## STUDENT ASSESSMENT IN SCARSDALE SCHOOLS

Scarsdale embraces the importance of student assessment. It is one of the three, integral facets of the teaching and learning cycle along with curriculum and instruction.

In terms of an organizing structure, the curriculum is written based on learning standards and desired student outcomes. It is the "what" we want students to learn. The teacher then delivers customized instruction to help students master the desired learning outcomes. This is "how" students learn content and develop deep, enduring understanding. Finally, the teacher assesses students to determine whether we were successful. While there are implications for individual students, the real purpose is to inform the teacher. If learning results are less than expected, the teacher uses the assessment data to adjust instruction to elicit more favorable results. Similarly, the assessment data may reveal a misalignment in the curriculum that needs revision. The three elements of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, then, work together to create an iterative learning cycle.

Curriculum: What do we want students to know and be able to do?
Instruction: How do we teach the curriculum?
Assessment: How do we measure student learning?


## PART I:

## Assessment Defined

This report contains information about two aspects of student assessment in the Scarsdale Schools: (1) Scarsdale's approach to student assessment, and (2) various assessment results.

Student assessment in the Scarsdale Schools includes both formal and informal classroom assessments and standardized testing. It is common for people to use "standardized testing" synonymously with "student assessment"; however, these are really not the same thing and do not serve the same purpose. Standardized testing is a snapshot in time of students performance on a given measure. Student assessment is much broader, encompassing a variety of ways to determine how students are progressing along a trajectory of learning over time.

In Scarsdale, student assessment includes authentically evaluating students' abilities, relative strengths and weaknesses, and their ability to apply knowledge to "the real world." It is an ongoing, iterative process in every classroom and critical to effective teaching and learning.

Standardized tests, on the other hand, provide summative and somewhat limited information that represent a single point in time. Although we don't place a lot of value on this for gauging individual student achievement, we recognize that it is important to view results over time and to include this, along with other performance indicators, in evaluating student, program, school, and District performance. Trend data particularly helps to inform our work as we engage in goal-setting and instructional decision-making for the future.

## Scarsdale Assessments

Scarsdale teachers evaluate student progress both informally and formally, providing an array of qualitative and quantitative feedback to students and parents.

## Purposes of Assessments

Assessment [OF] Learning: A summative measure of what a student has learned after instruction has ended, such as: unit test, mid-year exam, final exam.

Assessment [AS] Learning: An assessment is the learning activity, such as the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade Capstone project, an activity or project designed to also be a measure of learning. These are also known as performance assessments and typically include a scoring rubric.

Assessment [FOR] Learning: A formative measure of what the student already knows and does not know so the teacher may plan future instruction accordingly. Some examples include a pretest on multiplying fractions and the STAR Reading and Math Assessments used as a universal screeners in Kindergarten through 5th grades to identify struggling learners.

Assessment [FOR] access: Our students take entrance exams that may impact their access to Universities and Colleges.

## Types of Assessments

## Teacher Informal Assessment

Our teachers evaluate students informally on a daily basis, observing their responses to questions, noting classroom contributions and interactions with other peers, evaluating the complexity of discourse, and identifying gaps in knowledge or understanding. The teacher uses these informal observations such as Observations, Questioning, Discussion, Exit/Admit Slips, Learning/Response Logs, Graphic Organizers, Peer/Self Assessments, Practice Presentations, Visual Representations, and Kinesthetic Assessments. These tools are used to answer questions such as: "Are the students learning specific skills?," and "Have the students understood the concept I was trying to teach?" If the answer is "no," the teacher looks for another way to illuminate the skill or concept, either for the whole class, identified groups, or individual students. If the answer is "yes," then the teacher moves on to new material, content, and ideas.

## Teacher Formal Assessment (Non-Standardized)

Teachers augment informal student assessments with more formal measures. This affirms and deepens the teachers' understanding of their students' skills and knowledge both individually and collectively.

Teachers use many types of formal assessment, including quizzes, exams, papers, essay questions, projects, math problems, science labs, and art or performance pieces, to name a few. Although formal assessments often mean a single measure, this is not always the case. An alternative type of assessment evaluates students using a variety of indicators and sources of evidence over time, for example:

- Performance Assessment is a teacher's evaluation of the process students use to solve a problem or complete a project demonstrating their knowledge and skills, as well as the evaluation of the product they create.
- Portfolio Assessment involves teacher evaluation of a collection of samples of an individual student's work showing progress over time.


## Standardized Tests

A standardized test is one that is designed in such a way that the questions, conditions for administering, scoring procedures, and interpretations are consistent, and they are administered and scored in a predetermined, standard manner. When statistically valid and reliable, these allow students in Scarsdale to be compared with students regionally, statewide, and nationally. There are two types of standardized tests:

- Norm-referenced Tests (e.g., SATs): these provide a score that compares a student's performance to that of students in a sample of peers. The goal is to rank students as being better or worse than other students based on the notion that this is a bell-shaped curve distribution of ability among students.
- Criterion-referenced Tests (e.g. NYS Regents exams): these provide a score that compares a student's performance to specific standards, or formal definitions of content, regardless of the scores of other examinees. These may also be described as standards-based assessments. Criterion-referenced score interpretations are concerned solely with whether or not this particular student's answer is correct. Under criterion-referenced systems, it is possible for all students to pass the test, or for all students to fail the test.
- The current State tests for New York students in grades three through eight create a hybrid of these types causing major concerns about the accuracy and value of this data.

Most of the standardized tests we administer to our students in Scarsdale are required by State mandate. These tests serve a variety of compliance and regulatory purposes. Even so, we understand that they may provide some informative data for our use:

- For teachers, parents, and students: this data can provide insight on students' progress with basic skills and mastery or recall of subject area content.
- For teachers: this may help to identify students in need of additional support or who have some specific skill deficiencies.
- For administrators and teachers: collective student performance can provide insight on appropriate curriculum and instruction resources, sequencing of instructional units, and appropriate scaffolding and other supports that may be needed.
- For the broad school community: this data may demonstrate how Scarsdale students perform relative to students in the region, state, and nation.


## Limits of Standardized Tests

Caution must be used when interpreting standardized test scores. They should not be the sole evaluation of student achievement or an educational program because these tests are concerned only with certain basic skills and abilities and are not intended to measure total achievement for each subject and grade.

According to W. J. Popham (1999), uncritical use of standardized test scores to evaluate teacher and school performance is inappropriate because the students' scores are influenced by three things: what students learn in school, what students learn outside of school, and the students' innate intelligence. The school only has control over one of these three factors.

Value-added modeling (which is what our state tests purport to measure "teacher effectiveness") has been proposed to cope with this criticism by statistically controlling for innate ability and out-of-school contextual factors. In a value-added system of interpreting test scores, analysts estimate an expected score for each student, based on factors such as the student's own previous test scores, primary language, or socioeconomic status. The difference
between the student's expected score and actual score is presumed to be due primarily to the teacher's efforts. This results in student scores that have been mathematically altered through various algorithms further diluting individual and collective student scores.

Moreover, Education theorist, Bill Ayers (1993), has commented on the limitations of the standardized test saying, "Standardized tests can't measure initiative, creativity, imagination, conceptual thinking, curiosity, effort, irony, judgment, commitment, nuance, good will, ethical reflection, or a host of other valuable dispositions and attributes. What they can measure and count are isolated skills, specific facts and function, content knowledge, the least interesting and least significant aspects of learning."

Not only are these efforts often misplaced, but, "The overemphasis on standardized testing has caused considerable collateral damage in too many schools, including narrowing the curriculum, teaching to the test, reducing love of learning, pushing students out of school, driving excellent teachers out of the profession, and undermining school climate." (Board of Education, 2013.)

Therefore, as a district, we believe that the best assessment of a student's achievement is still classroom performance as judged by a teacher who sees the student's work in a variety of situations over the course of a school year.

## Part 2:

## Scarsdale's Approach to Student Assessment

## 1. What are our goals?

We are a District where virtually every graduate goes to college, so we aim to provide an exceptional academic preparation. A handful of our graduates go directly to career training or careers, sometimes in workshop settings.

To succeed and to lead after they leave us, our graduates should also possess certain related skills and abilities. Among the most important are initiative, perseverance, resourcefulness, inventiveness, and an ability to work with others.

We also believe it's important for our graduates to realize their potential in a full range of human endeavors, to become fulfilled, contributing human beings who learn throughout their lives.

## 2. How do we know if we're successful?

First, we look at the end results both in terms of college acceptances and on graduates' reports on their successes after they leave Scarsdale.

College acceptance results have always been excellent and have grown even stronger over the last two decades.

