



**[Academic Leadership Charter  
School]**

**2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

**Friday** Wednesday October 31, 2018

By **:Leena Varghese**

**677 EAST 141<sup>st</sup> street  
Bronx NY 10454**

**718-585-4215**

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

(Leena Varghese, Principal and Britny Rivera, Operations Manager) prepared this 2017-18 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
James Sander	Chair
Lucas Doe	Finance Chair
Desiree LaFontaine	Education Committee
Hilda Pascuales	Member
Christopher Brignola	Education Committee
Ted Hurwitz	Ex-Officio

Norma Hurwitz, Leena Varghese, Jaime Kennedy have served as the school leaders since [2009].

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

“With the leadership of the School Board, its administration, teachers and support staff, Academic Leadership Charter School’s mission is to develop in students the ability to exceed NYS performance standards in all major academic areas in a safe and nurturing environment. In partnership with parents and the community, our students will be empowered to become leaders and take an active role in their learning while exhibiting good character.”

Since its beginnings in 2009, Academic Leadership Charter School has set very high academic performance goals for our students and has striven to meet those goals by providing a strong and differentiated instructional program. Our main goal and focus is to provide our students with a quality educational program that helps them to develop and demonstrate College and Career Readiness by meeting or exceeding NYS Common Core Standards through a strong curriculum.

It is our belief that all students can achieve academic success in a nurturing and academically rigorous environment. Our students have outperformed schools in CSD 7, our peer schools, and students city-wide<sup>1</sup>. During our initial charter period, we also saw an improvement for individual students from year to year. Our instructional program focuses on Literacy across the content areas in all grades and this has proven to be successful for all of our students, including our struggling population.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2013-14														
2014-15														
2015-16														
2016-17														
2017-18	55	50	51	55	47	58	49	49	83	0	0	0	0	549

## GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at Academic Leadership Charter School will become proficient in Mathematics.

### BACKGROUND

Our Literacy program is designed to help students become fluent readers and critical thinkers. We follow an interdisciplinary approach that is content based and allows for language development and vocabulary expansion. Every day, students read and analyze stories and other rich texts, such as magazine articles and poetry. Fiction and non-fiction stories are analyzed by students based on weekly themes and story genres which enable mastery of that particular weekly topic; character study, mysteries, plays, multicultural stories, myths, fables, legends and novels.

We offer four periods of Literacy instruction daily, employing a balanced literacy program offering a mini lesson followed by a workshop period when the classroom teacher and the associate teacher initially work with at-risk, Special education, or ELL students. Once these students have demonstrated mastery, they proceed to work independently. The classroom teacher then reviews work with the group of on or above level students. Each of the aforementioned groups participate in small group workshop sessions with the classroom teacher, associate, or one of the instructional support teachers for 15-20 minutes sessions daily during the activity portion of the lesson.

The first two periods consist of our core reading program, SRA Imagine It! for grades K-6 which allows students to read a variety of texts and build necessary reading comprehension skills. For grades 7- 8, we use novels and Pearson's Literature reading anthologies. The third period is devoted to supplemental fiction texts that are teacher selected and theme based. The fourth period focuses on writing and responding to literature.

It is important that our students to have a love for reading by providing meaningful topical material tailored to students' social and cognitive developmental and interest level, engaging texts, and the opportunity for all students to be active participants in every lesson, regardless of their ability level. To assist with providing best differentiated lessons in ELA, each classroom has created an ELA chart that outlines each comprehension skill, strategy, and elements of figurative language. This system of tracking identifies each student's strengths where students are provided more challenging activities, and weaknesses which

requires re-teaching. The ELA chart is updated within each six week period to support most updated differentiated groups.

In addition to rich fiction texts, we use have a variety of non-fiction texts incorporated in our curriculum. From their early years, ALCS students receive a content rich curriculum with social studies and science being taught daily and one period a day devoted to each of those subjects. In addition, during our literacy block, content is reinforced. Teachers have students read and discuss newspaper articles to remain aware of current events. Students examine articles from various newspapers on the same topic, to analyze how each has a point of view and bias and each journalist chooses to write what he or she wants readers to walk away with

Each lesson is highly interactive and teachers facilitate rich discussions, analysis, and application of what is learned. Instead of teachers simply monitoring and ensuring that each student is on task during independent activities, our teachers use this time to re-teach and provide greater scaffolding to students who need it most.

