МАТН | READING | MATH |  |  |
| ALL STUDENTS | $x$ | $x$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | $x$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Black / Non-Hispanic | $x$ | $x$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Hispanic | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | $x$ | $x$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English Proficient | $x$ | x | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $x$ | x | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
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## THERE ARE TWO WAYS TO MAKE AYP:

1. Meet or exceed the AYP targets (testing and attendance/graduation rate) for the current year
2. Meet or exceed Safe Harbor ${ }^{2}$ (sh) requirements for the current year

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS (DCPS) - SECONDARY GRADES

This LEA did not meet AYP because only 40 of 73 indicators were satisfied

| STUDENT GROUP | MET PROFICIENCY GOAL |  | MET PARTICIPATION GOAL |  | ATTENDANCE RATE ${ }^{1}$ | GRADUATION RATE ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | reading | MATH | READING | мATH |  |  |
| ALL STUDENTS | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ |  | $x$ |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | $x$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Black / Non-Hispanic | $x$ | $x$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\times$ |
| Hispanic | $\checkmark$ (sh) | $\checkmark$ (sh) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |
| White | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ |  | $x$ |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English Proficient | $x$ | $\checkmark$ (sh) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $x$ | $x$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |

## ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESULTS

Only students who were enrolled in the state for the full academic year are included in the AYP results. In the District of Columbia, a Full Academic Year is defined as being enrolled on the official enrollment day in October (October 5, or the first business day after October 5) AND being enrolled on the first day of the assessment window (generally late April) AND remaining enrolled for 85 percent of instructional days between the October date and the April date.

The percentage marker on the charts show the annual performance target set for the state for elementary schools in the 2010-2011 school year.

## READING

| STUDENT GROUP | PARTICIPATION PERCENTAGE |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 0\% | TARGET | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 99\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 100\% | 73\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non-Hispanic | 99\% | 36\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Hispanic | 99\% | 47\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| White | 99\% | 90\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled ${ }^{1}$ | 97\% | 17\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English ${ }^{2}$ | 99\% | 42\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 99\% | 34\% | $\square$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $73.7 \%$ |  |

## MATHEMATICS

## STUDENT GROUP

PARTICIPATION
PERCENTAGE

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE

|  |  |  | target | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL STUDENTS | 99\% | 42\% |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 100\% | 82\% |  |  |
| Black / Non-Hispanic | 99\% | 33\% |  |  |
| Hispanic | 100\% | 53\% |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  |
| White | 99\% | 89\% |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled ${ }^{1}$ | 97\% | 19\% |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 100\% | 49\% |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 99\% | 34\% |  |  |
|  |  |  | 70.1\% |  |
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## SECONDARY SCHOOL RESULTS

Only students who were enrolled in the state for the full academic year are included in the AYP results. In the District of Columbia, a Full Academic Year is defined as being enrolled on the official enrollment day in October (October 5, or the first business day after October 5) AND being enrolled on the first day of the assessment window (generally late April) AND remaining enrolled for 85 percent of instructional days between the October date and the April date.

The percentage marker on the charts show the annual performance target set for the state for elementary schools in the 2010-2011 school year.

## READING

| STUDENT GROUP | PARTICIPATION PERCENTAGE |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 0\% | TARGET | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 95\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 98\% | 67\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non-Hispanic | 94\% | 38\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 97\% | 49\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native |  |  | \| |  |  |
| White | 97\% | 87\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled ${ }^{1}$ | 86\% | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English ${ }^{2}$ | 98\% | 31\% |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 95\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 71.8\% |  |

## MATHEMATICS

## STUDENT GROUP

PARTICIPATION PERCENTAGE

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS proficient and above

|  |  | $0 \%$ | TARGET | $100 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ALL STUDENTS | $94 \%$ | $46 \%$ |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | $98 \%$ | $86 \%$ |  |  |
| Black / Non-Hispanic | $93 \%$ | $40 \%$ |  |  |
| Hispanic | $97 \%$ | $52 \%$ |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  |
| White | $97 \%$ | $89 \%$ |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled ${ }^{1}$ | $86 \%$ | $15 \%$ |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | $98 \%$ | $45 \%$ |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $95 \%$ | $37 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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## ATTENDANCE/GRADUATION RATES

In addition to test score results for Reading and Mathematics, schools must meet a third indicator to make AYP: daily average attendance rates for elementary and middle schools, and graduation rates for high schools.

The daily average attendance rate target is $90 \%$ and the graduation target is $85 \%$. If a school or LEA does not meet the target, but demonstrates improvement of $1 \%$ from the previous year, they are considered to have made AYP for this indicator.


[^3]Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

## ALL GRADES READING - ELEMENTARY

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{gathered} \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 20\% | 38\% | 35\% | 8\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 19\% | 37\% | 37\% | 7\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 15\% | 38\% | 39\% | 9\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 14\% | 36\% | 40\% | 9\% | 49\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 25\% | 37\% | 32\% | 6\% | 38\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 24\% | 37\% | 33\% | 6\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 92\% | 7\% | 20\% | 54\% | 19\% | 73\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 4\% | 19\% | 54\% | 23\% | 77\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 23\% | 41\% | 32\% | 4\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 22\% | 40\% | 34\% | 4\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 16\% | 37\% | 39\% | 7\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 17\% | 38\% | 37\% | 7\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 2\% | 8\% | 55\% | 34\% | 90\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 2\% | 9\% | 55\% | 34\% | 89\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 55\% | 29\% | 9\% | 7\% | 16\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 54\% | 32\% | 9\% | 5\% | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 28\% | 46\% | 21\% | 5\% | 26\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 27\% | 47\% | 23\% | 2\% | 25\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 24\% | 42\% | 30\% | 4\% | 34\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 23\% | 41\% | 32\% | 4\% | 36\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

