



# COMPLETE GUIDE TO THE SCHOOL ANNUAL REPORTS

December 2010  
SIXTH EDITION



*Imagine*  
**2014**

**OFFICE** of  
**ACCOUNTABILITY**  
The School District of Philadelphia

## OUR CORE BELIEFS

- CHILDREN COME FIRST
- PARENTS ARE OUR PARTNERS
- VICTORY IS IN THE CLASSROOM AND FACILITATED BY A STRONG INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER
- LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY ARE KEYS TO SUCCESS
- IT TAKES THE ENGAGEMENT OF THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY TO ENSURE THE SUCCESS OF ITS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The School Annual Reports were developed in 2008 as part of a new performance matrix for the School District of Philadelphia. Superintendent Arlene C. Ackerman, Ed.D., sought to enhance the public reporting of school district data as well as establish uniform metrics for all schools and offices.

Using existing data sources, the Office of Accountability has established baseline data and generated targets for numerous indicators. There are two versions of the School Annual Reports: One for high schools and one for schools that serve any grade configuration that ends with grade 8 or lower. While most of the indicators are the same between the two versions, there are some differences between the reports.

There are four types of indicators on the reports: Student Achievement, School Operations, Community Satisfaction, and School-Specific Indicators. By viewing school data in a holistic manner, the Office of Accountability is able to provide a more comprehensive report on the progress of schools in the School District of Philadelphia.

For each indicator there is a baseline from 2008-2009 school year data and a target for the 2009-10 school year. Information in these two columns was provided to principals earlier in the school year. At the end of the year, the final three columns are filled in, showing the actual 2009-10 results for each indicator, whether or not the target was met, and the 2010-11 target. Three icons show whether the target was: (1) met, (2) missed, but with positive growth, or (3) missed.

### INDICATOR DESCRIPTIONS

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⊗ Target missed</li> <li>⊕ Target missed, positive growth</li> <li>⊕ Target Met</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* New Indicator</li> <li>N/A Not Applicable</li> </ul> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; margin-bottom: 5px;">CURRENT STANDING ICONS</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">⊕ Bottom 25% of schools</li> <li style="width: 50%;">● Above Average</li> <li style="width: 50%;">⊕ Below Average</li> <li style="width: 50%;">● Top 25% of schools</li> </ul> |
|---|---|--|

There is also a current standing icon that indicates how the school compares in relation to other schools. Non-high schools are compared with other non-high schools. Likewise, high schools are compared only with other high schools.

In addition to the indicators, other information about the school and its enrollment are displayed at the top of the page on each school's annual report. The school's address and contact information are shown, as well information about the student population.

## Student Achievement

These indicators measure student academic performance. This section is primarily based on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA). In addition to student proficiency, there are also goals for progress toward closing the District's achievement gap. Information is provided for categories that include at least 20 students.

**NOTE:** Even though we use a minimum of 20 students, Pennsylvania Department of Education uses a minimum of 40 students to calculate subgroups for Adequate Yearly Progress.

## PSSA Proficiency & Below Basic

Annual targets for proficiency on the PSSA exams in reading and math were set using a linear projection based on 2009 test results. All schools are expected to increase the percentage of students scoring “Advanced” or “Proficient.” Schools are subject to the same equation: Target for 2010 = .92 \* 2009 Baseline + .08. This means that schools who were at 0% “Advanced” or “Proficient” in 2009, are expected to increase to 8% in 2010. Schools at 25% must increase 6 percentage points to 31%. Schools at 50% must increase 4 percentage points to 54%. Schools at 75% must increase 2 percentage points to 77%. Schools with lower baselines must make higher gains to meet their targets. The same model is used for reading and math and for each student group.

This formula was derived by comparing three previous years of PSSA proficiency rates at the school level. First, the relationship between 2008-09 results (defined as percentage of students “Advanced” or “Proficient”) and 2007-08 results was examined using linear regression. In both math and reading, the 2008-09 results were strongly associated with 2007-08 results ( $R^2=.82$  for math and  $.84$  for reading), with an overall improvement across all schools.

Because the models were quite similar, and in order to ensure that the goals were always for gain, targets were set using a slight modification of those parameters (to be consistent across student groups and subjects).

