



SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARIES

School Performance Summaries are one page synopses of student performance results for the last three years in English language arts and mathematics. The summaries are an indication of the extent to which a school is meeting its two most important Accountability Plan goals, based on results from the Institute's currently required outcome measures.

The summaries indicate whether or not a school has met each individual measure, not the *degree* to which it has met or not met the measure. These yes/no designations do not determine overall goal attainment; rather goal attainment is based on a nuanced evaluation of the school's performance on all outcome measures for that goal, taking into account the relative difficulty of the respective measures. The measures vary in difficulty depending on factors such as the age of the school, grade span, and the district in which the school is located.

Over the last six years the Institute has become more prescriptive about outcome measures and, because of its standard of excellence, set more rigorous expected levels of performance. As of 2010, all SUNY authorized charter schools have the same required measures in their Accountability Plans, centering on student performance in the New York State Testing Program. Together the following measures serve as the basis for determining if a goal has been met:

- Measure 1 (absolute) shows the performance on the state test of both all students and students enrolled in at least their second year;¹ Attainment is based on a pre-determined target.
- Measure 2 (absolute) presents the school's Performance Index (PI) measured against the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set by the state's NCLB accountability system. The PI is derived from the sum of the percentage of students at Levels 2 and above and the percentage at Levels 3 and above, and can range from 0 to 200.¹ Attainment is based on a pre-determined target.
- Measure 3 (comparative) compares the performance of charter school students enrolled in at least their second year to all students in the same tested grades in the local school district. Attainment is based on school performance relative to that of the district.
- Measure 4 (comparative) compares the actual overall performance of the school to the predicted performance of similar schools statewide using a regression analysis based on free lunch statistics. Attainment is based on a fixed target: schools must achieve an Effect Size of 0.3.
- Measure 5 (growth) examines the year-to-year growth of the same students in grade level cohorts, determining if each cohort has increased the proportion of students scoring at the proficient level.¹ Attainment is based on all cohorts reaching their individual growth targets.

¹ In 2009-10, the State Education Department (SED) raised its achievement standard, by increasing the scaled score cut off for proficiency or Level 3 performance on the English language arts and mathematics exams. In order to maintain a consistent standard for determining meeting the absolute and growth measures, the Institute asked schools to report 2009-10 results on these measures using a 650 scaled score cut-off, as SED had used a 650 cut-off in the previous few years.

SED then refined the cut score for its own NCLB accountability system. While following the same principle of maintaining year-to-year consistency in cut scores, the state has also taken into account when the two exams were administered in 2010 compared to previous years. As the exams were administered later in the year, students had more learning opportunities prior to the exam. As such, SED set the cut scores slightly higher than 650 in each grade. For the purpose of evaluating the goals' three absolute and growth measures, the Institute has adapted SED's "time-adjusted" cut-offs. In developing the performance summaries for 2009-10, the "time-adjusted" cut offs are used where possible (the absolute and growth measures), while the previously released cut offs are used for all other measures. This is also denoted on the summary itself.

The School Performance Summaries are based on data from the following sources: annual Accountability Plan Progress Reports; Excel databases submitted by schools; and state reports (State Education Department test results; and school and district State Report Cards).

BACKGROUND

The School Performance Summaries provide school boards of trustees and school leaders with an overview of their school's performance in the context of the Institute's standards for renewal. This feedback can be used to gauge a school's progress towards meeting the two key goals in its Accountability Plan and assist the board and leaders in preparing for charter renewal.

The most important question at renewal is: *Is the school an academic success?* A critical criterion for academic success is that a school meets or come close to meeting the key academic goals in its Accountability Plan. These plans are developed in the first year of operation of the initial charter period; for schools in a subsequent renewal period, Accountability Plans are developed through the renewal process.

Each year, schools submit a report on their progress towards meetings the goals in their Accountability Plan. These annual Progress Reports, also posted to this website, are an opportunity for schools to analyze their performance, share information with their community, and ultimately build their case for renewal.

At renewal, the Institute has established priorities to weigh certain performance results more heavily. They are:

- ELA and math goal results are most important.
- The comparative and growth measures are the most important.
- Recent results are more important.
- Positive trends are considered but are not sufficient to meet expectations.
- Performance on state exams is most important.
- Optional measures are taken into account, but must be valid and reliable assessments of the goal and are supplemental to the required measures.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: English Language Arts