ALL GRADES READING - SECONDARY

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENTAND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 94\% | 19\% | 37\% | 31\% | 12\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 17\% | 41\% | 31\% | 11\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 95\% | 13\% | 37\% | 35\% | 15\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 96\% | 12\% | 41\% | 34\% | 13\% | 47\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 93\% | 25\% | 38\% | 28\% | 9\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 94\% | 22\% | 41\% | 28\% | 9\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 5\% | 28\% | 37\% | 29\% | 66\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 90\% | 4\% | 21\% | 45\% | 30\% | 76\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 94\% | 22\% | 40\% | 30\% | 8\% | 38\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 19\% | 44\% | 30\% | 7\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 92\% | 15\% | 38\% | 35\% | 12\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 94\% | 16\% | 45\% | 32\% | 7\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 0\% | 0\% | 60\% | 40\% | 100\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 3\% | 10\% | 37\% | 50\% | 87\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 4\% | 7\% | 36\% | 54\% | 90\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 86\% | 53\% | 35\% | 9\% | 3\% | 12\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 87\% | 48\% | 38\% | 10\% | 3\% | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 87\% | 28\% | 51\% | 15\% | 6\% | 21\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 88\% | 30\% | 55\% | 14\% | 2\% | 15\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 95\% | 23\% | 44\% | 27\% | 6\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 96\% | 19\% | 48\% | 28\% | 4\% | 32\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

## ALL GRADES MATHEMATICS - ELEMENTARY

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENTAND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 21\% | 37\% | 30\% | 12\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 21\% | 36\% | 33\% | 10\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 19\% | 37\% | 32\% | 12\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 18\% | 37\% | 34\% | 11\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 24\% | 37\% | 28\% | 12\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 23\% | 35\% | 32\% | 10\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 5\% | 15\% | 38\% | 42\% | 80\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 3\% | 16\% | 48\% | 34\% | 82\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 25\% | 42\% | 27\% | 6\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 24\% | 39\% | 31\% | 6\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 15\% | 34\% | 38\% | 13\% | 51\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 17\% | 36\% | 37\% | 10\% | 47\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 2\% | 10\% | 39\% | 49\% | 88\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 3\% | 10\% | 44\% | 44\% | 88\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 49\% | 34\% | 11\% | 6\% | 18\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 49\% | 33\% | 11\% | 6\% | 17\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 24\% | 42\% | 26\% | 8\% | 34\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 25\% | 43\% | 25\% | 6\% | 32\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 25\% | 42\% | 27\% | 6\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 24\% | 40\% | 30\% | 6\% | 36\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

ALL GRADES MATHEMATICS - SECONDARY


No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

Footnotes
Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

ALL GRADES SCIENCE - ELEMENTARY

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 27\% | 40\% | 26\% | 6\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 26\% | 39\% | 28\% | 7\% | 35\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 24\% | 41\% | 29\% | 6\% | 35\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 24\% | 40\% | 29\% | 6\% | 35\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 96\% | 29\% | 40\% | 24\% | 6\% | 31\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 28\% | 37\% | 28\% | 7\% | 35\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 8\% | 18\% | 51\% | 23\% | 74\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 5\% | 18\% | 44\% | 33\% | 77\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 32\% | 44\% | 22\% | 2\% | 24\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 30\% | 42\% | 25\% | 3\% | 28\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 18\% | 40\% | 38\% | 4\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 20\% | 37\% | 37\% | 6\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 3\% | 5\% | 43\% | 49\% | 92\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 1\% | 6\% | 45\% | 48\% | 93\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 94\% | 51\% | 36\% | 10\% | 3\% | 13\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 51\% | 36\% | 10\% | 4\% | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 33\% | 47\% | 17\% | 4\% | 20\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 31\% | 43\% | 22\% | 4\% | 26\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 31\% | 46\% | 22\% | 1\% | 23\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 31\% | 44\% | 24\% | 2\% | 26\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.
$3^{\text {RD }}$ GRADE READING

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENTAND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 23\% | 36\% | 37\% | 4\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 23\% | 34\% | 36\% | 7\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 18\% | 37\% | 41\% | 4\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 17\% | 33\% | 41\% | 9\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 29\% | 35\% | 32\% | 4\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 30\% | 34\% | 31\% | 5\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 95\% | 12\% | 22\% | 63\% | 3\% | 66\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 4\% | 19\% | 59\% | 18\% | 77\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 28\% | 40\% | 30\% | 2\% | 32\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 27\% | 37\% | 33\% | 4\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 96\% | 21\% | 40\% | 34\% | 5\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 24\% | 39\% | 32\% | 6\% | 38\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 3\% | 9\% | 73\% | 15\% | 88\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 2\% | 10\% | 57\% | 31\% | 87\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 59\% | 21\% | 13\% | 7\% | 19\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 66\% | 23\% | 7\% | 4\% | 11\% | I |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 93\% | 31\% | 45\% | 21\% | 4\% | 24\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 28\% | 45\% | 25\% | 2\% | 26\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 30\% | 40\% | 27\% | 3\% | 30\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 29\% | 38\% | 30\% | 4\% | 33\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

## $3^{\text {RD }}$ GRADE MATHEMATICS

| STUDENT GROUP | SCHOOL YEAR | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL¹ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENTAND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | below basic | BASIC | Proficient | advanced |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 24\% | 39\% | 24\% | 13\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 23\% | 38\% | 30\% | 9\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 21\% | 40\% | 26\% | 12\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 21\% | 38\% | 32\% | 9\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 28\% | 37\% | 22\% | 14\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 26\% | 37\% | 28\% | 9\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 7\% | 19\% | 41\% | 33\% | 74\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 0\% | 23\% | 50\% | 27\% | 77\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 31\% | 44\% | 20\% | 6\% | 25\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 27\% | 41\% | 27\% | 5\% | 32\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 17\% | 39\% | 30\% | 14\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 22\% | 41\% | 30\% | 6\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 3\% | 13\% | 37\% | 47\% | 85\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 3\% | 11\% | 48\% | 38\% | 86\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 53\% | 28\% | 12\% | 7\% | 19\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 53\% | 33\% | 11\% | 4\% | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 23\% | 44\% | 25\% | 8\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 26\% | 46\% | 24\% | 4\% | 28\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 30\% | 44\% | 19\% | 6\% | 26\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 28\% | 42\% | 25\% | 5\% | 30\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.
$4^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE READING