In 2019, $98 \%$ of graduates are attending college, $96 \%$ to 4 year colleges. $64 \%$ of graduates were accepted at colleges and universities ranked "most competitive" in the U.S. These statistics compare with $61 \%$ in 2010, and $57 \%$ in 2005.

We do not know of another comprehensive, non-selective, public school district whose students achieve stronger results.

Graduates are overwhelmingly positive about the quality of the academic preparation they received in Scarsdale.
In the most recent graduate survey conducted in 2019 by Futuristics Research, Inc., which surveyed the Classes of 2014, 2016 and 2018, $95.7 \%$ of graduates reported that they either felt better prepared ( $65 \%$ ) or as prepared ( $30.7 \%$ ) as other students at that college while $4.3 \%$ felt not as well prepared.

## Graduates also provided feedback about the quality of Scarsdale High School's preparation for their future in certain key areas.

When asked to rate how well Scarsdale High School prepared them for future responsibilities and learning skills, the highest ranked categories included preparation to think critically, preparation to persevere, preparation to successively use technology, and preparation to work collaboratively.

## SAT and AP Exams

Our students take Advanced Placement and SAT examinations in grades 11 and 12. Historically, Scarsdale's SAT results have been in the top 1\% of the top 1\% nationally. AP participation rates are not as high as in some comparable districts because Scarsdale does not have open enrollment in its college level high school courses. For the most part, these tests don't give us results that help us understand teaching and learning, but they do provide us an independent external benchmark, so we can understand how our students fare in relation to others. (See appendix p. 18-21)

## In 2018-19, the most meaningful SAT and AP results were as follows:

- Scarsdale's Mean Combined SAT Score Results continue to be the highest among comparable districts in our region.
- The percent of students receiving scores of $3,4,5$ on AP Exams is $95 \%$, which has been consistent. (see appendix p. 21)

In 2018-19, the most meaningful ACT results were as follows:

|  | English | Math | Reading | Science | Composite |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scarsdale <br> mean | 31.3 | 29.8 | 31 | 29.8 | 30.6 |
| NYS <br> mean | 24.1 | 24.1 | 25 | 24.4 | 24.5 |

## Scarsdale Common Assessments

In addition to the assessments individual teachers develop for use in their classes, we have systematically developed "common" assessments of student growth in each grade/department/subject (See appendix p. 3, 4, \& 6). In general, we are less interested in the numerical results of these measures than in the textured information they give us. It's how we understand what students are learning (or not) and how to improve curriculum and teaching.

In 2018-19, the five most important conclusions from these measures were:

- Students are strengthening their skills to collaborate to solve complex problems;
- Students are more apt to persevere when student choice is embedded in performance based assessments;
- Students benefit when teachers are able to monitor student progress closely and modify instruction immediately as needed;
- Students fosters deeper learning with timely feedback from assessments; and
- Students consistently demonstrate that the alignment of instruction to assessment is essential in measuring what is actually taught.

Again, the main value of these measures is that they help us to understand what our students are learning and how can continue to improve curriculum and teaching.

We also use some third party publishers' assessments, when they are appropriate and superior to measures we could produce on our own (e.g. STAR Assessment System, Lexia, and Fountas \& Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System).

## International Comparisons: Global Learning Alliance

The Global Learning Alliance (GLA) was co-founded in 2012 by the Scarsdale Public Schools, Teachers College at Columbia University, and Hwa Chong Institution (HCI) in Singapore .

Before that, in 2009, the Scarsdale Public Schools entered a partnership with a research team at Teachers College (TC) to explore what "world class" learning actually is. Prior to this endeavor, we could only speculate from our own anecdotal experience what the highest caliber student work in the world looks like, and how schools and teachers enable their students to produce it. To investigate this question in a systematic way, our research team identified core capacities that are important for students to acquire to be prepared for the challenges of the 21st century, and developed a research framework based on these capacities. Our interest in identifying global, exemplar student work led our TC research partners to arrange site visits to international schools that are acknowledged leaders in their countries, including Hwa Chong Institution.

The first GLA Summit hosted in Singapore in 2012 by HCI, brought together representatives from those schools and associated universities to consider the information and findings gathered by the TCt researchers, and to gauge the level of interest in continuing our association beyond that meeting. The Summit was a great success, with much information shared by the participants, and there was indeed an outpouring of interest to support a second GLA Summit, which took place in Scarsdale in
2014. At this event participants provided an update of their work in fostering students' core capacities. They also discussed developing a pilot assessment of students' ability to solve non-standard, complex, global problems in collaborative groups. The first such problem selected was "The Global Warming Challenge: Keeping global warming below $2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$." A review of the resulting global project was a highlight of the third GLA Summit in August, 2016, and is reflective of its theme: Educating Students for a Global Tomorrow. An overview, background, and list of participants in the GLA can be found in the Appendix pages 25-28.

In the summer of 2018, Scarsdale took part in the fourth GLA Summit in Helsinki, Finland. This Summit had two primary features. The first was to discuss the outcomes of the collaborative, cross cultural project-based learning research study on Wellness and Human Well-Being. A group of Scarsdale students partnered with students from Singapore and Finland to present research studies on student wellness with proposed recommendations. The second was to explore educational policies and practices from around the world with a close-up view of the Finnish school system. Finnish educational researcher Pasi Sahlberg was an inspiring keynote speaker. His talk was followed by presentations by Finnish educators on teacher training and best practices, tours of Finnish classrooms, a visit to the innovative project-based learning center Me and My City, and seminars facilitated by a panel of international educators.

The 2020 GLA is in the planning phase. Scarsdale and our university partner, Teachers College at Columbia University, with be hosting the GLA summit in April. Like last the meeting in Helsinki, a student collaborative research project will be at the center. The theme of student wellness will continue, this time with a focus on "Belonging." Our original GLA members will have student and teacher representation. In addition, it is anticipated that in 2020 they will be joined by representatives from Beijing and Stockholm. We look forward to welcoming this international group of learners and are excited by the opportunity to have wider Scarsdale District participation.

## Standardized Tests

We give standardized State assessments at each grade, 3-8, and in Regents courses at the High School. Testing results do not inform instruction as teachers get a score from the spring tests in the beginning of the next school year, too late to make any instructional changes. By then, students have moved on to new teachers.

Furthermore, the New York State assessments do not provide valuable information to allow districts to analyze trend lines because the State has changed the tests every few years. In fact, the 3-8 State tests were revised in 2010, 2013, and again in 2018.

Prior to the early 2000's, Scarsdale administered other standardized tests (Educational Records Bureau [ERB]) that were more useful for evaluating what individual students knew and could do, that provided superior information for possible adaptations in curriculum and teaching, and that enabled the District to compare performance with performance in a universe of high-performing public schools
and with selective independent schools. We discontinued use of these tests due to the number and intrusiveness of the State exams.

## The 2018-19 State test results confirmed previous conclusions:

- Overall, school-to-school differences in elementary students' scores were not significant
- As in past years, Middle School scores inconsistently predicted student High School performance on Regents examinations, which continued to be strong
- Overall, test scores were among the strongest in New York State and in the same range as those in a selected group of comparable districts

The most important information is that which is gathered by teachers daily in the classroom, and how that information is used to drive instruction. Testing results do not inform instruction as teachers get a score from the spring tests at the beginning of the next school year, too late to make any instructional changes. By then, students have moved on to new teachers.

## Non-Academic Areas

Finally, we use a number of measures to evaluate student achievement and/or growth in important non-academic areas. Of necessity, these are often proxy, as distinct from direct, measures. Data for the Class of 2018-2019:

- Percentage of total student enrollment involved in extracurricular activities other than athletics: approximately 75\%
- Percent participation in athletics: Fall (579/1552 [37.3\%]); Winter (448/1552 [28.9\%]); Spring (504/1552 [32.5\%]) = All three seasons without duplication (950/1552 [61.2\%]).


## Special Services

## Special Education

We also specifically evaluate the performance of Scarsdale students in our special education programs and have delivered extensive reports on the results in the past. For the present, however, we report that as a group, special education students in Scarsdale outperformed the average American student in the regular education population, and that career preparation/placement for those not pursuing a college education was strong.

## Academic Intervention Services (AIS) - Local Effort

Individual teachers monitor test score data for areas of concern with students. These students are brought to Child Study Team (CST) in each building where a group of professionals investigate all areas of a student's performance. Scarsdale's 2018-2019 AIS plan was approved by the School Board in October, 2018. The 2019-2020 version is currently being reviewed.