If a new high school had no baseline data at all, but most of the students have records from earlier enrollment, the targets were set based on the average 8th grade PSSA scaled scores of the current year’s 11th graders.

Schools are also be measured on how well they decrease the percent of students earning “Below Basic” on the math and reading sections of the PSSA. The target for Below Basic is set using the following formula:

$$2010 \text{ Target} = .919 * \text{Baseline}$$

## Achievement Gap

The achievement gap is based on two matrices - “Compared to School” matrix and “Compared to District” matrix - that compare the difference (in percentage points) between African American/Latino and White/Asian student performance on the PSSA. The “Compared to School” achievement gap is defined as the difference (in percentage points) between the percent of “Advanced” or “Proficient” African American and Latino students and the percentage of “Advanced” or “Proficient” White and Asian students, if the number of White and Asian students at a school is equal to or exceeds 40 and the percentage of “Advanced” or “Proficient” White and Asian students at the school exceeds the district average for White students. The “Compared to District” achievement gap is defined as the difference (in percentage points) between the percent of “Advanced” or “Proficient” African American and Latino students and the district average for White students. The district average is used when the number of enrolled White and Asian students falls below 40 or the percent of “Advanced or Proficient” White and Asian students falls below the district average for White students. The target is to reduce the achievement gap – the difference in proficiency rates in percentage points – by 10%.

For example, if a school has a population of 40 White and Asian students and 60% of those students score at the “Advanced” or “Proficient” level and 50% of African American and Latino students score at the “Advanced” or “Proficient” level, then the gap would be expressed as 10.0. The target would be to reduce the gap by 10% to 9.0. The lower the number, the better.

## Advanced or Proficient Scores on the PSSA: Baseline and Target Student Percentages

| Baseline % | Target % |
|------------|----------|
| 0          | 8.0      |
| 5          | 12.6     |
| 10         | 17.2     |
| 15         | 21.8     |
| 20         | 26.4     |
| 25         | 31.0     |
| 30         | 35.6     |
| 35         | 40.2     |
| 40         | 44.8     |
| 45         | 49.4     |
| 50         | 54.0     |
| 55         | 58.6     |
| 60         | 63.2     |
| 65         | 67.8     |
| 70         | 72.4     |
| 75         | 77.0     |
| 80         | 81.6     |
| 85         | 86.2     |
| 90         | 90.8     |
| 95         | 95.4     |
| 100        | 100      |

Expressed in the percentage of students scoring Advanced or Proficient

## PSSA Growth (Middle Schools/Elementary Schools only)

As a part of the School Performance Index (SPI), PSSA growth was introduced as an alternate method of analyzing PSSA scores. This indicator reports as to which grades (displayed separately for reading and math) have made, on average, positive change in student scores when comparing each student to their year's score. What is displayed on the Annual Reports is the proportion of grade levels in which students averaged positive change out of the total number of grades ranging from the 4-8 that the school offers.

## On-Track-to-Graduation Rate (High Schools only)

- **Determining Students:** Students who were first time 9th graders in 2009, started 9th grade in the District (i.e., not in a private or charter school), and were enrolled in a District school on October 15th, 2009 were included in the calculation. The school in which the student was enrolled on October 15th is the school that is credited with the student's on-track status.
- **Credits Accumulated:** 9th grade students who earned at least five credits during the 2009-2010 school year were considered to be on-track for graduation. Any student that did not receive at least five credits during the school year was considered to be not on-track.
- **Course Failures:** 9th grade students who failed either a Mathematics course or an English course during the 2009-2010 school year were considered to be off-track.
- **Summary:** If a first time 9th grade student had fewer than five credits or failed either Math or English during the 2009-2010 school year, the student was considered to not be on-track for graduation.

## Percentage of Students Dropping Out (High Schools only)

A student is considered to have dropped out if they leave a District school and do not enroll in an alternate program (Private School, etc.) that leads to a High School Diploma. This indicator shows the percentage of students in grades 9-12 who have left a District school to not go on to such a program.

## Alignment of Report Card Marks and PSSA (Middle Schools/Elementary Schools only)

With the increased visibility of PSSA results and the District's decision to align standard course marks (in grades) to performance level descriptions (Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic) on student report cards, parents and guardians have become increasingly concerned about the disconnect between report card marks in reading and math and performance levels on the PSSA. This indicator measures similarity between the PSSA levels and report card marks.