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 20\% | 35\% | 35\% | 10\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 19\% | 35\% | 38\% | 8\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 14\% | 37\% | 37\% | 12\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 14\% | 36\% | 40\% | 10\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 26\% | 33\% | 33\% | 8\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 23\% | 35\% | 36\% | 6\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 89\% | 4\% | 18\% | 48\% | 30\% | 78\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 5\% | 19\% | 54\% | 22\% | 76\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 24\% | 40\% | 32\% | 4\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 21\% | 39\% | 36\% | 4\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 18\% | 34\% | 40\% | 7\% | 47\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 18\% | 38\% | 38\% | 7\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 1\% | 7\% | 44\% | 47\% | 91\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 3\% | 8\% | 52\% | 37\% | 89\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 96\% | 58\% | 27\% | 10\% | 5\% | 14\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 55\% | 30\% | 11\% | 4\% | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English Proficient | 2010-2011 | 90\% | 30\% | 42\% | 24\% | 4\% | 28\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 92\% | 29\% | 44\% | 25\% | 2\% | 26\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 25\% | 41\% | 31\% | 4\% | 34\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 23\% | 41\% | 33\% | 4\% | 36\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.
$4^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE MATHEMATICS

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT OF } \\ & \text { STUDENTS } \\ & \text { TESTED } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | $\overline{\text { ADVANCED }}$ |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 20\% | 34\% | 34\% | 13\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 19\% | 34\% | 35\% | 11\% | 47\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 18\% | 34\% | 35\% | 13\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 17\% | 35\% | 35\% | 12\% | 47\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 23\% | 33\% | 32\% | 12\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 21\% | 33\% | 36\% | 10\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 2\% | 14\% | 39\% | 45\% | 84\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 4\% | 10\% | 49\% | 38\% | 86\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 25\% | 38\% | 31\% | 6\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 23\% | 37\% | 34\% | 6\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 14\% | 34\% | 40\% | 12\% | 52\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 14\% | 36\% | 39\% | 11\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 1\% | 7\% | 42\% | 50\% | 92\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 4\% | 9\% | 40\% | 48\% | 88\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 96\% | 48\% | 35\% | 13\% | 4\% | 17\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 49\% | 30\% | 14\% | 6\% | 20\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 22\% | 42\% | 28\% | 8\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 21\% | 43\% | 28\% | 8\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 25\% | 39\% | 30\% | 6\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 23\% | 38\% | 33\% | 6\% | 39\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in this grade take a science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP.
$5^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE READING

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT OF } \\ & \text { STUDENTS } \\ & \text { TESTED } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL¹ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 18\% | 37\% | 37\% | 9\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 16\% | 38\% | 39\% | 7\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 14\% | 35\% | 41\% | 10\% | 51\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 11\% | 37\% | 43\% | 8\% | 52\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 21\% | 39\% | 32\% | 8\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 21\% | 38\% | 35\% | 6\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 95\% | 1\% | 17\% | 54\% | 27\% | 81\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 0\% | 15\% | 58\% | 26\% | 85\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 20\% | 41\% | 34\% | 4\% | 38\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 19\% | 41\% | 36\% | 4\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 14\% | 36\% | 43\% | 7\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 11\% | 40\% | 42\% | 6\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 3\% | 6\% | 47\% | 45\% | 91\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 2\% | 7\% | 58\% | 33\% | 91\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 53\% | 31\% | 9\% | 6\% | 16\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 55\% | 33\% | 9\% | 4\% | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 94\% | 27\% | 49\% | 19\% | 6\% | 24\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 21\% | 53\% | 24\% | 2\% | 26\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 21\% | 43\% | 33\% | 3\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 19\% | 43\% | 34\% | 3\% | 38\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

Footnotes
Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in this grade take a science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP.

## $5^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE MATHEMATICS



No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

Footnotes
Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in this grade take a science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP.

## $5{ }^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE SCIENCE

| STUDENT GROUP | SCHOOL YEAR | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL¹ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT and ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | below basic | BASIC | PROFICIENT | advanced |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2010-2011 \\ & 2009-2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97 \% \\ & 99 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \% \\ & 21 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 42 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 27 \% \\ & 31 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & 7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \% \\ & 38 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98 \% \\ & 99 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 19 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43 \% \\ & 43 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \% \\ & 32 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & 7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \% \\ & 38 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Male | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & 2009-2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96 \% \\ & 99 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \% \\ & 24 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \% \\ & 39 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \% \\ & 30 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & 8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \% \\ & 37 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99 \% \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & 2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19\% } \\ & \text { 18\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51 \% \\ & 48 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \% \\ & 32 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \% \\ & 80 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97\% } \\ & 99 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \% \\ & 25 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \% \\ & 45 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23\% } \\ & 27 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & 3 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \% \\ & 30 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97\% } \\ & 99 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & 16 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \% \\ & 38 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & 5 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \% \\ & 44 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 2010-2011 } \\ \text { 2009-2010 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97 \% \\ 100 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & 1 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & 5 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \% \\ & 44 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & 49 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \% \\ & 94 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93 \% \\ & 99 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \% \\ & 47 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \% \\ & 10 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & 2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & 13 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English Proficient | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \% \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \% \\ & 25 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & 46 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \% \\ & 24 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & 4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \% \\ & \text { 28\% } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Migrant | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98 \% \\ & 99 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \% \\ & 26 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49 \% \\ & 47 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \% \\ & 25 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & 2 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \% \\ & 27 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

Footnotes
Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.
$6^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE READING

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | below basic | BASIC | PROFICIENT | $\overline{\text { ADVANCED }}$ |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 21\% | 38\% | 35\% | 7\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 19\% | 41\% | 33\% | 7\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 12\% | 39\% | 40\% | 9\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 12\% | 44\% | 36\% | 8\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 28\% | 36\% | 30\% | 6\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 25\% | 39\% | 30\% | 6\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 79\% | 0\% | 27\% | 50\% | 23\% | 73\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 91\% | 7\% | 26\% | 52\% | 14\% | 67\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 25\% | 42\% | 31\% | 2\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 22\% | 45\% | 30\% | 2\% | 32\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 94\% | 15\% | 41\% | 34\% | 9\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 13\% | 53\% | 29\% | 4\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 3\% | 13\% | 52\% | 32\% | 84\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 4\% | 5\% | 50\% | 41\% | 91\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 93\% | 56\% | 33\% | 8\% | 3\% | 11\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 57\% | 30\% | 10\% | 2\% | 12\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 82\% | 30\% | 39\% | 23\% | 8\% | 31\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 89\% | 27\% | 56\% | 13\% | 4\% | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 27\% | 46\% | 25\% | 2\% | 27\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 23\% | 50\% | 26\% | 1\% | 27\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.
$6^{\text {th }}$ GRADE MATHEMATICS