## Recent Articles
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The Test is Tricky: New York Times - Aug 10, 2015
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Standardized Testing in Scarsdale

| Test | TO EVALUATE | GRADE | TEST GIVEN | RESULTS AVAILABLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NYS Tests | ELA, Math Science | Grades 3-8 <br> Grades 4 \& 8 | April, May \& June | August |
| NYS Regents | Algebra, English, U.S. History \& Gov't., Global History, Living Environment | Grades 8-11 | August, January \& June | August, January \& June |
| *PSAT | Critical Reading \& Math | Primarily Grade 11 (with a few 10s) | October | December |
| *ACT or SAT | Critical Reading, <br> Math \& Writing | Grades 11-12 | Throughout the year | Two to four weeks after the student takes the test |
| *SAT Subject Tests | Academic Subjects | Grades 9-12 | Throughout the year | Two to four weeks after the student takes the test |
| *Advanced <br> Placement <br> Test (AP) | Academic Subjects | Grades 9-12 | Throughout the year | Two to four weeks after the student takes the test |
| **NYSESLAT | English Proficiency | K-12 | April-May | Late summer |
| **NYSITELL | English Proficiency Diagnostic for Course Placement | K-12 | Upon the ELL student's entry into the district | Shortly after completion of the exam |

[^0]Overview of K-5 Assessments

|  | ELA |  |  |  |  | MATH |  |  |  |  | SCIENCE |  | SOCIAL STUDIES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Narrative Assessments* | Informational <br> On Demand Assessment* | STAR <br> Reading | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NYS } \\ & \text { ELA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STAR } \\ & \text { Math } \end{aligned}$ | NYS <br> Math | 1st <br> Trimester | 2nd <br> Trimester | 3rd <br> Trimester |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall \& Spring |  | Spring | Sept. |  | Sept. |  | Nov. | March | June | Assessments are embeddedwithin the three Science 21Units |  |  |  |
| K |  |  |  | Jan. May |  | Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fall Assessment to be completed by end of second marking period. <br> Spring Assessment - June |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Nov. | March | June | Assessments a within the three Units | e embedded <br> Science 21 | Fall Assessment to completed by end of marking period. Spring Assessment | be f second - June |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | "Op <br> Nov <br> Dec. <br> Feb. <br> M | Style" Tas <br> - Numer <br> - Measure <br> - Multipli <br> ay - Fracti | asks ment ation ns | Assessments a within the three Units | e embedded <br> Science 21 | Fall Assessment to completed by end of marking period. Spring Assessment | be f second - June |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | April |  | May | Nov. |  | June | Assessments a within the four Units | e embedded <br> Science 21 | Fall Assessment to completed by end o marking period. Spring Assessment | be f first - June |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | April |  | May | Nov. | Jan - <br> Fractions <br> March - <br>  <br> Perimeter | June | Ecosystems \& Land \& Water (Embedded assessments throughout year) | NYS Science Perf May June Written June | Fall Explorers Asse be completed by the second marking per Spring Assessment | essment to end of riod. <br> - June |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | April |  | May |  | en Style" <br> an - Fracti <br> arch - Volu |  | Effervescent L and Mixtures Unit (use Proce | aunchers Unit nd Solutions ess Skills rubric | Fall Assessment to be completed by the end of the first marking period | Spring <br> Capstone <br> Project <br> April - <br> June |

[^1]SMS Overview of Grades 6-8 Assessments (Common/N.Y.S.)

|  | English |  |  | Math |  |  | Science |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 |
| September | pre-assessment benchmark |  | grammar pre-test | Inventory |  |  |  | Scientific Method Lab | Density Cube Lab |
| October | Character trait paragraph | Poetry (ongoing throughout the school year) | Literary essay (ongoing throughout the year) |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Periodic Table } \\ \text { Lab } \end{gathered}$ |
| November |  | Literary essay (ongoing throughout the year) |  |  |  |  | Scientific Method \& Measuremen Assessment |  |  |
| December |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Moon Phases |
| January | Writing about conflict (time of year varies by house) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mid-year assessment | Angle of Insolation lab |
| February |  |  | Shakespeare essay (time of year varies by house) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| March |  | Speech Unit | Speech Unit |  |  |  |  |  | Sling Psychrometer |
| April | theme essay NYS ELA | NYS ELA | NYS ELA |  |  |  |  | Flower Forensics Lab | Solar Home Stem Project |
| May |  |  |  | NYS Math | NYS Math | NYS Math |  | Natural Selection Simulation | NYS <br> Performance |
| June | Writing Benchmark <br> Speeches | Julius Caesar essay | 8th grade interdisciiplinary project <br> grammar post-test | Cumulative Assessment | Final Exam | Gr. 8 Final Exam Algebra Regents | Longitudinal trout observation | Final Exam | NYS Written <br> 8th grade end of the year project |

## SMS Overview of Grades 6 - 8 Assessments (Common/N.Y.S.)

|  | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| September | Inventory <br> Geography Project | NYHS - NY <br> History and Document Alanysis |  | Spanish 6 common diagnostic | Common Diagnostic | Common Diagnostic <br> Pobre Ana, <br> Pauvre Anne |
| October |  | Empire | Primary Source Document Analysis Skills | Sp 6 aural/oral <br> Fr 6 introductory topics | Sp 7 Chapter 3 <br> Fr 7 Chapter 1, 2 | Sp 8 Chapter 9 <br> Fr 8 Chapters 9, 10 |
| November | Human Rights Unit |  |  | Sp 6 Mini Unit 1 <br> Fr 6 Classroom and Useful expressions | Sp 7 Chapter 4 <br> Fr 7 Chapter 3 | Fr 8 Chapter 11 |
| December | Revolution "Debates" |  |  | Sp 6 Mini Unit 2 <br> Fr 6 Residence, Numbers, weather | Sp 7 Chapter 5 <br> Fr 7 Chapter 4 | Sp 8 Chapter 10 <br> Fr 8 Chapter 13 |
| January |  |  |  | Sp 6 Mini Unit 3 <br> Fr 6 Classroom, time, colors | Sp 7 Chapter 6 <br> Fr 7 Human Rights Project | Sp 8 Chapter 11 <br> Fr 8 Chapter 12, Human Rights project |
| February |  |  |  | Sp 6 Mini Unit 4 <br> Fr 6 Café and Jardin | Sp 7 Capítulo Puente <br> Fr 7 Chapter 5, Country Project | Sp 8 Chapter 12, Madrid Project Fr 8 Chapter 17 |
| March | Presidential <br> Powers DBQ |  |  | Sp 6 Mini Units 5,6 <br> Fr 6 Shopping and the market | Sp 7 Chapter 7, Country Project <br> Fr 7 Chapter 6 | Sp 8 Unidad 1 Etapa 1 , Sp 8 Unidad 1 Etapa 2 Fr 8 Chapter 14, Paris Project |
| April |  |  |  | Sp 6 Mini Unit 7 <br> Fr 6 Sports |  | Sp 8 Unidad 1 Etapa 3 <br> Fr 8 Chapter 15 |
| May | Current Events Assessment |  | Research Project and Annotated Bibliography | Sp 6 Mini Unit 8 <br> Fr 6 Likes and Dislikes | Sp 7 Chapter 8 <br> Fr 7 Chapter 8 | Sp 8 Intro to Imperfect. <br> Fr 8 Chapter 16, 17 Fr 8 Chapter 18 |
| June | Inventory <br> Ideal Civilization Project | Civil War Museum | 8th grade end of the year project | Aural/Oral Assessment | Final Exam | Final Exam |

## Scarsdale High School Common Assessments, 2019-2020

Members of each department at Scarsdale High School work together to establish common course goals, devise approaches to teaching material, and create final assessments. The following table identifies each department's common assessments.

## Arts

Ninth grade art classes participate in a museum project where students visit a museum of their choosing from a department list and a required final art project, which is posted on Schoolwires.

## English

Ninth grade: Shakespeare Festival; essays of literary analysis
Tenth grade: essays of literary analysis; digital argumentation
Eleventh grade: literary research paper; essays of literary analysis; New York State Regents Exam
Twelfth grade: research paper; essays of literary analysis

## Health

Two common assessments in the Health 10 course include a current events assessment and the Health Fair.

The current events assessment is the first major task of the quarter when students choose two different health topics and conduct an in-depth investigation by researching and analyzing reliable current events articles. As consumers, students need to decipher what information is truthful and what is not.

The Health 10 course concludes with the Health Fair, which includes small group research projects (various topics \& current trends) culminating with multigenre presentations. This experience is an application of several developmental personal and social skills which, when mastered, enable our students to enhance their personal, family, and community health and safety.