While there is no implication that PSSA performance levels should exactly match report card marks, there is an expectation that the two measures should be correlated.

This indicator measures the average degree of match between final report card grades and PSSA scores. If all "A" students scored "Advanced", all "B" students scored "Proficient", all "C" students scored "Basic", and all "D" or "F" students scored "Below Basic", the alignment score would be 100. Partial credit is given for near matches according to the adjacent table.

The goal is to increase the alignment score by 10 percent of the difference between the baseline and 100. Only students who have both a final report card mark and participated in the PSSA are included in the calculations.

**Alignment Score: Student Course Grades and PSSA results**

| Results     | A<br>4 | B<br>3 | C<br>2 | D/F<br>1 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Advanced    | 100    | 67     | 33     | 0        |
| Proficient  | 67     | 100    | 67     | 33       |
| Basic       | 33     | 67     | 100    | 67       |
| Below Basic | 0      | 33     | 67     | 100      |

Each individual student will receive 0, 33, 67, or 100 points depending on alignment. A school's alignment score on the Annual Reports is the average of all the individual student alignment scores.

Course Marks: A,B,C,D,F are used in grades 4-12 and 1,2,3,4 are used in grades K-3.

PSSA Performance level: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic

## Percentage of Students Receiving College or Career Counseling (Grades 10 - 12 only)

---

This indicator reports the percentage of students that received adequate guidance for college and/or career planning. The baseline data was taken from the Annual High School Student Survey and is the percentage of students who answered yes to at least two of the following questions:

- Taken the PSAT?
- Met with your counselor or a teacher to discuss what courses you need for college?
- Learned about ways to pay for college?
- Research career possibilities?
- Attended college fair(s)?
- Researched college options?
- Taken the SAT? (seniors only)
- Received assistance from your school counselor in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)? (seniors only)
- Received assistance from your school counselor in completing college or trade and technical school applications? (seniors only)
- Completed the FAFSA? (seniors only)
- Been accepted to any schools for fall admission? (seniors only)
- Received any scholarships for next year? (seniors only)

Which of the following best describes your plan after graduation:

- I applied to college (2 to 4 year) and plan to attend in the fall. (seniors only)
- I applied to vocational or technical school and plan to attend in the fall. (seniors only)
- I will enter the military after graduation. (seniors only)

The target for this indicator is to have 90% of students answering yes to at least two of the above questions.

## Percentage of Students Taking PSAT/SAT (High Schools only)

---

This measures the percentage of students in grades 10-12 who have participated in the PSAT or SAT. The 2009 baseline uses actual test records divided by enrollment for those grades on April 30, 2009. The target for this indicator was a 10% increase in the number of test takers.

## School Operations

These indicators evaluate the school's ability to maintain an environment conducive to learning by measuring attendance, service to students, and compliance with School District policies.

Additional indicators have been added for high schools with selective admission criteria.

## Student Assistance (CSAP) Rating

---

The Student Assistance Rating reports the extent to which the school assists students with learning and/or behavior concerns by use of the Comprehensive Student Assistance Process (CSAP). This indicator is on a 100-point scale and is comprised of three parts. Forty percent of the rating is based on evidence that the school is using the Tier 1 CSAP protocol (evidence is from the District-wide survey and data collected by the Office of Specialized Instructional Support), 40% is based on the percentage of students eligible for Tier 2 CSAP that are being served by CSAP Tier 2, and 20% is based on whether the majority of Permission To Evaluate (PTE) referrals are made from CSAP Tier 2. Schools will get the full 40 points if they are following the CSAP Tier 1 protocol — this portion is pass/fail.

Schools can earn up to 40 points based on the percentage of students eligible for Tier 2 CSAP that are being served by CSAP Tier 2; for example, if a school is serving 50% of eligible students in Tier 2, they would earn

20 of the 40 points. The intent is not to have more or less students in Tier 2, but rather to increase service to students who need to be served.