Amber Charter School



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

	2007-08			MET	2008-09			MET	2009-10			MET							
	Grades Served: K-6				Grades Served: K-5				Grades Served: K-6										
	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)								
ABSOLUTE MEASURES 1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State exam.(§)	3	64.0 (50)	59.1 (44)	NO	3	88.3 (51)	88.2 (51)	YES	3	71.7 (60)	71.7 (60)	YES							
	4	50.0 (28)	51.9 (27)		4	82.2 (45)	81.8 (44)		4	89.1 (46)	88.9 (45)								
	5	45.8 (24)	47.8 (23)		5	95.0 (20)	95.0 (20)		5	62.9 (35)	62.9 (35)								
	6	56.5 (23)	54.5 (22)		6	(0)	(0)		6	(0)	(0)								
	7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)								
	8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)								
	All	56.0 (125)	54.3 (116)		All	87.1 (116)	87.0 (115)		All	75.2 (141)	75.0 (140)								
2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.(§)	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES							
	3-6	156	133		3-5	187	144		3-6	175	155								
COMPARATIVE MEASURES 3. Each year the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local district.	Comparison: Manhattan District 5			YES	Comparison: Manhattan District 5			YES	Comparison: Manhattan District 5			YES							
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District								
	3-6	54.3	48.0		3-5	87.0	57.1		3-6	49.3	29.3								
4. Each year the school will exceed its predicted percent of students at or above Level 3 on the state exam by at least a small Effect Size (at least 0.3) based on its Free Lunch (FL) rate.	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	YES	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	YES				
	71.1	55.6	58.3	-0.19		74.9	87.1	66.2	1.52		73.2	49.7	40.7	0.60					
GROWTH MEASURE 5. Each grade level cohort will reduce by one half the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam. An asterisk indicates cohort met target.(§)	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	NO	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	YES	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	NO	
	4	27	81.5	81.6	51.9		3							3					
	5	23	73.9	74.0	47.8		4	45	64.4	69.7	82.2 *		4	46	91.3	91.4	89.1		
	6	18	72.2	73.6	55.6		5	20	60.0	67.5	95.0 *		5	35	80.0	80.1	62.9		
	7						6						6						
	8						7						7						
	All	68	76.5		51.5		8						8						
					All	66	62.1		84.8	All	82	85.4		76.8					

(§)2009-10 results for #1, #2, and #5 are based on the State's determined "time adjusted cut score" instead of Level 3 cut scores as in previous years.
Data Source: New York State data; school-submitted workbooks; and the Institute's student performance database.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: Mathematics

Amber Charter School



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

	2007-08			MET	2008-09			MET	2009-10			MET								
	Grades Served: K-6				Grades Served: K-5				Grades Served: K-6											
	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)									
ABSOLUTE MEASURES																				
1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State exam.(§)	3	82.0 (50)	84.1 (44)	NO	3	98.0 (51)	98.0 (51)	YES	3	100.0 (59)	100.0 (59)	YES								
	4	57.1 (28)	59.3 (27)		4	95.6 (45)	95.5 (44)		4	95.5 (44)	95.5 (44)									
	5	54.2 (24)	56.5 (23)		5	100.0 (20)	100.0 (20)		5	94.3 (35)	94.3 (35)									
	6	56.5 (23)	59.1 (22)		6	(0)	(0)		6	(0)	(0)									
	7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)									
	8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)									
	All	66.4 (125)	68.1 (116)		All	97.4 (116)	97.4 (115)		All	97.1 (138)	97.1 (138)									
2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.(§)	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES								
	3-6	162	102		3-5	197	119		3-6	197	135									
COMPARATIVE MEASURES																				
3. Each year the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local district.	Comparison: Manhattan District 5			YES	Comparison: Manhattan District 5			YES	Comparison: Manhattan District 5			YES								
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District									
	3-6	68.1	67.3	3-5	97.4	75.3	3-6	66.7	38.4											
4. Each year the school will exceed its predicted level of students at or above Level 3 on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size (at least 0.3) based on its Free Lunch (FL) rate.	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	YES	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	YES					
	71.1	66.4	77.6	-0.75		74.9	97.4	84.7	1.12		73.2	66.6	49.4	0.93						
GROWTH MEASURE																				
5. Each grade level cohort will reduce by one half the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam. An asterisk indicates cohort met target.(§)	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	NO	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	YES	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	NO		
	3						3							3						
	4	28	89.3	89.4	57.1		4	45	80.0	80.1	95.6 *		4	44	100.0	100.0	95.5			
	5	23	52.2	63.6	56.5		5	20	70.0	72.5	100.0 *		5	35	97.1	97.2	94.3			
	6	20	50.0	62.5	55.0		6						6							
	7						7							7						
	8						8							8						
	All	71	66.2		56.3	All	66	75.8		97.0	All	80	97.5		95.0					

(§) 2009-10 results for #1, #2, and #5 are based on the State's determined "time adjusted cut score" instead of Level 3 cut scores as in previous years. Data Source: New York State data; school-submitted workbooks; and the Institute's student performance database.