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | $\overline{\text { ADVANCED }}$ |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 20\% | 34\% | 29\% | 17\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 24\% | 35\% | 27\% | 14\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 16\% | 33\% | 33\% | 18\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 20\% | 35\% | 31\% | 14\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 23\% | 35\% | 26\% | 16\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 28\% | 35\% | 23\% | 13\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 3\% | 19\% | 38\% | 41\% | 78\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 13\% | 13\% | 24\% | 49\% | 73\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 24\% | 40\% | 28\% | 9\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 28\% | 40\% | 25\% | 7\% | 32\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 16\% | 28\% | 36\% | 19\% | 56\% |  | - |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 20\% | 39\% | 36\% | 6\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 5\% | 10\% | 28\% | 58\% | 85\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 7\% | 7\% | 31\% | 55\% | 86\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 94\% | 53\% | 37\% | 5\% | 5\% | 10\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 92\% | 63\% | 26\% | 8\% | 4\% | 11\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English Proficient | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 24\% | 38\% | 28\% | 11\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 31\% | 45\% | 19\% | 5\% | 24\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 26\% | 41\% | 26\% | 7\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 29\% | 42\% | 23\% | 6\% | 29\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.
$7^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE READING

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | below basic | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 15\% | 41\% | 30\% | 14\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 15\% | 42\% | 30\% | 13\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 10\% | 40\% | 34\% | 17\% | 51\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 10\% | 41\% | 34\% | 15\% | 49\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 20\% | 43\% | 26\% | 11\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 96\% | 20\% | 44\% | 26\% | 11\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 93\% | 8\% | 25\% | 38\% | 30\% | 68\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 75\% | 0\% | 9\% | 45\% | 45\% | 91\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 18\% | 45\% | 29\% | 8\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 16\% | 47\% | 29\% | 8\% | 37\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 95\% | 13\% | 42\% | 33\% | 12\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 16\% | 40\% | 35\% | 9\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 1\% | 8\% | 30\% | 61\% | 90\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 3\% | 9\% | 31\% | 57\% | 88\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 93\% | 47\% | 38\% | 9\% | 5\% | 14\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 41\% | 45\% | 9\% | 4\% | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 89\% | 24\% | 56\% | 11\% | 10\% | 20\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 77\% | 31\% | 52\% | 12\% | 4\% | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 18\% | 48\% | 28\% | 7\% | 34\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 17\% | 50\% | 28\% | 5\% | 33\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.
$7^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE MATHEMATICS

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL¹ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 20\% | 31\% | 35\% | 14\% | 49\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 25\% | 31\% | 33\% | 12\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 16\% | 29\% | 40\% | 15\% | 55\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 21\% | 31\% | 37\% | 11\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 24\% | 33\% | 31\% | 13\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 28\% | 31\% | 29\% | 12\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 2\% | 14\% | 40\% | 43\% | 83\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 5\% | 5\% | 41\% | 50\% | 91\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 23\% | 34\% | 36\% | 7\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 27\% | 34\% | 32\% | 7\% | 38\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 16\% | 36\% | 36\% | 12\% | 47\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 26\% | 28\% | 39\% | 7\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 99\% | 3\% | 5\% | 25\% | 67\% | 92\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 3\% | 8\% | 34\% | 55\% | 89\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 93\% | 53\% | 29\% | 12\% | 6\% | 18\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 95\% | 57\% | 29\% | 11\% | 3\% | 14\% | - |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 100\% | 18\% | 48\% | 25\% | 10\% | 34\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 40\% | 32\% | 15\% | 13\% | 28\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 23\% | 36\% | 34\% | 7\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 29\% | 36\% | 30\% | 5\% | 35\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in this grade take a science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP.

## $8^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE READING



No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

Footnotes
Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in this grade take a science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP.

## $8^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE MATHEMATICS

| STUDENT GROUP | SCHOOL YEAR | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL¹ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | below basic | BASIC | PRoFICIENT | advanced |  | 0\% 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2010-2011 \\ & 2009-2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 97 \% \\ & 97 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 25 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30 \% \\ & 34 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 40 \% \\ & 33 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \% \\ 8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & 2010-2011 \\ & 2009-2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97 \% \\ & 98 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \% \\ \text { 22\% } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \% \\ & 34 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \% \\ & 36 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \% \\ 8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \% \\ & 44 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Male | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97 \% \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \% \\ & 28 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \% \\ & 34 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \% \\ & 29 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \% \\ 9 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \% \\ & 38 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | $\begin{aligned} & 2010-2011 \\ & 2009-2010 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & 0 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \% \\ 8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \% \\ & 43 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & 49 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88 \% \\ & 92 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96 \% \\ & 96 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \% \\ & 28 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \% \\ & 37 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \% \\ & 31 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \% \\ & 4 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \% \\ & 35 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Hispanic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98\% } \\ & 99 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \% \\ & 23 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \% \\ & 33 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \% \\ & 38 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & 6 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & 44 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 2010-2011 } \\ \text { 2009-2010 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98 \% \\ & 98 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \% \\ & 8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & 8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & 35 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51 \% \\ & 50 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \% \\ & 85 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91\% } \\ & 91 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43 \% \\ & 52 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \% \\ & 34 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14\% } \\ & \text { 11\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & 2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17\% } \\ & \text { 14\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English Proficient | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99 \% \\ 100 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \% \\ & 31 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \% \\ & 39 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \% \\ & 23 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & 7 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36 \% \\ & 29 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Migrant | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-2011 } \\ & \text { 2009-2010 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97\% } \\ & 97 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \% \\ & 27 \% \end{aligned}$ | $35 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \% \\ & 29 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & 4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \% \\ & 33 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

Footnotes
Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in this grade take a science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP.
$8^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE SCIENCE

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT OF } \\ & \text { STUDENTS } \\ & \text { TESTED } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL¹ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 41\% | 26\% | 26\% | 7\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 49\% | 22\% | 22\% | 7\% | 29\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 92\% | 38\% | 28\% | 29\% | 5\% | 34\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 47\% | 24\% | 22\% | 6\% | 29\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 90\% | 43\% | 25\% | 24\% | 9\% | 32\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 51\% | 20\% | 22\% | 8\% | 29\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 14\% | 18\% | 45\% | 22\% | 67\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 15\% | 15\% | 38\% | 32\% | 70\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 89\% | 45\% | 29\% | 23\% | 3\% | 26\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 55\% | 22\% | 20\% | 3\% | 23\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 40\% | 27\% | 28\% | 5\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 44\% | 33\% | 20\% | 3\% | 23\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 95\% | 6\% | 6\% | 49\% | 39\% | 87\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 2\% | 2\% | 40\% | 56\% | 96\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 84\% | 68\% | 23\% | 6\% | 3\% | 9\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 77\% | 15\% | 4\% | 4\% | 7\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 96\% | 52\% | 34\% | 9\% | 5\% | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 61\% | 23\% | 14\% | 2\% | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \| |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 48\% | 32\% | 18\% | 2\% | 20\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 59\% | 23\% | 16\% | 2\% | 17\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