Every Monday, we hold professional development sessions to help teachers become well versed with our ELA curriculum. School administrators also co-teach with teachers to provide additional support. We assess students every six-weeks using a Mock assessment, modeled after the state's ELA exam, to track student mastery and progress.

### 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 [3] through [8] grade in April 2018. 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).

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

2017-18 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>2</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	51	0	0	0	1	52
4	45	0	0	0	0	45
5	55	0	0	0	1	56
6	46	0	0	0	0	46
7	45	0	0	0	0	45
8	83	0	0	0	0	83
All	325	0	0	0	0	327

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

As reflected in the table below, our school met our overall goal of 75% of students at proficiency. We have noted that students in grade 7 did not perform as well as students in other grade level cohorts. We will be working to ensure our seventh grade curriculum and practices are enhanced to provide support for students in this grade, this year. Also, the seventh grade cohort will be closely examined using our in-house assessments to ensure they make progress in grade 8. For most grades and overall, our school's curriculum and teaching practices reflect great success.

Performance on 2017-18 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	92%	51	91%	45
4	69%	45	79%	33
5	72%	55	67%	49
6	72%	46	71%	41
7	49%	45	53%	38
8	84%	83	84%	83
All	75%	325	76%	289

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

For the 2016-2017 school year, our school was at 59% proficiency for ELA and for the 2017-2018 school year, we increased to 75%. This growth of 16% is a result of consistent reflection of our data

<sup>2</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.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

and practices. We devote professional development sessions to ensuring our teachers master how to guide students to think critically and our practices are improving each year. We also place an emphasize on writing and ensuring that our students are able to support their writing with text based evidence.

## Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (“PI”) on the State English language arts exam will meet that year’s state Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.

## METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state’s ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state’s 2017-18 English language arts MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

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

English Language Arts 2017-18 Performance Index									
Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level								
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4					
	[?]	[?]	[?]	[?]					
	PI	=	[?]	+	[?]	+	[?]	=	[?]
					[?]	+	[?]	=	[?]
							(.5)*[?]	=	[?]
							PI	=	[?]

## 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.<sup>3</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

As reflected in the table below, we have significantly exceeded the performance of district 7 at all grade levels.

2017-18 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3			38%	1224

<sup>3</sup> 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](#).



## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

4			69%	1210
5			72%	1215
6			72%	1048
7			49%	1197
8			84%	1159
All			28%	7053

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school has consistently exceeded the performance of district 7 at all grade levels and we continue to do so.

#### 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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3					91%	38%
4					79%	33%
5					67%	20%
6					71%	27%
7					53%	20%
8					84%	31%
All					76%	28%

#### 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.

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2016-17 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. 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.

2016-17 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*

### 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 Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15						
2015-16						

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

2016-17						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>4</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 target of 50.

## 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 2016-17 and also have a state exam score from 2015-16 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2015-16 score are ranked by their 2016-17 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 target for this measure, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>5</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2016-17 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. 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.

2016-17 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All		50.0

<sup>4</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>5</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 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			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

<p><b>Goal 3: Optional Measure</b></p> <p>[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]</p> <p><b>METHOD:</b></p> <p><b>RESULTS AND EVALUATION:</b></p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b></p>
--

## SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

For the 2017-2018 school year, we have met our ELA goals!

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.	Goal Met
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	
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 language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Goal Met
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	

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

	regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2016-17 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 target of 50. (Using 2016-17 results.)	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

### ACTION PLAN

Our school is dedicated to improving our practices and performance. We have and will continue to analyze our assessment results and provide differentiated instruction for all students to help them reach proficiency. Our school backfill and accepts new students in many of our testing grades. This provides a challenge for us as most students come into our school, several grade levels behind. We have found, however, that within 2-3 years these students make great progress and many even reach proficiency. We will continue to support all of our students to help them grow. We will also continue to provide more focus on team teaching to strengthen our teachers and their practices.

## GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: Mathematics

All students at Academic Leadership Charter School will become proficient in Mathematics.

### BACKGROUND

Our mathematics program is designed to help students master basic numerical skills while allowing them to think more critically, solve word problems, and gain necessary skills for their future. We have a spiraled approach to Mathematics, with each lesson beginning with a ten-minute warm-up activity to review arithmetic operations and fundamentals for each algorithm. Each period contains two mini lessons which focus on different math strands. During each lesson, based on how well students have mastered the day's concepts, they either receive further review or participate in an independent activity offering greater challenge. Mathematics is taught for two 45-minute periods daily, allowing ample time for students to master their grade's curriculum while being exposed to concepts of the next grade. Math charts which display each mathematics strand and common core standard will be aligned to each student identifying mastery and needs of improvement which will guide teachers to best differentiate instruction.

For grades K-5, ALCS employs the TERC Investigations in Number, Data and Space. For grades 6-8, we use Connected Mathematics Project. For all grades, in addition to our core Mathematics programs, We also purchase supplemental workbooks from Coach, Test

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Ready, Progress NY, and Finish Line to enhance our Mathematics curriculum. Having as many resources as possible will allow teachers to teach topics in a variety of ways.

Teachers create math binders which combine all resources, organized by topic. . This makes lesson planning more manageable and allows for more strategic planning as activities at various levels are easily available to differentiate instruction. Each classroom has a math center with worksheets organized by topic, manipulatives, and computers for student use. This allows students to reinforce topics where students need additional support after each lesson. If a student finishes an activity early, they go to the math center to work at applying understanding or tackling an area where further practice is warranted. Teachers maintain math charts that track progress by strands/skills and show where students need additional support. Students are made aware of their progress as they have their individual math charts in their notebooks and teachers hold conversations with them. This enables students to become active participants in their learning. They know what topics they need to work on and can go to the math center and practice those topics further.

### 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 [3] through [8]

] grade in April 2018. 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.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 2017-18 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>6</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	51	0	0	0	1	52
4	45	0	0	0	0	45
5	55	0	0	0	1	56
6	46	0	0	0	0	46
7	45	0	0	0	0	45
8	83	0	0	0	0	83
All	325	0	0	0	0	327

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

For the 2017-2018 school year, we met our goal of students at our school for 2 or more years being at 75%. Students who were enrolled at our school for 2 or more years are performing at 84%. Our Mathematics program, which focuses on quality teacher training and differentiated instruction, using a variety of mathematics resources has led to our success.

## Performance on 2017-18 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	88%	51	89%	45
4	69%	45	79%	33
5	67%	55	65%	49
6	57%	46	54%	41
7	62%	45	63%	38
8	80%	83	80%	83
All	72%	325	84%	242

<sup>6</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.

## 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 in Appendix B.

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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3					89%	45
4					79%	33
5					65%	49
6					54%	41
7					63%	38
8					80%	83
All					84%	242

### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (“PI”) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year’s state Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.

## METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state’s ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state’s 2017-18 mathematics MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.



## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

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

Mathematics 2017-18 Performance Level Index (PI)				
Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	[?]	[?]	[?]	[?]

  

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & [?] & + & [?] & + & [?] & + & [?] & = & [?] \\
 & & & & [?] & & & & [?] & = & [?] \\
 & & & & & & & & (.5)*[?] & = & [?] \\
 & & & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & [?]
 \end{array}$$

**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.<sup>7</sup>

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

As reflected in the table below, our students are significantly outperforming district 7 in Mathematics.

<sup>7</sup> 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](#).

## 2017-18 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	89%	45	39%	1258
4	79%	33	30%	1232
5	65%	49	23%	1234
6	54%	41	17%	1062
7	63%	38	15%	1217
8	80%	83	14%	1118
All	84%	242	<b>23%</b>	7121

### 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 in Appendix B.

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		
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3					89%	39%
4					79%	30%
5					65%	23%
6					54%	17%
7					63%	15%
8					80%	14%
All					84%	23%

### 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 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2016-17 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. 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.