If a school has a majority of its PTE coming from the Tier 2 process (or less than 5 total PTE referrals) it would earn 20 points. If a school were to have, for example, 10 PTE referrals from CSAP, but 11 other PTE referrals that were parent-initiated, then the school would earn approximately 19 points. Schools are not penalized or rewarded for having more or less PTE referrals, but evaluated by the percentage of students come through the CSAP process. If the overall CSAP score was less than 70, then the target was set at 70, otherwise the target was determined as a 10% increase from the number of eligible students who remain unserved using the formula below:

$$(1-\% \text{ of students served}) * .10 + \% \text{ of students served}$$

## Facility Safety Audit

---

This measure is the grade schools receive on the Facility Safety Audit, which is administered annually at each school. The annual safety audit was designed by the Office of School Climate and Safety in conjunction with the Office of Accountability. Audits are usually conducted by regional lieutenants from the Office of School Climate and Safety along with the school's principal. Grades are based on the responses given to certain questions about the school's capacity in preventing, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from emergencies. This indicator does not measure student behavior. The following questions are examples of the questions used to calculate the grade:

- If the school has after-school program(s), does the school have a plan to monitor the safety of the after-school program(s)?
- Are signs posted in different languages to reflect the student population?
- Are all of the exterior locks in working condition?
- Are there emergency procedures in the plan that address the following?
  - a. Fires
  - b. Shelter-in-place
  - c. HAZMAT
  - d. Bomb threats
  - e. Evacuation drills

**Note:** If a school did not have a 2009 "Baseline" but they had a 2010 "Actual" score, they received a "Target Mised, Positive Growth" icon.

## Percent of Discretionary Budget Spent

---

This indicator is a measure of whether the percentage of operating budgeted discretionary dollars spent by the school is between 85-100% (the target range). Excluded from the calculation are costs associated with Twilight/EOP programs, bus attendant EC, physical therapy, and supports for hearing-impaired students. Failure to spend operating budget extra-curricular (EC) funds does not contribute to funds not spent. Data is compiled by the Office of Management and Budget.

## Summer School Participation Rate

---

This is the percentage of students participating in the District's 2010 Summer Learning and More (S.L.A.M.) Program.

- Empowerment Schools: Student enrollment for each Empowerment School was pulled for June 2010. Empowerment schools were expected to have 75% or more of their students participate in the SLAM program, as measured by program attendance records.
- Non-Empowerment Schools: SLAM participation rate was based on those students who were "eligible" to participate. For K-8 students, this was based on course failure in a core subject area (Reading,

Math, Science or Social Studies), as indicated on 2009-10 report cards. For High School students, this was based on course failure at any point in high school (i.e. needed to make up a course for graduation). Of those students from Non-Empowerment schools who were deemed 'eligible' to participate, actual participation was calculated, as confirmed by program attendance records. The goal for Non-Empowerment schools is to have 75% of the "eligible" students participating in the program.

## English Language Learner Level Movement

---

This measure looks at the percentage of students who moved at least one proficiency level from the previous school year, using levels determined by the W-APT and Access tests. Students who have exited the ESOL program also count as having moved one level. The baseline was determined by using this criterion for the previous three years.

Schools must have at least 20 English Language Learners (including those exited during the current year) to have a target for this indicator.

## Special Education Compliance

---

This is the percentage of students who have valid IEPs on November 30th of each year. "Having a valid IEP" means that the IEP is in compliance with all prescribed time lines for necessary annual renewal. Promptness of three-year reevaluations are not included in this indicator. The target is fixed at 100% for all schools.

## Curriculum Implementation Rating (Middle Schools/Elementary Schools only)

---

For elementary and middle schools, this is the percentage of students who were enrolled in key curricular initiatives. This rating measures 8th grade enrollment in Mathematics/Algebra8 and K-8 enrollment in Art or Music. There are eight different course codes that count for Art or Music.

The percentage is determined by adding the number of grade 8 students who received a Mathematics/Algebra 8 grade with the number of K-8 students who received a grade in art or music. This number is then divided by the sum of 8th graders who received report cards and K-8 students who received report cards. Grade 8 students are counted twice because they should be enrolled in both Mathematics/Algebra8 and art or music. This target was determined as a 10% increase from the number of eligible students who remain unserved using the formula below:

$$(1-\% \text{ of students served}) * .10 + \% \text{ of students served}$$

## School Breakfast Participation

---

This measures the percentage of students enrolled in the school who are also participating in school breakfast. The District's goal is to have at least 70% of students who are enrolled in the school lunch program to also participate in school breakfast. The target provided for each school for 2010 would set the District on track to achieving a 70% participation rate.