## Mathematics

Grades 9-12: At monthly course meetings, teachers share lessons, unit tests and quarterly tests with each other, so the assessments are not exactly the same, but the formats and questions are similar. Each course culminates in a common final exam.

AT Statistics: Juniors in AT Statistics do a year-end project for which the requirements and grading rubric are common to all sections of the course. The students formulate and analyze a research question using the Adolescent Heath Database from the University of North Carolina Population Center. This project is funded by the National Science Foundation, and students use Google Hangouts to communicate with Wesleyan University students who help students to learn the software program "R" and develop techniques for analyzing their data. This project is in addition to a common final exam.

## Performing Arts

Assessments for performing ensembles include individual evaluations of prepared selections, live or recorded performances, and winter and spring concerts or performances. In academic music classes, such as AT Music Theory, Digital Music, and Music Appreciation, final assessments include the composition of a piece with set criteria, music for a film clip or make presentations in which they connect aural and multi-media materials to an issue, style, or concept.

## Physical Education

During each quarter students participate in skills performance assessments, often in both of the two units that are covered. Assessments can be live action viewing, video playback self-assessment, peer-assessment, or teacher-assessment. Each has its own rubric. A quarterly cognitive assessment piece takes the form of either a formal written test or a variety of writing assignments developed by the department (i.e., a review of a fitness-based app, a self-designed workout plan for a specific fitness goal, etc.).

## Science

All ninth-graders take the New York State Living Environment Regents exam. Chemistry 513 students take the New York State Chemistry Regents exam. All other students take a local final exam that grows out of collaborations among teachers of each course. Environmental Science concludes with presentations of research or culminating projects.

## Social Studies

Ninth Grade World History: Cumulative 9th grade final assessment

## Tenth Grade World History

- multi-step, process-oriented research paper project
- New York State Regents Exam in Global History

Eleventh Grade

- multi-step, process-oriented research paper project
- New York State Regents Exam in United States History

Twelfth Grade

- multi-step, process-oriented research paper project

Advanced Topics courses

- Advanced Topics U.S. History, Advanced Topics U.S. Constitutional Law, Advanced Topics American Government, Advanced Topics International Politics, Advanced Topics Macroeconomics: common final exam in each course
- Advanced Topics Psychology: multi-step, process-oriented research project/study


## World Languages

Common assessments in World Languages are designed by the teachers within each course team (e.g., Spanish 323, French 344, etc.). All common assessments evaluate the four skills of language. In Spanish AT Language \& Culture, a portfolio of student work serves as the final assessment.

| ELA | NYS ELA Proficiency Rate (Level 3 and 4) 2010-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Historical Comparison of Scarsdale's Proficiency Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 78\% | 88\% | 87\% | 64\% | 70\% | 58\% | 87\% | 87\% | 88\% | 91\% |
| 4 | 85\% | 89\% | 87\% | 66\% | 55\% | 70\% | 83\% | 78\% | 89\% | 87\% |
| 5 | 81\% | 82\% | 90\% | 73\% | 69\% | 55\% | 71\% | 74\% | 84\% | 82\% |
| 6 | 86\% | 87\% | 88\% | 74\% | 60\% | 63\% | 56\% | 65\% | 88\% | 86\% |
| 7 | 87\% | 88\% | 85\% | 67\% | 64\% | 65\% | 66\% | 67\% | 82\% | 79\% |
| 8 | 88\% | 87\% | 88\% | 70\% | 75\% | 72\% | 80\% | 74\% | 71\% | 86\% |
| Avg 3-8 | 84\% | 87\% | 87\% | 69\% | 66\% | 64\% | 74\% | 74\% | 84\% | 85\% |
| Edgewood |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 85\% | 96\% | 77\% | 66\% | 62\% | 65\% | 83\% | 88\% | 89\% | 94\% |
| 4 | 86\% | 91\% | 85\% | 63\% | 51\% | 62\% | 84\% | 76\% | 88\% | 90\% |
| 5 | 72\% | 77\% | 91\% | 65\% | 66\% | 59\% | 63\% | 67\% | 89\% | 81\% |
| Avg | 81\% | 88\% | 84\% | 65\% | 60\% | 62\% | 77\% | 77\% | 88\% | 88\% |
| Fox Meadow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 79\% | 92\% | 93\% | 59\% | 65\% | 52\% | 96\% | 90\% | 89\% | 90\% |
| 4 | 91\% | 93\% | 97\% | 73\% | 46\% | 69\% | 84\% | 77\% | 94\% | 85\% |
| 5 | 83\% | 90\% | 90\% | 80\% | 72\% | 45\% | 67\% | 63\% | 84\% | 87\% |
| Avg | 85\% | 92\% | 93\% | 71\% | 61\% | 56\% | 82\% | 77\% | 89\% | 87\% |
| Greenacres |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 88\% | 93\% | 89\% | 71\% | 63\% | 46\% | 74\% | 87\% | 78\% | 94\% |
| 4 | 77\% | 96\% | 86\% | 75\% | 50\% | 77\% | 78\% | 72\% | 88\% | 87\% |
| 5 | 90\% | 72\% | 94\% | 77\% | 79\% | 60\% | 80\% | 73\% | 85\% | 75\% |
| Avg | 85\% | 87\% | 90\% | 74\% | 64\% | 61\% | 77\% | 77\% | 84\% | 85\% |
| Heathcote |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 67\% | 78\% | 86\% | 58\% | 76\% | 63\% | 100\% | 84\% | 94\% | 89\% |
| 4 | 84\% | 77\% | 88\% | 59\% | 72\% | 74\% | 78\% | 95\% | 83\% | 85\% |
| 5 | 78\% | 85\% | 82\% | 70\% | 71\% | 60\% | 72\% | 86\% | 87\% | 86\% |
| Avg | 76\% | 80\% | 85\% | 62\% | 73\% | 66\% | 83\% | 88\% | 87\% | 87\% |
| Quaker Ridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 70\% | 81\% | 88\% | 65\% | 82\% | 68\% | 82\% | 87\% | 89\% | 91\% |
| 4 | 86\% | 90\% | 80\% | 59\% | 55\% | 70\% | 91\% | 77\% | 92\% | 89\% |
| 5 | 86\% | 83\% | 92\% | 72\% | 56\% | 57\% | 71\% | 81\% | 78\% | 80\% |
| Avg | 80\% | 85\% | 87\% | 65\% | 64\% | 65\% | 81\% | 81\% | 86\% | 87\% |
| Middle School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 6 | 86\% | 87\% | 88\% | 74\% | 60\% | 63\% | 56\% | 65\% | 88\% | 86\% |
| 7 | 88\% | 88\% | 85\% | 67\% | 64\% | 65\% | 66\% | 67\% | 82\% | 79\% |
| 8 | 88\% | 87\% | 88\% | 70\% | 75\% | 72\% | 80\% | 74\% | 72\% | 86\% |
| Avg | 87\% | 87\% | 87\% | 70\% | 66\% | 67\% | 67\% | 69\% | 81\% | 84\% |