### 2016-17 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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]*

## 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 Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15						
2015-16						
2016-17						

### Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>8</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 target of 50.

## 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 2016-17 and also have a state exam score in 2015-16 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2015-16 scores are ranked by their 2016-17 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students'

<sup>8</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>9</sup>

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2016-17 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. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's overall mean growth percentile is greater than the target of 50. In addition, the narrative may also include discussion of specific grade-level results.

2016-17 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All		50.0

### 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			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

<sup>9</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

<p><b>Goal 4: Optional Measure</b></p> <p>[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]</p> <p><b>METHOD:</b></p> <p><b>RESULTS AND EVALUATION:</b></p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b></p>
--

**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.	Goal Met
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate PI on the state’s English language arts exam will meet that year’s state MIP as set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.	
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 school district of comparison.	Goal Met
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 2016-17 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 target of 50. (Using the 2016-17 results.)	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

**ACTION PLAN**

As we aim to have all of our students reaching proficiency, we will continue to examine our Mathematics practices. We will continue to individualize training provided to teachers and

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

differentiate instruction in a more meaningful way for students. We have found that we need to place greater emphasis on ensuring all students memorize their math facts and we are exploring additional ways (such as math contests) to help with this.

## GOAL 3: SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Science

All students at Academic Leadership Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

### BACKGROUND

All students at Academic Leadership Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

#### Goal 3: 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 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 2018. 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 AND EVALUATION

Our students in both grades 4 and 8 met our goal and exceeded it. Our instructional program, which offers Science daily from Kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grade, has allowed our children to develop strong skills and collect a body of knowledge.

Charter School Performance on 2017-18 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 Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100%	44		
8	89%	83		
All	93%	127		

## 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 in Appendix B.

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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	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. Given the timing of the state's release of district science data, the 2017-18 comparative data is not yet available. Schools should report comparison to the district's **2016-17** data.

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

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.



## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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.

### 2017-18 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 <sup>10</sup>	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100%	44		
8	89%	83		
All	93%	127		

### 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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
4					100%	
8					89%	
All					93%	

#### Goal 5: Optional Measure

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

**METHOD:**

**RESULTS AND EVALUATION:**

**ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:**

<sup>10</sup> This table uses the prior year's results as 2017-18 district science scores are not yet available.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 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 or above proficiency on the New York State examination.	Met
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.	Met
	[Write in optional measure here]	

## ACTION PLAN

We teach science every day, beginning in Kindergarten. We will continue to ensure all students receive a solid foundation within our science program so our exceptional results can be continued.

## GOAL 4: ESSA

### Goal 4: ESSA

Write the school's Accountability Plan ESSA goal here.

#### Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state's ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

## METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school's status under the state accountability system.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our school has been deemed in good standing.

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

#### Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2015-16	Good Standing
2016-17	Good Standing
2017-18	Good Standing

## 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**

Each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school's program

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

- Each year, Academic Leadership will have a average daily student attendance rate of at least 90%.

- Goal Met- our attendance rate was 96%

**Goal:** Academic Leadership Charter will be a fiscally sound organization.

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

- Each year, Academic Leadership will undergo an independent financial audit that will result in an un-qualified opinion and no major problem findings.
- Each year, Academic Leadership will operate on a balanced budget and maintain a stable cash flow.

## RESULTS

Our independent audit resulted in no findings and we are fiscally sound.

## 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 2017-18, 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.

2017-18 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 2017-18; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 2017-18 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
2015-16									
2016-17									
2017-18									

### 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.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 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 2016-17 and 2017-18. 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 2017 to Spring 2018

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2016-17	Target	2017-18	
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?
2015-16	
2016-17	
2017-18	

### Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2014-15	[?/?]		
2015-16	[?/?]		
2016-17	[?/?]		
2017-18	[?/?]		

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

2017-18 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								