Footnotes
Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


## DC CAS Test Score Results

Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in high school take a Biology science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP, and depending on the year Biology is taken in high school, that is the grade in which the assessment is also taken.
$10^{\text {H }}$ GRADE READING

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT OF } \\ & \text { STUDENTS } \\ & \text { TESTED } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | beLow basic | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 89\% | 22\% | 34\% | 30\% | 13\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 90\% | 15\% | 41\% | 33\% | 11\% | 44\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 92\% | 17\% | 33\% | 34\% | 16\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 92\% | 11\% | 41\% | 36\% | 12\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 87\% | 28\% | 36\% | 26\% | 9\% | 36\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 88\% | 19\% | 42\% | 30\% | 10\% | 40\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 98\% | 5\% | 40\% | 24\% | 31\% | 55\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 3\% | 28\% | 48\% | 23\% | 70\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 88\% | 25\% | 36\% | 29\% | 9\% | 38\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 89\% | 16\% | 43\% | 33\% | 8\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 95\% | 12\% | 34\% | 40\% | 15\% | 54\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 97\% | 15\% | 46\% | 32\% | 7\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 92\% | 5\% | 7\% | 33\% | 55\% | 88\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 94\% | 2\% | 5\% | 37\% | 56\% | 92\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 74\% | 58\% | 32\% | 8\% | 1\% | 9\% | $\square$ |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 68\% | 46\% | 41\% | 11\% | 1\% | 12\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 24\% | 55\% | 16\% | 4\% | 20\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 28\% | 60\% | 11\% | 1\% | 12\% | - |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 25\% | 39\% | 29\% | 7\% | 35\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 94\% | 17\% | 47\% | 31\% | 6\% | 36\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


## DC CAS Test Score Results

Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in high school take a Biology science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP, and depending on the year Biology is taken in high school, that is the grade in which the assessment is also taken.
$10^{\text {H }}$ GRADE MATHEMATICS

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENT OF } \\ & \text { STUDENTS } \\ & \text { TESTED } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | beLow basic | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 89\% | 27\% | 34\% | 32\% | 7\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 90\% | 23\% | 34\% | 34\% | 9\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 24\% | 34\% | 35\% | 7\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 92\% | 20\% | 35\% | 36\% | 9\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 86\% | 31\% | 34\% | 28\% | 7\% | 35\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 88\% | 25\% | 34\% | 31\% | 10\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 96\% | 7\% | 11\% | 46\% | 35\% | 81\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 3\% | 18\% | 48\% | 33\% | 80\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 88\% | 31\% | 36\% | 30\% | 3\% | 33\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 89\% | 25\% | 36\% | 33\% | 6\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 94\% | 16\% | 35\% | 39\% | 10\% | 49\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 96\% | 17\% | 38\% | 39\% | 6\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 91\% | 3\% | 11\% | 44\% | 42\% | 86\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 94\% | 3\% | 5\% | 35\% | 57\% | 92\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 72\% | 63\% | 30\% | 7\% | 1\% | 8\% | $\square$ |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 67\% | 60\% | 30\% | 10\% | 1\% | 10\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 97\% | 29\% | 41\% | 24\% | 6\% | 30\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 98\% | 28\% | 48\% | 21\% | 3\% | 24\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 90\% | 32\% | 37\% | 28\% | 4\% | 31\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 93\% | 26\% | 39\% | 31\% | 5\% | 36\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

## Footnotes

Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


## DC CAS Test Score Results

Since 2006, the annual assessment system for the District of Columbia has been the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS), which is given in the spring of each year. The assessments are aligned to the District of Columbia Learning Standards.

In addition, students in high school take a Biology science assessment. Results in this content area do not count towards AYP, and depending on the year Biology is taken in high school, that is the grade in which the assessment is also taken.

2011 biology data were not available in time for the production of the 2010-2011 report card. The data displayed below are from 2010. OSSE will soon make 2011 biology data available at www.nclb.osse.dc.gov.

HIGH SCHOOL BIOLOGY

| STUDENT GROUP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTED | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS TESTED WHO SCORED IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL¹ |  |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PROFICIENT AND ABOVE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | BELOW BASIC | BASIC | PROFICIENT | ADVANCED |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| ALL STUDENTS | 2010-2011 | 64\% | 33\% | 22\% | 42\% | 3\% | 45\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 27\% | 28\% | 43\% | 3\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
| GENDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2010-2011 | 66\% | 29\% | 23\% | 45\% | 3\% | 48\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 24\% | 27\% | 46\% | 3\% | 49\% |  |  |  |
| Male | 2010-2011 | 63\% | 37\% | 22\% | 38\% | 3\% | 41\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 29\% | 29\% | 39\% | 3\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
| RACIAL/ETHNIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian / Pacific Islander | 2010-2011 | 82\% | 22\% | 22\% | 46\% | 10\% | 56\% |  | - |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 4\% | 20\% | 65\% | 12\% | 76\% |  |  |  |
| Black / Non Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 61\% | 35\% | 22\% | 41\% | 2\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 29\% | 29\% | 41\% | 1\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2010-2011 | 75\% | 31\% | 26\% | 40\% | 2\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 28\% | 29\% | 41\% | 2\% | 43\% |  |  |  |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2010-2011 | 89\% | 8\% | 9\% | 64\% | 19\% | 83\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 2\% | 2\% | 63\% | 34\% | 97\% |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | 2010-2011 | 58\% | 58\% | 25\% | 16\% | 0\% | 17\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 56\% | 31\% | 12\% | 1\% | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Limited English Proficient/Non English | 2010-2011 | 73\% | 44\% | 27\% | 27\% | 1\% | 29\% |  |  |  |
| Proficient | 2009-2010 | 100\% | 41\% | 37\% | 22\% | 0\% | 22\% |  |  |  |
| Migrant | 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2010-2011 | 61\% | 38\% | 24\% | 38\% | 1\% | 39\% |  |  |  |
|  | 2009-2010 | 99\% | 32\% | 31\% | 37\% | 0\% | 37\% |  |  |  |

No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.
Footnotes
' Due to rounding, percentages may not total $100 \%$.