| Math | NYS MATH Proficiency Rate (Level 3 and 4) 2010-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Historical Comparison of Scarsdale's Proficiency Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 83\% | 91\% | 89\% | 65\% | 78\% | 72\% | 83\% | 89\% | 92\% | 92\% |
| 4 | 93\% | 92\% | 95\% | 75\% | 73\% | 80\% | 84\% | 86\% | 92\% | 90\% |
| 5 | 87\% | 93\% | 95\% | 69\% | 79\% | 73\% | 80\% | 83\% | 88\% | 90\% |
| 6 | 83\% | 89\% | 92\% | 75\% | 73\% | 80\% | 76\% | 83\% | 88\% | 86\% |
| 7 | 78\% | 90\% | 94\% | 63\% | 68\% | 73\% | 78\% | 78\% | 88\% | 85\% |
| 8 | 80\% | 92\% | 95\% | 61\% | 59\% | 71\% | 81\% | 74\% | 79\% | 86\% |
| Avg 3-8 | 84\% | 91\% | 93\% | 68\% | 72\% | 75\% | 80\% | 82\% | 88\% | 88\% |
| Edgewood |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 94\% | 92\% | 86\% | 75\% | 78\% | 72\% | 77\% | 89\% | 95\% | 91\% |
| 4 | 97\% | 94\% | 98\% | 64\% | 76\% | 81\% | 82\% | 91\% | 96\% | 94\% |
| 5 | 92\% | 95\% | 99\% | 70\% | 72\% | 74\% | 79\% | 77\% | 86\% | 95\% |
| Avg | 95\% | 94\% | 94\% | 70\% | 75\% | 76\% | 79\% | 86\% | 93\% | 93\% |
| Fox Meadow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 94\% | 92\% | 86\% | 75\% | 78\% | 72\% | 97\% | 94\% | 93\% | 94\% |
| 4 | 97\% | 94\% | 98\% | 64\% | 76\% | 81\% | 89\% | 83\% | 98\% | 88\% |
| 5 | 92\% | 95\% | 99\% | 70\% | 72\% | 74\% | 79\% | 83\% | 93\% | 90\% |
| Avg | 95\% | 94\% | 94\% | 70\% | 75\% | 76\% | 88\% | 87\% | 94\% | 91\% |
| Greenacres |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 89\% | 93\% | 90\% | 66\% | 68\% | 69\% | 67\% | 85\% | 85\% | 92\% |
| 4 | 85\% | 97\% | 97\% | 89\% | 74\% | 94\% | 80\% | 82\% | 88\% | 87\% |
| 5 | 87\% | 84\% | 97\% | 77\% | 91\% | 82\% | 88\% | 81\% | 90\% | 84\% |
| Avg | 87\% | 91\% | 95\% | 77\% | 78\% | 82\% | 78\% | 83\% | 88\% | 88\% |
| Heathcote |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 65\% | 89\% | 94\% | 60\% | 86\% | 64\% | 89\% | 81\% | 95\% | 95\% |
| 4 | 93\% | 77\% | 91\% | 79\% | 74\% | 78\% | 80\% | 88\% | 84\% | 93\% |
| 5 | 84\% | 94\% | 87\% | 68\% | 78\% | 74\% | 78\% | 89\% | 88\% | 89\% |
| Avg | 81\% | 87\% | 91\% | 69\% | 79\% | 72\% | 82\% | 85\% | 89\% | 92\% |
| Quaker Ridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 3 | 74\% | 83\% | 83\% | 57\% | 81\% | 81\% | 85\% | 97\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| 4 | 94\% | 96\% | 93\% | 69\% | 78\% | 77\% | 91\% | 88\% | 92\% | 90\% |
| 5 | 82\% | 95\% | 93\% | 56\% | 65\% | 78\% | 75\% | 85\% | 86\% | 90\% |
| Avg | 83\% | 91\% | 90\% | 61\% | 75\% | 78\% | 83\% | 89\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| Middle School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 6 | 83\% | 89\% | 92\% | 75\% | 73\% | 80\% | 76\% | 83\% | 88\% | 86\% |
| 7 | 78\% | 90\% | 94\% | 63\% | 68\% | 73\% | 78\% | 78\% | 88\% | 85\% |
| 8 | 80\% | 93\% | 95\% | 61\% | 59\% | 71\% | 81\% | 74\% | 80\% | 86\% |
| Avg | 80\% | 91\% | 94\% | 66\% | 67\% | 75\% | 79\% | 78\% | 85\% | 86\% |

Percent Proficient (Level 3 and 4)


Percent Proficient (Level 3 and 4)

| Middle School ELA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 ELA Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | Scarsdale | Bronxville | Chappaqua | Edgemont | Great <br> Neck | Byram Hills | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rye } \\ & \text { City } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Ardsley | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Blind Brook- } \\ \text { Rye }\end{array}$ <br> 73 | Mam'k |
| 6 | 86 | 88 | 83 | 88 | 79 | 83 | 78 | 78 | 73 | 71 |
| 7 | 79 | 76 | 77 | 68 | 80 | 71 | 74 | 66 | 69 | 62 |
| 8 | 86 | 86 | 85 | 84 | 83 | 84 | 75 | 81 | 77 | 66 |
| avg 6-8 | 84 | 84 | 82 | 80 | 80 | 79 | 76 | 75 | 73 | 66 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 ELA Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | $\begin{gathered} \text { Byram } \\ \text { Hills } \end{gathered}$ | Chappaqua | Edgemont | Scarsdale | Great <br> Neck | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Bronxvill } \\ \text { e } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rye } \\ & \text { City } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Mam'k | Ardsley | $\qquad$ |
| 6 | 90 | 88 | 87 | 88 | 82 | 89 | 80 | 74 | 73 | 85 |
| 7 | 81 | 78 | 79 | 82 | 74 | 74 | 70 | 68 | 67 | 60 |
| 8 | 83 | 81 | 76 | 71 | 79 | 70 | 71 | 76 | 72 | 52 |
| avg 6-8 | 85 | 83 | 81 | 80 | 79 | 77 | 74 | 72 | 71 | 66 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 ELA Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | Byram <br> Hills | Chappaqua | Great <br> Neck | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rye } \\ & \text { City } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Bronxville | Scarsdals | Ardsley | Edgemont | Mam'k | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Blind Brook- } \\ \text { Rye } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 | 70 | 69 | 63 | 60 | 65 | 65 | 62 | 72 | 51 | 35 |
| 7 | 80 | 80 | 75 | 75 | 68 | 67 | 74 | 71 | 73 | 58 |
| 8 | 73 | 76 | 83 | 81 | 80 | 74 | 68 | 68 | 65 | 65 |
| avg 6-8 | 75 | 75 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 63 | 51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 ELA Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | Byram Hills | Edgemont | Great <br> Neck | Chappaqua | Bronxville | Scarsdals | Ardsley | Mam'k | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rye } \\ & \text { City } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Blind BrookRye |
| 6 | 87 | 69 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 56 | 69 | 64 | 62 | 52 |
| 7 | 71 | 63 | 73 | 69 | 66 | 66 | 60 | 65 | 62 | 59 |
| 8 | 67 | 83 | 80 | 80 | 74 | 80 | 73 | 65 | 68 | 56 |
| avg 6-8 | 75 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 65 | 64 | 56 |

2015 ELA Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Byram <br> Hills | Chappaqua | Scarsdale | Bronxville | Rye <br> City | Great <br> Neck | Edgemont | Mam'k | Ardsley | Blind BrookRye |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 76 | 58 | 63 | 68 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 57 | 58 | 49 |
| 7 | 56 | 68 | 65 | 62 | 66 | 66 | 70 | 60 | 45 | 46 |
| 8 | 83 | 77 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 58 | 68 | 57 | 62 |
| avg 6-8 | 72 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 | 64 | 62 | 53 | 52 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 ELA Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | Bronxville | Chappaqua | Scarsdale | Rye City | Byram Hills | Mam'k | Edgemont | Great <br> Neck | Ardsley | Blind Brook- <br> Rye |
| 6 | n/a | 75 | 60 | 62 | 67 | 57 | 68 | 54 | 46 | 37 |
| 7 | 67 | 73 | 63 | 66 | 57 | 65 | 58 | 54 | 56 | 39 |
| 8 | 74 | 65 | 75 | 71 | 72 | 64 | 59 | 63 | 68 | 68 |
| avg 6-8 | 71 | 71 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 62 | 62 | 57 | 57 | 48 |

Percent Proficient (Level 3 and 4)

| Elementary MATH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | Scarsdale | Bronxville | Edgemont | Great <br> Neck | Blind Brook Rye | Chappaqua | Byram Hills | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rye } \\ & \text { City } \end{aligned}$ | Ardsley | Mam'k |
| 3 | 92 | 89 | 91 | 85 | 85 | 84 | 82 | 75 | 75 | 78 |
| 4 | 90 | 89 | 80 | 83 | 80 | 85 | 89 | 85 | 70 | 74 |
| 5 | 90 | 86 | 81 | 85 | 78 | 81 | 72 | 75 | 71 | 66 |
| Avg | 91 | 88 | 84 | 84 | 81 | 83 | 81 | 78 | 72 | 73 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | Scarsdale | Bronxville | Blind Brook-Rye | Chappaqua | Great <br> Neck | Edgemont | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rye } \\ & \text { City } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Byram <br> Hills | Ardsley | Mam'k |
| 3 | 92 | 87 | 87 | 85 | 79 | 85 | 83 | 85 | 79 | 79 |
| 4 | 92 | 88 | 81 | 80 | 82 | 72 | 80 | 69 | 66 | 66 |
| 5 | 88 | 90 | 77 | 77 | 81 | 83 | 78 | 75 | 80 | 74 |
| Avg | 91 | 88 | 82 | 81 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 76 | 75 | 73 |

