Instructions / Notesfor 2016-17 Accountability Plan Progress Report (“APPR”)

1. Text Highlighted in Grey = explanation or guidance for an entry in the Progress Report. As guidance, schools should remove the existing text entirely and replace it with the appropriate information to complete the report.
2. Text Highlighted in Green = a sample entry that may be modified. As a sample entry, schools will edit sections highlighted in green or leave the text intact in alignment with the measures and goals included in the school’s Accountability Plan.
3. The template for reporting for each K-2 school with a norm-referenced test growth measure in the Accountability Plan appears on page 30. Present the respective results at the end of the English language arts and math goals.
4. **Annual adjustments to the Accountability Plan Progress Report**

**Elementary and Middle Schools**

1. **During the 2016-17 school year, the state continued to generate Annual Measureable Objectives (“AMOs”) as well as accountability designations for Focus Charters and schools in need of a local assistance plan. The implementation of a new accountability system under the Every Student Succeeds Act is forthcoming.**
2. **For the 3-8 Growth Measure and 3-8 Comparative Effect Size measure in ELA and mathematics, report 2015-16 results. (The 2016-17 results are not yet available.)**
3. Please do not include these instructions or the reference guide below in a submitted report.

# Reference Guide to Template Sections
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***The Accountability Plan Progress Report Template Is Below.***

|  |
| --- |
| **[SCHOOL NAME]** |
| **2016-17 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**  **PROGRESS REPORT** |
| Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on: |
| Date, 2017 |
| By \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| School Address |
| School Phone Number |

[School Logo]

Enter Name(s) and Tite(s) prepared this 2016-17 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school’s board of trustees:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Trustee’s Name | Board Position |
| Name | Office (e.g. chair, treasurer, secretary), committees (e.g. finance, executive) |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |
| Name | Office, Committees |

**Enter first and last Name(s) has served as the school leader since [XXX].**

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. In the table below, provide the school’s enrollment as of June 30, 2017.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| 2012-13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 

# ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Enter the school’s English Arts Goal Here:

## Background

Provide a 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 2016-17 school year.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above 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 (“ELA”) assessment to students in [X] through [Y] grade in April 2017. 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 (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year).

2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested[[1]](#footnote-1) | | | | Total Enrolled |
| IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused |
| 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 2016-17 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 Proficient | Number  Tested | Percent Proficient | 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[[2]](#footnote-2). 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 64 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 | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| 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 PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 English language arts AMO of **111**. 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.[[3]](#footnote-3)

## 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 2016-17 Performance Level Index

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 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 school district of comparison.

## Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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.[[4]](#footnote-4)

## 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.

2016-17 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 2nd 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.

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 Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to District Students | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| Charter School | District | Charter School | District | Charter School | 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 meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

## Method

The SUNY Charter Schools Institute (“Institute”) conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. 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 concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school’s 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 meaningful 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2015-16 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.

*2015-16* 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | |
| **School’s Overall Comparative Performance:** | | | | | | |
| ***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 of this comparative measure, including trends over time.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School  Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged | Number  Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect  Size |
| 2013-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Goal 1: Growth Measure[[5]](#footnote-5)

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 2015-16 and also have a state exam score from 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 score are ranked by their 2015-16 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[[6]](#footnote-6)

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2015-16 results, shown in the data table below, 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.

2015-16 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
| School | Statewide Median |
| 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 50th 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.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | | | |
| 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Statewide Median |
| 4 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| All |  |  |  | 50.0 |

Goal 1: Optional Measure

[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]

## Method:

## Results:

## Evaluation:

## Additional Evidence:

## 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. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested studentswho 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 students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison. |  |
| 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 2015-16 results.) |  |
| 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. (Using 2015-16 results.) |  |
|  | [Write in optional measure here] |  |
|  |  |  |

## 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 2016-17 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 2017. 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.

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested[[7]](#footnote-7) | | | | Total Enrolled |
| IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused |
| 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 2016-17 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  Proficient | Number  Tested | Percent  Proficient | 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 64 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 | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| 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 PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 mathematics AMO of **109**. 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.[[8]](#footnote-8)

## Results

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

Mathematics 2016-17 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 school district of comparison.

## Method

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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.[[9]](#footnote-9)

## 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.

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam   
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency | | | |
| Charter School Students In At Least 2nd 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 | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| Charter School | District | Charter School | District | Charter School | 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 meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

## Method

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. 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 concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school’s 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 meaningful 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 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2015-16 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.

*2015-16* 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:** | | | | | | |
| ***[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 on this comparative measure, including trends over time.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School  Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged | Number  Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect  Size |
| 2013-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Goal 2: Growth Measure[[10]](#footnote-10)

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 2015-16 and also have a state exam score in 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 scores are ranked by their 2015-16 scores 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2015-16 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.

2015-16 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
| School | Statewide Median |
| 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 50th 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 | | | |
| 2013-14 | 2015-16 | 2015-16 | Statewide Median |
| 4 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| All |  |  |  | 50.0 |

Goal 2: Optional Measure

[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]

## Method:

## Results:

## Evaluation:

## Additional Evidence:

## 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. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested studentswho 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 school district of comparison. |  |
| 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 2015-16 school district results.) |  |
| 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. |  |
|  | [Write in optional measure here] |  |
|  |  |  |

## 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 4th and 8th grade in spring 2017. 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 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 proficiency.

