

# Instructions / Notes

## for 2013-14 Accountability Plan Progress Report

1. Text Highlighted in Yellow = explanation or guidance for an entry in the Progress Report
2. Text Highlighted in Green = a sample entry which may be modified
3. The template for the **high school measures** is in Appendix A, beginning on page 26.
4. For K-2 schools with a norm-referenced-test growth measure in its Accountability Plan, the template for reporting appears on page 67. Present the respective results at the end of the ELA and math goals.
5. **Changes in the 2013-14 Report from the 2012-13 Report**

### **Elementary and Middle Schools**

- a) **The State Education Department has recalibrated the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in ELA and math. Therefore, complete the second 3-8 absolute measure (“Performance Level Index meeting the AMO”) in ELA and math.**
- b) **For the 3-8 Growth Measure in ELA and math, report 2012-13 results using the state’s 3-8 Growth Model. (The 2013-14 results are not yet available.) Instructions for finding the 2013-14 results appear below.**

### **College Preparatory High Schools**

- a) **Because of the introduction of college and career readiness standards, schools renewed in 2012-13 or later use revised Accountability Plan measures. (See the appendix in the Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for a list of the revised measures.)**
  - b) **The Institute will gradually phase the new measures into its evaluation of all schools and the SUNY Trustees will take them into account when making renewal decisions. Therefore, the Institute encourages high schools not renewed this year to include the college-and-career-readiness-standard in their Progress Report as optional measures.**
6. Please do not include these instructions or the reference guide below in a submitted report.

## Reference Guide to Template Sections

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	4
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL GOALS.....	5
NCLB GOAL.....	25
HIGH SCHOOL COHORTS .....	26
HIGH SCHOOL GOALS.....	28
OPTIONAL GOALS .....	63
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES	
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS.....	66
HIGH SCHOOLS.....	69

***The Accountability Plan Progress Report Template Is Below.***

School Logo

**Our World Neighborhood  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2014-15 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

July 30, 2015

By Brian Ferguson

36-12 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Astoria NY 11106  
718-392-3405

B Ferguson, Executive Director prepared this 2014-15 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Jeanette Betancourt EdD	Chair (Executive, Development, Education)
Maura Fitzgerald	Secretary (Audit & Finance, Executive)
Charles Guadagnolo	Treasurer (Audit & Finance, Facilities)
Richard Bogle	(Development, Facilities)
Melissa Chin	(Development, Facilities, Education)
Sara Espanol	(Development, Education)

**B. Ferguson has served as the Executive Director since 2002**

## INTRODUCTION

Narrative description of the school, e.g. mission, when it opened, what grades served, number of students, demographic characteristics of students, etc. In addition, the description may also include key design elements or other unique aspects of the school program.

### School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2010-11														
2011-12														
2012-13														
2013-14														
2014-15														

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

Write the school's English language arts goal here.

### Background

Brief narrative discussing English language arts curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the English language arts program or staff prior to or during the 2013-14 school year.

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in X through Y grade in April 2014. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

**2014-15 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>1</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All					

<sup>1</sup> Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

## Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table below that directly addresses the measure, i.e. the overall percent of students *in at least their second year* achieving at proficiency.

### Performance on 2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

## Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period. This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The school can use a supplemental table for this section on performance disaggregated by number of years in the school. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school's instructional program.

### English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						

6						
7						
8						
All						

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**  
 Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

**Method**

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 English language arts AMO of 89. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>2</sup>

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure by comparing the PLI to this year’s AMO.

**English Language Arts 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	?	?	?	?

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & ? & + & ? & + & ? & = & ? \\
 & & & & ? & + & ? & = & ? \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & ?
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

<sup>2</sup> In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.



**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

**Method**

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>3</sup>

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure, e.g. the aggregate charter school performance compared to the aggregate district performance in the same tested grades.

**2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure, i.e., whether the charter school fell short of, equaled or exceed the aggregate district performance and by how much. In addition the evaluation may also include a discussion of specific grade levels’ comparative performance.