2017 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Bronxville Scarsdale | Blind <br> Brook-Rye | Great <br> Neck | Edgemont | Chappaqua | Rye <br> City | Ardsley | Byram <br> Hills | Mam'k |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 85 | 89 | 87 | 81 | 82 | 82 | 74 | 69 | 68 | 66 |
| 4 | 94 | 86 | 79 | 77 | 76 | 81 | 70 | 65 | 71 | 66 |
| 5 | 83 | 83 | 81 | 86 | 81 | 70 | 74 | 75 | 70 | 74 |
| Avg | 88 | 86 | 82 | 81 | 80 | 78 | 73 | 70 | 70 | 68 |


| 2016 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gr | Bronxville | Scarsdale | Great Neck | Edgemont | Blind Brook Rye | Chappaqua | Mam'k | Byram Hills | Ardsley | Rye City |
| 3 | 87 | 83 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 74 | 70 | 63 | 69 | 65 |
| 4 | 85 | 84 | 87 | 80 | 79 | 75 | 75 | 78 | 66 | 66 |
| 5 | 82 | 79 | 79 | 83 | 61 | 71 | 67 | 70 | 71 | 74 |
| Avg | 85 | 82 | 82 | 81 | 74 | 73 | 71 | 70 | 69 | 68 |

## 2015 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Bronxville | Edgemont | Great <br> Neck | Scarsdale | Blind Brook <br> Rye | Chappaqua | Byram <br> Hills | Mam'k | Rye <br> City | Ardsley |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 81 | 78 | 77 | 72 | 77 | 71 | 74 | 71 | 56 | 66 |
| 4 | 84 | 83 | 74 | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | 70 | 74 | 74 | 70 | 78 | 65 |
| 5 | 71 | 71 | 77 | 73 | 78 | 76 | 68 | 75 | 67 | 68 |
| Avg | 79 | 77 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 72 | 72 | 67 | 66 |

## 2014 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Bronxville Scarsdale | Edgemont | Great Neck | Mam'k | Chappaqua | Byram <br> Hills | Blind Brook- <br> Rye | Rye <br> City | Ardsley |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 89 | 79 | 77 | 70 | 73 | 75 | 76 | 74 | 66 | 63 |
| 4 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 74 | 66 | 72 | 59 | 53 |
| 5 | 78 | 79 | 72 | 76 | 73 | 68 | 73 | 68 | 74 | 76 |
| Avg | 80 | 77 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 66 | 64 |

Percent Proficient (Level 3 and 4)
Middle School MATH
2019 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Chappaqua | Edgemont | Scarsdale | Byram <br> Hills | Bronxville | Blind Brook- <br> Rye | Great <br> Neck | Ardsley | Rye <br> City |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 92 | 95 | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | 85 | 84 | 76 | 80 | 73 | 71 |
| 7 | 84 | 79 | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | 87 | 85 | 71 | 84 | 75 | 78 |
| 8 | 88 | 87 | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | 78 | 77 | 86 | 59 | 74 | 62 |
| avg 6-8 | 88 | 87 | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | 84 | 82 | 78 | 78 | 74 | 70 |

## 2018 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Chappaqua Scarsdale | Edgemont | Blind Brook- <br> Rye | Byram <br> Hills | Great <br> Neck | Rye <br> City | Bronxville | Ardsley |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 88 | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | 90 | 80 | 87 | 85 | 78 | 79 | 71 |
| 7 | 88 | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | 78 | 79 | 84 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 78 |
| 8 | 87 | $\mathbf{7 9}$ | 82 | 78 | 63 | 65 | 69 | 67 | 68 |
| avg 6-8 | 88 | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | 83 | 79 | 78 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 72 |

## 2017 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Chappaqua | Edgemont | Byram <br> Hills | Scarsdale | Great <br> Neck | Bronxville | Rye <br> City | Ardsley | Blind Brook- <br> Rye |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 88 | 92 | 85 | $\mathbf{8 3}$ | 76 | 72 | 70 | 74 | 75 |
| 7 | 80 | 74 | 84 | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | 79 | 77 | 81 | 72 | 70 |
| 8 | 91 | 79 | 49 | 74 | 58 | 71 | 67 | 61 | 59 |
| avg 6-8 | 87 | 81 | 80 | 78 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 70 | 69 |

2016 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Chappaqua | Edgemont | Scarsdale | Bronxville | Great <br> Neck | Ardsley | Byram <br> Hills | Rye <br> City | Blind Brook- <br> Rye |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 89 | 84 | 76 | 69 | 75 | 72 | 88 | 70 | 63 |
| 7 | 83 | 69 | 78 | 84 | 85 | 74 | 83 | 81 | 71 |
| 8 | 88 | 84 | 81 | 62 | 57 | 67 | 43 | 61 | 73 |
| avg 6-8 | 87 | 79 | 78 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 69 |

2015 MATH Performance of Comparable Districts

| Gr | Chappaqua Scarsdale | Edgemont | Rye <br> City | Bronxville | Byram <br> Hills | Ardsley | Great <br> Neck | Blind Brook- <br> Rye |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 82 | 80 | 78 | 75 | 78 | 86 | 80 | 80 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 82 | 73 | 78 | 79 | 69 | 77 | 71 | 73 | 66 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 83 | 71 | 66 | 67 | 70 | 52 | 59 | 53 | 63 |  |  |  |  |  |
| avg 6-8 | 82 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 69 | 62 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gr | Chappaqua | Rye <br> City | Byram <br> Hills | Edgemont | Great <br> Neck | Scarsdale | Ardsley | Bronxville | Mamaroneck |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 91 | 75 | 83 | 83 | 74 | 72 | 69 | 61 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 79 | 68 | 76 | 68 | 74 | 68 | 70 | 66 | 69 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 81 | 73 | 48 | 57 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 66 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |
| avg 6-8 | 84 | 72 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 66 | 66 | 64 | 57 |  |  |  |  |  |

Percent Proficient (Levels 3 and 4)

| ELA grades 3-8 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Scarsdale | $69 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| Comparable Districts* | $64 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Lower Hudson Region | $42 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| NY State | $31 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Scarsdale vs State difference | $38 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Scarsdale vs LHR difference | $27 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Scarsdale vs Comp Dist diff | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ |



[^2]
## Percent Proficient (Levels 3 and 4)

| MATH grades 3-8 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scarsdale | $68 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| Comparable Districts* | $66 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Lower Hudson Region | $39 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| NY State | $31 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Scarsdale vs State difference | $37 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| Scarsdale vs LHR difference | $29 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Scarsdale vs Comp Dist diff | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ |



* Ardsley, Blind Brook-Rye, Bronxville, Byram Hills, Chappaqua, Edgemont, Great Neck, Mamaroneck, and Rye City




## 2019 Median Scale Scores Between Level 2 and Level 3

## Academic Intervention Services (AIS)

Students who score below the median scale score between level 2 and level 3 (see shaded column in charts below) or referred by their teacher or parent are reviewed by the school Child Study Team (CST).

Grades 3-8 ELA Scale Score Ranges by Performance Level and Median Scale Score between Level 2 and Level 3

| Grade | NYS Level 1 | NYS Level 2 | NYS Level 3 | NYS Level 4 | Median Scale Score <br> between Level 2 and <br> Level 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $530-582$ | $583-601$ | $602-628$ | $629-655$ | 592 |
| 4 | $532-583$ | $584-602$ | $603-618$ | $619-654$ | 593 |
| 5 | $509-593$ | $594-608$ | $609-621$ | $622-661$ | 601 |
| 6 | $514-589$ | $590-601$ | $602-613$ | $614-657$ | 596 |
| 7 | $511-590$ | $591-606$ | $607-622$ | $623-654$ | 599 |
| 8 | $507-583$ | $584-602$ | $603-616$ | $617-651$ | 593 |

Grades 3-8 Mathematics Scale Score Ranges by Performance Level and Median Scale Score between Level 2 and Level 3

| Grade | NYS Level 1 | NYS Level 2 | NYS Level 3 | NYS Level 4 | Median Scale Score <br> between Level 2 and <br> Level 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $526-586$ | $587-599$ | $600-614$ | $615-646$ | 593 |
| 4 | $525-587$ | $588-601$ | $602-613$ | $614-650$ | 595 |
| 5 | $527-591$ | $592-603$ | $604-615$ | $616-654$ | 598 |
| 6 | $528-591$ | $592-603$ | $604-615$ | $616-656$ | 598 |
| 7 | $524-592$ | $593-605$ | $606-617$ | $618-644$ | 599 |
| 8 | $527-595$ | $596-609$ | $610-621$ | $622-651$ | 603 |