Charter School Performance on 2016-17 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 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 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 science program.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| Percent  Proficient | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | 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 school district of comparison.

## Method

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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 school district of comparison.

## 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.

2016-17 State Science Exam

Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency | | | |
| Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 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 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 | | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| Charter School | District | Charter School | | District | Charter School | District |
| 4 |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  | |  |  |  |

Goal 3: Optional Measure

[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]

## Method:

## Results:

## Evaluation:

## Additional Evidence:

## 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. |  |
| 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 school district of comparison. |  |
|  | [Write in optional measure here] |  |

## 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 school requiring a local assistance plan.

## Method

Because *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 |
| 2014-15 |  |
| 2015-16 |  |
| 2016-17 |  |

# APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following section contains a Parent Satisfaction optional goal, as well as examples of possible optional measures.

Goal S: Parent Satisfaction

Write the school’s goal here.

Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school’s program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

## Method

Provide a narrative explaining how the school developed, administered, collected and analyzed the survey. The school presents results as a percentage of all families in the school, not as a percentage of respondents only.

## Results

Provide a narrative of parents’ responses.

2016-17 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Responses | Number of Families | Response Rate |
| [##] | [##] | [%] |

2016-17 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Percent of Respondents Satisfied |
| [List Item Here] | [%] |
| [List Item Here] | [%] |
| [List Item Here] | [%] |
| [List Item Here] | [%] |
| [List Item Here] | [%] |

## Evaluation

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure with a discussion of individual items, changes from previous years, areas of concern, etc.

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.

2016-17 Student Retention Rate

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2015-16 Enrollment | Number of Students Who Graduated in 2015-16 | Number of Students Who Returned in 2016-17 | Retention Rate  2016-17 Re-enrollment ÷  (2015-16 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 |
| 2014-15 | [%] |
| 2015-16 | [%] |
| 2016-17 | [%] |

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.

2016-17 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 |
| 2014-15 | [%] |
| 2015-16 | [%] |
| 2016-17 | [%] |

# APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

The school may wish to use the following supplemental tables in the **Additional Evidence** sections. They are organized by subject and measure. Table titles need to be adapted to reflect the appropriate subject area, i.e. English language arts, mathematics, etc.

# ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

Absolute Measure

In 2016-17, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.

This table examines whether performance changes the longer students are enrolled in the school. In a successful school, student performance should increase with prolonged participation in the academic program.

2016-17 English Language Arts Performance

by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency According to Number of Years Enrolled | | | | | | | |
| One | | Two | | Three | | Four or More | |
| Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

While schools are required to compare themselves to the local school district, there may be individual schools that also provide a compelling comparison. These comparisons might be schools in the same neighborhood, with the same demographics, or have similar programs. The first table features a grade level breakdown for 2016-17; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

2016-17 English Language Arts Performance of   
Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on the State Exam by Grade | | | | | | | |
| Charter School | | School 1 | | School 2 | | School 3 | |
| Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

English Language Arts Performance of

School and Comparison Schools by School Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | Grades | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year  and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on State Exam by Year | | | | | | | |
| Charter School | | School 1 | | School 2 | | School 3 | |
| Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested |
| 2014-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Growth Measure (national norm-referenced assessment)

Each year, on a national norm-referenced assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

If the school has administered a norm referenced test, e.g. Terra Nova, ITBS, Stanford 10, it should report cohort growth results in a similar fashion to the growth measure based on state tests.

## Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they made towards the desirable outcome of grade level or an NCE of 50. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the same norm-referenced exam in 2015-16 and 2016-17. It includes students who repeated the grade. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students who took the exam in both years.

Include a brief narrative that describes the type of test administered, to which grades, the date of administrations, etc.

## Results

Cohort Growth on [XXX} Test from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50 | | | Target  Achieved |
| 2015-16 | Target | 2016-17 |
| A |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| B |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| C |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| All |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |

## Evaluation

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure; i.e., whether all of the cohorts achieved their targets. In addition, the evaluation may include how close each cohort came to its target, which cohorts’ performance increased or decreased, and the overall performance of all cohorts.

## Additional Evidence

Present a narrative providing an analysis of year-to-year cohort performance in previous years.

Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Reading Test

by School Year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| School Year | Cohort met target? |
| 2014-15 |  |
| 2015-16 |  |
| 2016-17 |  |

Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | Cohort Grades | Number of Cohorts Meeting Target | Number of Cohorts |
| 2013-14 | [?-?] |  |  |
| 2014-15 | [?-?] |  |  |
| 2015-16 | [?-?] |  |  |
| 2016-17 | [?-?] |  |  |

# ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

2016-17 Science Performance

by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 According to Number of Years in School | | | | | | | |
| One | | Two | | Three | | Four or More | |
| Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A school’s Accountability Period includes the final year of the previous charter term through the penultimate year of the current charter term. For schools in their initial charter, the Accountability Period includes the first year of operation through the fourth year of the charter term. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its 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](http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](http://www.newyorkcharters.org/operate/first-year-schools/accountability-plan/) for an explanation. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In contrast to NYSED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its 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](http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](http://www.newyorkcharters.org/operate/first-year-schools/accountability-plan/) for an explanation. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s business portal: portal.nysed.gov. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)