## Enrollment in Advanced Placement (High Schools only)

---

For high schools, this is the percentage of students in grades 11 and 12 who received a grade in at least one Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate course.

This target was determined as a 10% increase from the number of eligible students who remain unserved using the formula below:

$$(1-\% \text{ of students served}) * .10 + \% \text{ of students served}$$

## Student Attendance Rate

---

Averaged daily attendance (ADA) is defined as the number of days attended divided by the number of possible days. Student absences are attributed to the school where the absences were recorded: absences do not follow students who have switched schools. The target for this indicator is set as a 10% reduction of absences.

## Teacher Attendance Rate

---

The teacher average daily attendance measures short-term teacher absences at a school (long-term absences of 10 or more days do not affect the teacher attendance rate). All teacher codes defined in the union contract, including counselors and department heads, are included in the calculation. Administrative and other staff are not included. Teachers approved for travel or professional development are coded as present. The target for this indicator was set as a 10% increase from the actual for 2010 and the baseline for 2009.

## Chronically Truant Rate

---

This indicator provides the percentage of students in the school with more than 10 unexcused absences in a year. The goal for every school is to decrease the percentage of chronically truant students by 10%. The following formula is applied to get a target: (% 2010 chronically absent)\*.9.

## Special Admission Schools Only (High Schools only)

---

Three indicators are included that are specific to special admissions schools.

- Special Education enrollment (Legare req.): This indicator measures the percentage of special education (IEP) students enrolled in the special admission school on September 30, 2009. The target is to increase enrollment by 10%.
- English Language Learner enrollment: This indicator measures the percentage of English Language Learner students enrolled in the special admission school on September 30, 2009. The target is to increase enrollment by 10%.
- Percent of students returning to neighborhood schools: This indicator measures the percentage of students who left the school during the school year and enrolled in a neighborhood high school. The target is to decrease the percentage of students leaving the school by 10%.

## Survey Results/Customer Satisfaction

These indicators report on student, parent, and teacher perceptions of the school environment through surveys. All ratings come from a composite score of a number of related questions. Responses are scored on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 being the best possible.

In the spring of 2009, teachers, parents, and students in the District completed District-Wide Surveys, providing baseline data for this year's annual report. There was low participation in the parent version of the survey. This year the goal for all schools is to increase the response rate of the parent version of the survey. For the 2009-2010 school year, performance targets were adjusted to include additional respondents and questions. In 2009, the School Annual Reports contained three survey indicators; teacher commitment, parent involvement, and safety. These three indicators include teacher, student, and parent responses to District-Wide survey questions.

Last year's customer satisfaction indicators were revised to include more survey questions from the three respondent groups.

### **Teacher Commitment**

- Teacher Commitment Composite (teacher survey)
  - How many teachers at this school:
    - Take responsibility for improving the school?
    - Set high standards for themselves?
    - Are willing to try new ideas?
    - Feel responsible for helping each other do their best?
    - Are really trying to improve their teaching?
- Teacher Support Composite (student survey)
  - Most teachers at this school know who I am
  - In my school this year, there is at least ONE teacher or adult who:
    - Is willing to give me extra help with school work
    - Is willing to help me with a personal problem
    - Really cares about how I am doing in school
    - I can talk to if I feel I am being treated unfairly for being different
    - Cares if I'm not in school
    - I could ask to write me a recommendation for a job, program, or college (High School Only)
    - Meets with me to discuss how my classes will help with my future (High School Only)
  - An adult at this school has helped me plan for life after high school (High School Only)
- Professional Capacity Composite (teacher survey)
  - How many teachers at this school:
    - Are knowledgeable of the issues and concerns in the school's community?
    - Talk with students about their lives at home?
    - Talk with students about their cultures?
    - Read books or journals, watch documentaries or attend workshops that provide information about the cultural backgrounds of their students?
    - Feel good about parents'/guardians' support for their work