## HOW DOES THIS GRADE COMPARE?

This chart shows the percentage of students proficient and above in this grade/subject across the LEA and state.


Federal law requires all public elementary and secondary school students to be taught by teachers who are certified as being "highly qualified," otherwise known as HQT - Highly Qualified Teacher. This means that DCPS teachers in the core academic areas (defined as: English, reading/language arts, math, science, foreign languages, civics/government/ economics, arts, history and geography) must hold a bachelor's degree, have full state certification and demonstrate subjectmatter competency.

CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE STATE LEVEL
PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES

| Core Classes Taught | TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSES |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES TAUGHT/ NOT TAUGHT BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Core classes taught in the District of Columbia | 10,837 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 9,043 \\ & 1,794 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \% \\ & 17 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Core classes taught at high poverty schools | 1,397 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 1,190 \\ 207 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85 \% \\ & 15 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Core classes taught at low poverty schools | 3,280 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 2,778 \\ 502 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 85 \% \\ 15 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |

CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE LEA LEVEL

| Core Classes Taught | TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSES |  |  | PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES TAUGHT/ NOT TAUGHT BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Core classes taught in District of Columbia Public | 6,666 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 5,071 \\ & 1,595 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \% \\ & 24 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Core classes taught at high poverty schools | 1,018 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 786 \\ & 232 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77 \% \\ & 23 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Core classes taught at low poverty schools | 2,315 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 1,828 \\ 487 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \% \\ & 21 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL
PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES
TOTAL NUMBER taught Not taught by highly SCHOOL NAME OF CLASSES

QUALIFIED TEACHERS

|  |  |  |  |  | 0\% 50\% | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aiton ES | 15 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 93 \% \\ 7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Amidon Bowen ES | 19 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95 \% \\ 5 \% \end{gathered}$ | E |  |
| Anacostia HS | 258 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 171 \\ 87 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \% \\ & 34 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Ballou HS | 265 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 243 \\ 22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92 \% \\ 8 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Ballou STAY | 76 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 59 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \% \\ & 22 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Bancroft ES | 18 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94 \% \\ 6 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |

CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

TOTAL NUMBER
SCHOOL NAME

|  |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barnard ES | 17 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \% \\ & 24 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Beers ES | 18 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Benjamin Banneker Academy HS | 87 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & 20 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Brent ES | 13 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Brightwood ES | 46 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 39 \\ 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 85\% } \\ & \text { 15\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Brookland at Bunker Hill ES | 28 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \% \\ & 21 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Browne EC | 31 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 30 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97 \% \\ 3 \% \end{array}$ | $\square$ |  |  |
| Bruce Monroe ES | 23 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 20 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87 \% \\ & 13 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Burroughs EC | 28 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 23 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82 \% \\ & 18 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Burrville ES | 17 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94 \% \\ 6 \% \end{array}$ | $\square$ |  |  |
| C W Harris ES | 11 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \% \\ & 27 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Cardozo HS | 264 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 209 \\ 55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \% \\ & 21 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Cleveland ES | 15 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 93 \% \\ 7 \% \end{array}$ | $\square$ |  |  |
| Columbia Heights EC | 291 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 231 \\ 60 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \% \\ & 21 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Cooke H D ES at K C Lewis | 19 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89 \% \\ 11 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Coolidge HS | 216 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 191 \\ 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88\% } \\ & \text { 12\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ |  |  |
| Davis ES | 8 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \% \\ & 25 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Deal MS | 84 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 62 \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74 \% \\ & 26 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Drew ES | 10 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & 20 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Dunbar HS | 213 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 134 \\ 79 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \% \\ & 37 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Eastern HS | 53 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \% \\ & 25 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Eaton ES | 16 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88\% } \\ & 13 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Eliot Hine MS | 50 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \% \\ & 40 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Ellington School of the Arts | 101 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & 20 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

## CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

| SCHOOL NAME | TOTAL NUMBER |
| :--- | :---: |
| OF CLASSES |  |

PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES TAUGHT/ NOT TAUGHT BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS


## CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL



PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES TAUGHT/ NOT TAUGHT BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

|  |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LaSalle Backus EC | 27 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \% \\ & 22 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Lafayette ES | 26 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 26 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Langdon EC | 36 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 29 \\ 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \% \\ & 19 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Leckie ES | 19 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \% \\ & 21 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Ludlow Taylor ES | 13 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 92 \% \\ 8 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Luke C Moore HS | 138 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \\ & 66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52 \% \\ & 48 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| M C Terrell ES | 13 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77\% } \\ & \text { 23\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| MacFarland MS Lincoln Hill Cluster | 31 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77 \% \\ & 23 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Malcolm X ES | 9 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mamie D Lee School | 2 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mann ES | 12 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Marie Reed ES | 16 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88\% } \\ & \text { 13\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Marshall EC | 9 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67\% } \\ & 33 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Maury ES | 13 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 92 \% \\ 8 \% \end{array}$ | $\square$ |  |  |
| McKinley Technology HS | 211 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 147 \\ 64 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \% \\ & 30 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Miner ES | 23 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 20 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87\% } \\ & \text { 13\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Moten ES at Wilkinson | 19 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84\% } \\ & \text { 16\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Murch ES | 21 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 20 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95 \% \\ 5 \% \end{array}$ | $\square$ |  |  |
| Nalle ES | 18 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89 \% \\ 11 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Noyes ES | 33 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 29 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88\% } \\ & \text { 12\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Orr ES | 13 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 92 \% \\ 8 \% \end{array}$ | - |  |  |
| Oyster Adams ES | 65 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \% \\ & 29 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Patterson ES | 22 | Taught by a HQT <br> Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95 \% \\ 5 \% \end{array}$ | - |  |  |
| Payne ES | 13 | Taught by a HQT Not Taught by a HQT | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |

CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL
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## CORE CLASSES TAUGHT AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL



PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES
SCHOOL NAME
OF CLASSES
TAUGHT/ NOT TAUGHT BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS


## TEACHER LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATIONS HELD AT THE LEA LEVEL${ }^{7}$

| DCPS | PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Teachers who possess a valid DC teaching license | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |  |
| Teachers who do not possess a valid DC teaching license ${ }^{\mathbf{8}}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ |  |

TEACHERS WHO DO NOT POSSESS A VALID DC TEACHING LICENSE AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

| SCHOOL NAME | PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Aiton ES | 5\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Amidon Bowen ES | 4\% | - |  |  |
| Anacostia HS | 23\% |  |  |  |
| Ballou HS | 5\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Ballou STAY | 12\% |  |  |  |
| Bancroft ES | 7\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Barnard ES | 9\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Beers ES | 3\% | - |  |  |
| Benjamin Banneker Academy HS | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Brent ES | 8\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Brightwood ES | 2\% | I |  |  |
| Brookland at Bunker Hill ES | 3\% | ! |  |  |
| Browne EC | 3\% | - |  |  |
| Bruce Monroe ES | 11\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Burroughs EC | 3\% | - |  |  |
| Burrville ES | 0\% | 1 |  |  |
| C W Harris ES | 20\% |  |  |  |

## Footnotes

${ }^{7}$ These figures only include DCPS teachers as DCPS is the only district mandated by state law to have licensed teachers.
${ }^{8}$ OSSE defines the data provided for teachers who do not possess a valid teaching license as including teachers holding emergency certification, those with expired licenses, and those with no license at all.

TEACHERS WHO DO NOT POSSESS A VALID DC TEACHING LICENSE AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

| SCHOOL NAME | PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Cardozo HS | 7\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Cleveland ES | 9\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Columbia Heights EC | 15\% |  |  |  |
| Cooke HDES at K C Lewis | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Coolidge HS | 0\% | I |  |  |
| Davis ES | 15\% |  |  |  |
| Deal MS | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Drew ES | 7\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Dunbar HS | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Eastern HS | 0\% | I |  |  |
| Eaton ES | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Eliot Hine MS | 8\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Ellington School of the Arts | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Emery ES | 17\% |  |  |  |
| Ferebee Hope ES | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Francis Stevens EC | 5\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Garfield ES | 0\% | \| |  |  |
| Garrison ES | 0\% | - |  |  |
| H D Woodson HS | 7\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Hamilton Center | 10\% | - |  |  |
| Hardy MS | 8\% | - |  |  |
| Hart MS | 29\% |  |  |  |
| Hearst ES | 8\% | $\square$ |  |  |

[^4]TEACHERS WHO DO NOT POSSESS A VALID DC TEACHING LICENSE AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

| SCHOOL NAME | PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Hendley ES | 4\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Houston ES | 5\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Hyde Addison ES | 0\% | \\| |  |  |
| Incarcerated Youth Program | 0\% | 1 |  |  |
| Janney ES | 5\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Jefferson MS | 15\% |  |  |  |
| Johnson John Hayden MS | 20\% |  |  |  |
| Kelly Miller MS | 24\% |  |  |  |
| Kenilworth ES | 22\% |  |  |  |
| Ketcham ES | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Key ES | 0\% | \| |  |  |
| Kimball ES | 13\% |  |  |  |
| King M L ES | 4\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Kramer MS | 36\% |  |  |  |
| LaSalle Backus EC | 7\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Lafayette ES | 0\% | 1 |  |  |
| Langdon EC | 7\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Leckie ES | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Ludlow Taylor ES | 10\% | - |  |  |
| Luke C Moore HS | 32\% |  |  |  |
| M C Terrell ES | 12\% | - |  |  |
| MacFarland MS Lincoln Hill Cluster | 10\% | - |  |  |
| Malcolm X ES | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |

[^5]TEACHERS WHO DO NOT POSSESS A VALID DC TEACHING LICENSE AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

| SCHOOL NAME | PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Mamie D Lee School | 6\% | ■ |  |  |
| Mann ES | 0\% | \| |  |  |
| Marie Reed ES | 10\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Marshall EC | 23\% |  |  |  |
| Maury ES | 14\% |  |  |  |
| McKinley Technology HS | 12\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Miner ES | 11\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Moten ES at Wilkinson | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Murch ES | 3\% | - |  |  |
| Nalle ES | 9\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Noyes ES | 10\% | I |  |  |
| Orr ES | 0\% | \| |  |  |
| Oyster Adams ES | 20\% |  |  |  |
| Patterson ES | 4\% | - |  |  |
| Payne ES | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Peabody ES | 0\% | 1 |  |  |
| Phelps Architecture Construction \& Engineering HS | 30\% |  |  |  |
| Plummer ES | 0\% | I |  |  |
| Powell ES Lincoln Hill Cluster | 4\% | - |  |  |
| Prospect LC | 11\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Randle Highlands ES | 8\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Raymond ES | 3\% | - |  |  |
| River Terrace ES | 0\% | 1 |  |  |

[^6]TEACHERS WHO DO NOT POSSESS A VALID DC TEACHING LICENSE AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

| SCHOOL NAME | PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Ron Brown MS | 15\% |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt HS | 2\% | I |  |  |
| Roosevelt STAY | 50\% |  |  |  |
| Ross ES | 0\% | 1 |  |  |
| Savoy ES | 10\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| School Without Walls HS | 4\% | ■ |  |  |
| Seaton ES | 0\% | I |  |  |
| Shaed Elementary School | 19\% |  |  |  |
| Sharpe Health School | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Shaw MS at Garnet Patterson | 16\% |  |  |  |
| Shepherd ES | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Simon ES | 14\% |  |  |  |
| Smothers ES | 9\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Sousa MS | 59\% |  |  |  |
| Spingarn HS | 22\% |  |  |  |
| Spingarn STAY | 45\% |  |  |  |
| Stanton ES | 28\% |  |  |  |
| Stoddert ES | 0\% | I |  |  |
| Stuart Hobson MS | 7\% | ■ |  |  |
| Takoma EC | 7\% | ■ |  |  |
| The Washington Metropolitan High School | 18\% |  |  |  |
| Thomas ES | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Thomson ES | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |

[^7]TEACHERS WHO DO NOT POSSESS A VALID DC TEACHING LICENSE AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

| SCHOOL NAME | PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% |
| Transition Academy at Shadd | 22\% |  |  |  |
| Truesdell EC | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Tubman ES | 0\% | I |  |  |
| Turner ES at Green | 10\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Tyler ES | 10\% | - |  |  |
| Walker Jones EC | 12\% |  |  |  |
| Watkins ES Capitol Hill Cluster | 6\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| West EC | 5\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Wheatley EC | 13\% |  |  |  |
| Whittier EC | 0\% | 1 |  |  |
| Wilson J O ES | 4\% | - |  |  |
| Winston EC | 5\% | $\square$ |  |  |
| Woodrow Wilson HS | 15\% |  |  |  |
| Woodson Academy @ Ron Brown | 13\% | - |  |  |

[^8]The District of Columbia identifies for school improvement any school that has not made AYP for two consecutive years. Schools are labeled: School Improvement Year 1 (SI Yr 1), School Improvement Year 2 (SI Yr 2), Corrective Action (CA), Restructuring Year 1 (RS Yr 1), and Restructuring Year 2 (RS Yr 2). An LEA must take corrective action for any school that has been in school improvement for three consecutive years.

## NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED: 106

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS: 80\%

| SCHOOL NAME |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

${ }^{1}$ Legend: E (Elementary), S (Secondary)

| SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL <br> NUMBER | STATUS | SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL <br> NUMBER | STATUS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moten ES at Wilkinson | 285 | RS YR2 | Truesdell EC | 327 | RS YR2 |
| Murch ES | 287 | SI YR1 | Tubman ES | 328 | RS YR2 |
| Nalle ES | 288 | RS YR2 | Turner ES at Green | 329 | SI YR1 |
| Noyes ES | 290 | SI YR1 | Tyler ES | 330 | SI YR1 |
| Orr ES | 291 | RS YR1 | Walker Jones EC | 332 | RS YR2 |
| Oyster Adams ES | 292 | SI YR2 | Watkins ES Capitol Hill Cluster | 333 | SI YR1 |
| Patterson ES | 294 | CA | West EC | 336 | RS YR1 |
| Payne ES | 295 | SI YR1 | Wheatley EC | 335 | RS YR2 |
| Plummer ES | 299 | RS YR2 | Whittier EC | 338 | CA |
| Powell ES Lincoln Hill Cluster | 300 | RS YR2 | Wilson J O ES | 339 | SI YR1 |
| Prospect LC | 486 | RS YR2 | Winston EC | 355 | RS YR2 |
| Randle Highlands ES | 316 | RS YR1 | Woodrow Wilson HS | 463 | RS YR2 |
| Raymond ES | 302 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| River Terrace ES | 304 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Ron Brown MS | 425 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt HS | 459 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Savoy ES | 307 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Seaton ES | 309 | RS YR1 |  |  |  |
| Shaed Elementary School | 311 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Shaw MS at Garnet Patterson | 432 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Shepherd ES | 313 | SI YR1 |  |  |  |
| Simon ES | 315 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Smothers ES | 322 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Sousa MS | 427 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Spingarn HS | 460 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Stanton ES | 319 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Stuart Hobson MS | 428 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Takoma EC | 324 | RS YR1 |  |  |  |
| The Washington Metropolitan High School | 474 | SI YR1 |  |  |  |
| Thomas ES | 325 | RS YR2 |  |  |  |
| Thomson ES | 326 | CA |  |  |  |
| Transition Academy at Shadd | 953 | SI YR1 |  |  |  |

If you are looking for additional information on public schools in the District of Columbia, please consider these online resources:

- Office of the State Superintendent of Education: www.osse.dc.gov
- GreatSchools:
www.greatschools.org/dc
- District of Columbia Public Schools:
www.dcps.dc.gov
- District of Columbia Public Charter School Board:
www.dcpubliccharter.com
- District of Columbia Public Charter School Directory:
www.dcpubliccharter.com/data/files/DC_Public_Charter_School_Listing.pdf
- District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) results:
www.nclb.osse.dc.gov
- FOCUS (Friends of Choice in Urban Schools) School Quality Database:
www.focusdc.org/data-center
In addition, paper copies of state, LEA, and school report cards are available for viewing in select locations of the D.C. Public Library. For branch locations, please visit www.dclibrary.org.


[^0]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{1}$ Beginning with report cards for the 2010-2011 school year, OSSE will report attendance/graduation rates based on disaggregated subgroups.
    ${ }^{2}$ Safe Harbor: If a school has a $10 \%$ or better improvement in scores from the previous year, but still does not meet the state target, they are considered to have made AYP.

[^1]:    Footnotes
    'Disabled: 214 students participated in the DC CAS Alternate Assessment.
    ${ }^{2}$ Limited English/Non English Proficient: 122 students in this subgroup were exempted from the reading test due to their arrival in the US in the last 12 months.

[^2]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{1}$ Disabled: 101 students participated in the DC CAS Alternate Assessment.
    ${ }^{2}$ Limited English/Non English Proficient: 86 students in this subgroup were exempted from the reading test due to their arrival in the US in the last 12 months.

[^3]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{1}$ Beginning with report cards for the 2010-2011 school year, OSSE will report attendance/graduation rates based on disaggregated subgroups.
    ${ }^{2}$ Graduation rate data for this subgroup is currently unavailable.

[^4]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{7}$ These figures only include DCPS teachers as DCPS is the only district mandated by state law to have licensed teachers.
    ${ }^{8}$ OSSE defines the data provided for teachers who do not possess a valid teaching license to be the same as teachers holding emergency/provisional certification.

[^5]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{7}$ These figures only include DCPS teachers as DCPS is the only district mandated by state law to have licensed teachers.
    ${ }^{8}$ OSSE defines the data provided for teachers who do not possess a valid teaching license to be the same as teachers holding emergency/provisional certification.

[^6]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{7}$ These figures only include DCPS teachers as DCPS is the only district mandated by state law to have licensed teachers.
    ${ }^{8}$ OSSE defines the data provided for teachers who do not possess a valid teaching license to be the same as teachers holding emergency/provisional certification.

[^7]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{7}$ These figures only include DCPS teachers as DCPS is the only district mandated by state law to have licensed teachers.
    ${ }^{8}$ OSSE defines the data provided for teachers who do not possess a valid teaching license to be the same as teachers holding emergency/provisional certification.

[^8]:    Footnotes
    ${ }^{7}$ These figures only include DCPS teachers as DCPS is the only district mandated by state law to have licensed teachers.
    ${ }^{8}$ OSSE defines the data provided for teachers who do not possess a valid teaching license to be the same as teachers holding emergency/provisional certification.