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school’s performance in comparison to the local district in previous years. In addition, the school can use a supplemental table for this section on a comparison of the charter school to selected local schools. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

<sup>3</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

Also, additional evidence may include demographic differences between the school and the district as well as compelling reasons for comparing the school to a subset of schools within the district.

**English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District  
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**  
 Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>4</sup>

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools’ actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2012-13 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: overall Effect Size. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective Effect Sizes.

**2012-13 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

<b>School's Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<b><i>Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here</i></b>

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's aggregate Effect Size exceeded 0.3 and, if not, whether it was at least a positive Effect Size. In addition, the narrative may also include specific grade levels' comparative performance.

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance in comparison to similar schools statewide.

**English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11						
2011-12						
2012-13						

**Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>5</sup>**

Each year, under the state’s Growth Model, the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score from 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 score are ranked by their 2012-13 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students’ growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school’s mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>6</sup>

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2012-13 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: the school’s mean growth percentile. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective percentiles.

**2012-13 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
3		50.0
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All		50.0

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school’s overall mean growth percentile is greater than the state median of the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. In addition, the narrative may also include discussion of specific grade-level results.

<sup>5</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>6</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance in comparison to the statewide average.

**English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11 <sup>7</sup>	2011-12 <sup>7</sup>	2012-13	Statewide Average
3				50.0
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

<p><b>Goal 1: Optional Measure</b>          Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.</p>
<p><b>Method</b></p> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p><b>Additional Evidence</b></p>

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

<sup>7</sup> Grade level results not available.

	language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

**Action Plan**

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to maintain or improve academic performance based on the *specific results* associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts or sub-populations.

**MATHEMATICS**

**Goal 2: Mathematics**  
Write the school's mathematics goal here.

**Background**

Brief narrative discussing mathematics curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the mathematics program or staff prior to or during the 2013-14 school year.

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**  
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in X through Y grade in April 2014. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed

breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

**2013-14 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>8</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All					

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table below that directly addresses the measure, i.e. the overall percent of students *in at least their second year* achieving at proficiency.

**Performance on 2013-14 State Mathematics Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and

<sup>8</sup> Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period. This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The school can use a supplemental table for this section on performance disaggregated by number of years in the school. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school’s instructional program.

**Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the State mathematics exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

**Method**

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 mathematics AMO of 86. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> In contrast to NYSED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.



## Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure by comparing the PLI to this year's AMO.

### Mathematics 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	?	?	?	?

$$PI = ? + ? + ? = ?$$

PLI = ?

## Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

### Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

## Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>10</sup>

## Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure, e.g. the aggregate charter school performance compared to the aggregate district performance in the same tested grades.

<sup>10</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

**2013-14 State Mathematics Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure; i.e., whether the charter school fell short of, equaled or exceeded the aggregate district performance and by how much. In addition the evaluation may also include a discussion of specific grade levels' comparative performance.

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school's performance in comparison to the local district in previous years. In addition, the school can use a supplemental table for this section on a comparison of the charter school to selected local schools. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include demographic differences between the school and the district as well as compelling reasons for comparing the school to a subset of schools within the district.

**Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Local District  
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>11</sup>

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools’ actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2012-13 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: overall Effect Size. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective Effect Sizes.

**2012-13 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

**School’s Overall Comparative Performance:**

<sup>11</sup> The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics.

**Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here**

### Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's aggregate Effect Size exceeded 0.3 and, if not, whether it was at least a positive Effect Size. In addition, the narrative may also include specific grade levels' comparative performance.

### Additional Evidence

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance in comparison to similar schools statewide.

**Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11						
2011-12						
2012-13						

### Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>12</sup>

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

### Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>13</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2012-13 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: the school's mean growth percentile. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective percentiles.

**2012-13 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Average
3		50.0
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All		50.0

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's overall mean growth percentile is greater than the state median of the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. In addition, the narrative may also include discussion of specific grade-level results.

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance in comparison to the statewide average.

**Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Average
	2010-11 <sup>14</sup>	2011-12 <sup>14</sup>	2012-13	
3				50.0
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

<sup>14</sup> Grade level results not available.

<b>Goal 2: Optional Measure</b> Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.
<b>Method</b>  <b>Results</b>  <b>Evaluation</b>  <b>Additional Evidence</b>

**Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

**Action Plan**

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to maintain or improve academic performance based on the *specific results* associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts or sub-populations.

## SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Science

Write the school's Accountability Plan science goal here.

### Background

Brief narrative discussing science curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the science program or staff.

### Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State science examination.

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in spring 2014. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at proficiency.

### Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table below that directly addresses the measure, i.e. the overall percent of students *in at least their second year* achieving at proficiency.

**Charter School Performance on 2013-14 State Science Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4				
8				

### Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period. This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The school can use a supplemental table for this section on performance disaggregated by number of years in the school. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the science program.

**Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4						
8						
All						

**Goal 3: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

**Method**

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; e.g. the charter school performance compared to the district performance in the same tested grades.

**2013-14 State Science Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4				
8				



**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure; i.e. whether the charter school fell short of, equaled or exceeded the district performance in each grade and by how much.

**Additional Evidence**

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school’s performance in comparison to the local district in previous years.

**Science Performance of Charter School and Local District  
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4						
8						
All						

<p><b>Goal 3: Optional Measure</b>          Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.</p>
<p><b>Method</b></p> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p><b>Additional Evidence</b></p>

**Summary of the Science Goal**

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

## Action Plan

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the specific results and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented.

## NCLB

### Goal 4: NCLB

Write the school's Accountability Plan NCLB goal here.

### Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as a local-assistance-plan school.

## Method

Since *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

## Results

State the school's NCLB status this year.

## Evaluation

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and any changes over time.

## Additional Evidence

Provide a narrative reviewing the school's NCLB status during each year of the current Accountability Period.

### NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2011-12	Good Standing/ Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School
2012-13	Good Standing/ Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School
2013-14	Good Standing/ Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School

## Method

In receiving a waiver for its federal No Child Left Behind accountability system, the New York State Education Department now holds high schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards meeting college and career readiness standards. See page 72 of SED's ESEA waiver application for the high school AMOs:

[http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver\\_REVISED.pdf](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver_REVISED.pdf)

The AMO continues to be SED's basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 English language arts AMO of 166.

The APL is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of students in the Accountability Cohort at Levels 2 through 4 to the sum of the percent of students at Level 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible APL is 200. The Regents exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Level 1, 65 to 74 is Level 2, 75 to 89 is Level 3, and 90 to 100 is Level 4.

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure, by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

(§) Each year, students in the high school *Total Cohort* will exceed the predicted pass rate on the English language arts Regents exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State.

## Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, as it has for 3-8 schools. The Institute examines the school's performance in terms of demographically similar high schools state-wide by using a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. The Institute compares the School's actual performance to the predicted performance of high schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other high schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics

produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a small degree, is the target for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available.

#

#

#

## APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

**Method**

Provide a narrative explaining how students are tracked year to year

**Results**

Present a narrative describing number of students in various categories and the retention rate.

**2013-14 Student Retention Rate**

2012-13 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2012-13	Number of Students Who Returned in 2013-14	Retention Rate 2013-14 Re-enrollment ÷ (2012-13 Enrollment – Graduates)
#	#	#	%

**Evaluation**

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and how close the retention rate was to the target.

**Additional Evidence**

Year	Retention Rate
2011-12	%
2012-13	%
2013-14	%

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 95 percent.

**Method**

Provide a narrative explaining how the school tracks student attendance and calculates its daily attendance rate.

## Results

Provide a narrative describing the year's attendance rate.

### 2013-14 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	%
2	%
3	%
4	%
5	%
6	%
7	%
8	%
Overall	%

## Evaluation

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and how close the attendance rate was to the target.

## Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2011-12	%
2012-13	%
2013-14	%