### **Safety**

- Interpersonal Safety Composite (parent and student surveys)
  - How often do the following occur at your school?
    - Students threaten or bully other students
    - School staff are disrespectful to students
    - There is racial bias by school staff
    - Students use alcohol or illegal drugs during school
    - There is conflict based on race, culture, religion, sexual orientation, gender or disabilities
- Environmental Safety Composite (teacher, parent, and student surveys)
  - How safe do (teachers, students) feel:
    - Outside around the school
    - Traveling between home and school
    - In the hallways of your school
    - In the bathrooms of your school
    - In the classrooms of your school
    - In the lunchroom of your school
    - At after school programs at your school

### **Parent/Community Involvement**

- Parent Engagement Composite (teacher survey)

- How many of your students' parents/guardians:
  - Attended parent-teacher conferences when you requested them?
  - Picked up their child's last report card?
  - Support your teaching efforts?
  - Do their best to help their children learn?
- Parent Engagement Composite (parent survey)
  - How often do you:
    - Help with your child's homework and school projects?
    - Attend back to school night or other school-wide meetings?
    - Attend school events, such as athletic events, drama/music performances, etc?
    - Volunteer to help with activities in this school?

Questions in these indicators were grouped together through factor analyses and were found to be significantly predictive of attendance, and growth in reading and math on the PSSAs.

In order to account for the additional questions in each indicator from last year to this year, 2009 baseline scores were recalculated (where possible) to include all respondents. The safety indicator was not able to be recalculated and was adjusted by subtracting the 2010 District indicator mean from each school's indicator scores for last year (high schools were adjusted based on high school district means, and middle schools were adjusted based on middle school district means). This adjustment will not occur in future years

|               | <b>HS Survey Indicators</b> | <b>MS Survey Indicators</b> |
|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Safety</b> | -.21                        | -.29                        |

Once the 2009 baseline scores were recalculated or adjusted, performance targets were set for the 2010-2011 school-year. Performance targets were set using the combined average of the standard error of the mean for all 6 indicators for both high schools and middle schools (SEM=.027).

Next, based on previous years' data, it was decided that schools could reasonably increase their indicator score by 5% per year. The following formula was applied (V=a schools 2009 adjusted indicator score on the annual reports):

$$2010 \text{ Performance Target} = (5-V)*SEM + V$$

Not all schools are provided with baseline scores or performance targets. In addition, schools that did not have sufficient responses or a high enough response rate were only provided an indicator score for the respondent groups meeting the following response criteria.

|                                      | <b>Response Rate</b> | <b>Respondents Needed</b> |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Middle School Student Surveys</b> | 30%                  | 30                        |
| <b>High School Student Surveys</b>   | 20%                  | 20                        |
| <b>Parent Surveys</b>                | 5%                   | 25                        |
| <b>Teacher Surveys</b>               | 40%                  | 20                        |

If a school had sufficient responses on both the student and teacher surveys, but failed to meet the response rates for the parent surveys, parent questions were excluded from the indicators. If at least one respondent group had sufficient responses to make it into the indicator, then an indicator score is provided.

## School-Specific Indicators

Each school has an opportunity to have specific additional indicators for achievement, operations, and/or satisfaction. Once a school's specific indicators have been selected, they will be provided targets for improvement.

### **Performance targets to increase and/or improve specific to all schools:**

- Percentage of students taking a foreign language course
- Added a librarian
- Added a counselor
- Grant funding (school level)
- Decrease in chronically absent students
- Job Satisfaction (survey results)
- Professional Development (survey results)
- School Leadership (survey results)
- Education Quality (survey results)
- Computer Literacy (survey results)
- Teacher vacancy fill rate
- Teacher attendance
- Teacher retention

### **Performance targets to increase and/or improve specific to elementary and middle schools:**

- Percentage passing algebra exam
- Extra-curricular activity in art/music
- Percentage of students promoted
- Enrollment in technology courses
- Participation in mandated health screenings

### **High schools may select the following to increase and/or improve:**

- SAT scores
- Minority enrollment in Advanced Placement
- Advanced Placement tests scores at 3 or higher
- Advanced Placement courses offered
- Use of technology (survey)
- Post-secondary enrollment
- Physical exam recorded

Questions about this document or anything related to the The School District of Philadelphia's Annual Reports, should be directed to Daniel Piotrowski, Office of Accountability, 215-400-5886, [dpotrowski@philasd.org](mailto:dpotrowski@philasd.org). More information is also available at <http://www.philasd.org/offices/accountability/>.