Scarsdale High School SAT Score Results

|  | Scarsdale High School |  |  |  | National |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ERW <br> (mean) | Math <br> (mean) |  | Total <br> (mean) |  | ERW <br> (mean) | Math <br> (mean) |  | Total <br> (mean) |
| 2019 | 676 | 705 |  | 1381 |  | 531 | 528 |  | 1059 |
| 2018 | 668 | 689 |  | 1357 |  | 536 | 531 |  | 1068 |
| $2017^{*}$ | 663 | 674 |  | 1337 |  | 538 | 533 |  | 1060 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Crit. <br> Reading <br> (mean) | Math <br> (mean) | Writing <br> (mean) | Total <br> (mean) |  | Crit. <br> Reading <br> (mean) | Math <br> (mean) | Writing <br> (mean) | Total <br> (mean) $)$ |
| 2016 | 634 | 658 | 649 | 1941 |  | 494 | 508 | 482 | 1484 |
| 2015 | 637 | 657 | 652 | 1946 |  | 495 | 511 | 484 | 1490 |
| 2014 | 636 | 663 | 659 | 1958 |  | 497 | 513 | 487 | 1497 |
| 2013 | 633 | 656 | 648 | 1937 |  | 496 | 514 | 488 | 1498 |
| 2012 | 632 | 651 | 643 | 1926 |  | 497 | 514 | 498 | 1509 |
| 2011 | 634 | 651 | 650 | 1935 |  | 497 | 514 | 489 | 1500 |
| 2010 | 611 | 650 | 643 | 1904 |  | 501 | 516 | 492 | 1509 |
| 2009 | 628 | 656 | 641 | 1925 |  | 501 | 515 | 493 | 1509 |
| 2008 | 617 | 655 | 644 | 1916 |  | 502 | 515 | 494 | 1511 |
| 2007 | 617 | 639 | 636 | 1892 |  | 502 | 515 | 494 | 1511 |
| 2006 | 613 | 643 | 634 | 1890 |  | 503 | 518 | 497 | 1518 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Verbal | Math |  | Total |  | Verbal | Math |  | Total |
| 2005 | 623 | 652 |  | 1275 |  | 508 | 520 |  | 1028 |
| 2004 | 611 | 640 |  | 1251 |  | 508 | 518 |  | 1026 |
| 2003 | 614 | 648 |  | 1262 |  | 507 | 519 |  | 1026 |
| 2002 | 600 | 630 |  | 1230 |  | 504 | 506 |  | 1010 |

*The College Board made content, format, and scoring changes to the SAT prior to 2017. The redesigned SAT test prioritizes content that reflects the kind of reading and math students will encounter in college and their future work lives.

|  | Old SAT | New SAT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scoring | $600-2400$ | $400-1600$ <br> Subscore and Cross-test <br> Scores available |
| Sections | - Critical Reading: 200-800 <br> $\bullet$ <br> - Writing: 200-800 <br> $\bullet$ Math: 200-800 <br> Score) | • Evidence-Based Reading <br> and Writing: 200-800 <br> - Math: 200-800 <br> - Optional Essay (separately <br> scored) |

## Mean Combined SAT Scores of Comparable Districts

2019 Mean Combined SAT Scores of Comparable Districts

|  | Scarsdale | Edgemont | Chappaqua | Rye | Bronxville | Great Neck <br> South | Blind Brook <br> (Rye Brook) | Great Neck <br> North |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ERW | 676 | 671 | 668 | 661 | 663 | 634 | 640 | 614 |
| Math | 705 | 688 | 679 | 672 | 662 | 678 | 670 | 657 |
| Total | 1381 | 1359 | 1347 | 1333 | 1325 | 1312 | 1310 | 1271 |

2018 Mean Combined SAT Scores of Comparable Districts

|  | Scarsdale | Edgemont | Bronxville | Chappaqua | Great Neck <br> South | Blind Brook <br> (Rye Brook) | Rye | Great Neck <br> North |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ERW | 668 | 664 | 669 | 661 | 634 | 653 | 631 | 604 |
| Math | 689 | 693 | 676 | 676 | 678 | 651 | 629 | 627 |
| Total | 1357 | 1357 | 1345 | 1337 | 1312 | 1304 | 1260 | 1231 |

2017 Mean Combined SAT Scores of Comparable Districts

|  | Scarsdale | Chappaqua | Edgemont | Bronxville | Blind Brook <br> (Rye Brook) | Byram <br> Hills | Rye | Great Neck <br> North |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ERW | 663 | 659 | 658 | 654 | 623 | 632 | 627 | 607 |
| Math | 674 | 674 | 672 | 655 | 653 | 630 | 618 | 629 |
| Total | 1337 | 1333 | 1330 | 1309 | 1276 | 1262 | 1245 | 1236 |

2016 Mean Combined SAT Scores of Comparable Districts

|  | Scarsdale | Chappaqua | Blind Brook <br> (Rye Brook) | Bronxville | Byram <br> Hills | Rye | Great Neck <br> North | Edgemont |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crit Reading | 634 | 627 | 623 | 607 | 599 | 592 | 583 | 494 |
| Math | 658 | 637 | 638 | 635 | 638 | 614 | 630 | 508 |
| Writing | 649 | 649 | 634 | 613 | 601 | 618 | 590 | 482 |
| Total | 1941 | 1913 | 1895 | 1855 | 1838 | 1824 | 1803 | 1484 |

2015 Mean Combined SAT Scores of Comparable Districts

|  | Scarsdale | Chappaqua | Bronxville | Blind Brook <br> (Rye Brook) | Byram <br> Hills | Edgemont | Rye | Great Neck <br> North |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crit Reading | 637 | 618 | 612 | 624 | 602 | 595 | 603 | 566 |
| Math | 657 | 633 | 630 | 612 | 623 | 623 | 602 | 596 |
| Writing | 652 | 636 | 623 | 617 | 608 | 606 | 613 | 583 |
| Total | 1946 | 1887 | 1865 | 1853 | 1833 | 1824 | 1818 | 1745 |

2011-2019 ACT Report

| Scarsdale School District Average ACT Scores |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | English | Math | Reading | Science | Composite |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 31.3 | 29.8 | 31 | 29.8 | 30.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 31.2 | 29.1 | 30 | 28.6 | 29.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 30 | 28.6 | 29.5 | 28.6 | 29.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 29.9 | 28.5 | 29.2 | 28.6 | 29.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 29.1 | 27.8 | 28 | 27.3 | 28.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 29.2 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 27 | 28.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 28.4 | 28.3 | 27.4 | 26.3 | 27.7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 28.9 | 28.9 | 27.7 | 26.9 | 28.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 29.1 | 29 | 28 | 26.9 | 28.4 |
| NYS Average ACT Scores |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{y y y y y y y}$ | English | Math | Reading | Science | Composite |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 24.1 | 24.1 | 25 | 24.4 | 24.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 24.2 | 24.2 | 24.9 | 24.2 | 24.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 23.8 | 24 | 24.6 | 23.9 | 24.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 23.2 | 23.9 | 24.4 | 23.7 | 23.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 23 | 23.8 | 23.9 | 23.5 | 23.7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 22.7 | 23.8 | 23.6 | 23.2 | 23.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 22.6 | 23.8 | 23.7 | 23.1 | 23.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 22.7 | 23.7 | 23.4 | 23.1 | 23.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 22.7 | 23.8 | 23.5 | 23 | 23.4 |

Percent of ACT-Tested Students Ready for College-Level Coursework


Scarsdale High School Advanced Placement Exam Score Results

| Year | Total Exams | Mean <br> Test Score | \% Exam Scores <br> $\mathbf{4 , 5}$ | \% Exam Scores <br> $\mathbf{3 , 4 , 5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 470 | 4.26 | $81 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| 2018 | 491 | 4.19 | $78 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| 2017 | 419 | 4.31 | $85 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2016 | 392 | 4.41 | $85 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| 2015 | 356 | 4.31 | $81 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2014 | 428 | 4.35 | $83 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2013 | 375 | 4.36 | $82 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| 2012 | 428 | 4.42 | $86 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| 2011 | 509 | 4.28 | $81 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2010 | 515 | 4.23 | $81 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| 2009 | 566 | 4.17 | $78 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| 2008 | 650 | 4.12 | $76 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| 2007 | 856 | 3.98 | $71 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| 2006 | 841 | 4.06 | $72 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| 2005 | 731 | 3.8 | $63 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| 2004 | 756 | 3.89 | $67 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| 2003 | 733 | 3.8 | $61 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| 2002 | 694 | 3.77 | $62 \%$ | $89 \%$ |



| Annual Percentage of Students Scoring 65-100 $\mathbf{1}^{\mathbf{1}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regents Exam | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| Integrated Algebra I | $99 \%^{2}$ | $99 \%^{2}$ | $99 \%^{2}$ | $88 \%^{3}$ | $84 \%^{3}$ | not <br> offered | not <br> offered | not <br> offered |
| Common Core Algebra | not <br> offered | not <br> offered | $97 \%^{2}$ | $95 \%^{2}$ | $100 \%^{2}$ | $99 \%^{2}$ | $98 \%^{2}$ | $98 \%^{2}$ |
| Common Core ELA | not <br> offered | not <br> offered | not <br> offered | not <br> offered | $100 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Comprehensive English | $97 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $82 \%^{4}$ | not <br> offered | not <br> offered | not <br> offered |
| Living Environment (Biology) | $100 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $99.5 \%$ |
| Global History | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99.7 \%$ |
| U.S. History and Government | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ |

${ }^{1}$ Between 330 and 420 students took each exam, with the exception of

- The 2015 and 2016 Algebra I exams (34 students and 6 students, respectively)
- The 2016 Comprehensive English exam (17 students)

For each of these exams in each of these years, a handful of students classified by the Committee on Special Education passed with scores in the $55 \%$ to $64 \%$ range. The figures above do not include that population, since the LHRIC report on passing rates does not differentiate between classified and non-classified students who scored below $65 \%$.
${ }^{2}$ Includes all Scarsdale Middle School and Scarsdale High School students who took these exams.
${ }^{3}$ This exam was taken only by Scarsdale High School students - those who did not take algebra while students in in the Middle School. The exam is no longer offered.
${ }^{4}$ 2015-16 was the final year in which the Comprehensive English Regents was offered, and only to students who entered high school prior to 2013.

- At Scarsdale High School in 2016, 17 students qualified to take the Comprehensive English exam, and 14 of them ( $82 \%$ ) earned passing scores.
- Those students took it because they had either failed it in the past or were classified students who passed it with a score under $65 \%$ but wanted to try for a score higher than 65 , so that they could earn a Regents diploma rather than a local diploma.
- All other students (approximately 375) who took a Regents exam in English during 2016 took the Common Core English Regents (our first administration of that exam), and 100\% of them passed it.

Scarsdale Graduates to College

| Year | Percent to <br> college | Percent to <br> 4-year <br> college |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | $98 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| 2018 | $99 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| 2017 | $98 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2016 | $98 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2015 | $99 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2014 | $99 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2013 | $99 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| 2012 | $97 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| 2011 | $99 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| 2010 | $98 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| 2009 | $98 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| 2008 | $99 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2007 | $99 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 2006 | $99 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| 2005 | $97 \%$ | $94 \%$ |

Percent Accepted to Most Selective Colleges (According to Barron's Guide)

| Year | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | $64 \%$ |
| 2018 | $63 \%$ |
| 2017 | $59 \%$ |
| 2016 | $63 \%$ |
| 2015 | $64 \%$ |
| 2014 | $68 \%$ |
| 2013 | $64 \%$ |
| 2012 | $59 \%$ |
| 2011 | $62 \%$ |
| 2010 | $61 \%$ |
| 2009 | $58 \%$ |
| 2008 | $58 \%$ |
| 2007 | $58 \%$ |
| 2006 | $55 \%$ |
| 2005 | $57 \%$ |
| 2004 | $55 \%$ |

Students Named National Merit Semifinalists

| Year | Number of <br> Students | Percent of <br> Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 21 | $5 \%$ |
| 2018 | 20 | $5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 13 | $3 \%$ |
| 2016 | 26 | $7 \%$ |
| 2015 | 16 | $4 \%$ |
| 2014 | 27 | $7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 19 | $6 \%$ |
| 2012 | 22 | $6 \%$ |
| 2011 | 22 | $6 \%$ |
| 2010 | 15 | $4 \%$ |
| 2009 | 21 | $6 \%$ |
| 2008 | 20 | $5 \%$ |
| 2007 | 28 | $8 \%$ |
| 2006 | 21 | $6 \%$ |

Students Who Received National Merit Letters of Commendation

| Year | Number of <br> Students | Percent of <br> Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 36 | $9 \%$ |
| 2018 | 32 | $9 \%$ |
| 2017 | 27 | $7 \%$ |
| 2016 | 34 | $9 \%$ |
| 2015 | 52 | $14 \%$ |
| 2014 | 44 | $12 \%$ |
| 2013 | 34 | $10 \%$ |
| 2012 | 34 | $11 \%$ |
| 2011 | 62 | $16 \%$ |
| 2010 | 66 | $18 \%$ |
| 2009 | 43 | $12 \%$ |
| 2008 | 35 | $9 \%$ |
| 2007 | 45 | $13 \%$ |
| 2006 | 30 | $9 \%$ |

# The Global Learning Alliance <br> A School and University Partnership for High International Standards and Deep Learning 

## Overview

The Global Learning Alliance is a professional community with three goals:

- To promote transformative teaching and learning;
- To empower youth to meet the challenges of their century;
- To realize the benefits of these efforts for children and youth around the world.

We believe that individuals, schools and nations each grow and prosper when all do. We hope to support the transition from today's world of international competition to a tomorrow in which human beings contribute to and participate in the good of a global community.

A partnership among schools and universities in Asia and Australia, the Americas and Europe, the Alliance supports leading edge research and builds knowledge about how to promote the best learning in the world. Through real and virtual contacts, partners examine student work and teaching materials that meet a high international standard in measurable terms. As a result, they promote exemplary methods and foster individual and institutional growth. They are mindful of the need to reproduce effective practices in a broad cross-section of schools, world-wide.

## Background

Those who graduate from school in the 2000's must become contributing world citizens who think critically and creatively, who solve problems that transcend traditional boundaries, and who are grounded by an ethical concern for global issues.

Today, however, neither government policies nor school-based initiatives adequately address the challenges involved in fostering global citizens. National and state reforms fail to recognize differences among schools and promote changes that may be replicable but are shallow and often counterproductive. Meanwhile, individual schools and districts pursue improvement strategies whose benefits fail to transfer consistently or effectively.

Terms like "world class learning" and "Twenty-first Century learning" are clichés, furthermore, nobody really knows what they mean. International measures are limited to tests like PISA and to programs like the IB or Cambridge Pre-U. Some set a bar without helping students or teachers understand how to reach it. Others mandate a specific curriculum that may or may not represent the best student work in the world's top performing nations. Additionally, current measures don't effectively assess a number of capacities that will be important in the future.

Meanwhile, existing international school networks typically lack a sustained focus on international benchmarks, measurement, curriculum or instruction. Neither do they have the benefits of robust school-university linkages
nor are they structured to promote collaborative work on improving institutional and individual capacity. The Global Learning Alliance moves beyond these problems by modeling world class learning and practice and by providing a structured process for their replication.

The Alliance sponsors future contributors, citizens and leaders through:

- Organic professional exchanges through which educators understand and create Twenty-first century curriculum, instruction and assessment;
- Innovative and original research and practices that lead thinking and action in the field;
- Efforts to adapt or replicate effective practices that intentionally improve teaching and learning.


## Additional Information

The links below provide more detailed information about the Global Learning Alliance.
GLA Timeline 2009-2016
GLA Summit 2012 Global Capacities Framework
Scarsdale Presentation GLA 2012
GLA Status Report November, 2012
Why Cross Border Collaboration is More than PISA
Pilot Assessment 2016

- Research Proposal
- Coding Framework

2016 Summit III Brochure
2018 GLA Summit Brochure
2018 GLA Project on Wellness and Human Well-being
2020 GLA Reading for Inclusive Belonging Project

## Founding GLA PArtners



HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO


TEACHERSCOLLEGE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

A Graduate School of Education, Health \& Psychology

## Response to Intervention

Effective July 1, 2012, every school district in New York State is required to implement a Response to Intervention model in the elementary school grades.

Response to Intervention (RTI) serves as a multi-tiered intervention framework with increasing levels or tiers of instructional support. Using Scarsdale's Local Effort Service model, a three-tiered framework has been designed. The graphic presented below provides a visual illustration of the district's RTI model. It is important to note that the instruction a child receives in RTI is supplemental in nature. That is, the instruction is in addition to, and not in place of core instruction students receive in the classroom. Further information for each tier follows the graphic


## 9 E LRC Teacher and/or Other Professionals

Small group or individual instruction outside of the general education classroom. Frequency and duration of the service is determined by student needs.

## TIER 1 Nememivemancemesmen

Additional small group instruction provided within the general education classroom during designated times.

High Quality Differentiated Instruction


[^0]:    * Students have the opportunity to take these standardized tests depending on their particular experiences and educational plans
    ** Limited English Proficiency (LEP) only.

[^1]:    * Genre assessment determined by school curriculum calendar

[^2]:    * Ardsley, Blind Brook-Rye, Bronxville, Byram Hills, Chappaqua, Edgemont, Great Neck, Mamaroneck, and Rye City

