Instructions / Notesfor 2018-19 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 information to complete the report.
2. Text Highlighted in Green = a sample entry that may be modified. Schools should leave the text intact or edit appropriately so that the text aligns with the program’s offerings and the measures and goals included in the school’s Accountability Plan.
3. Schools serving students in 9th – 12th grades additionally submit a student-level data file as part of the required annual reporting to the Institute. These data should align and corroborate the high school achievement outcomes reported in the APPR. For example, the number of students included in the 2015 Total Cohort for Graduation and the 2018-19 four-year graduation rate reported in this document should be able to be calculated from this high school data submission.
4. As a reminder, the Institute updated and modified the required goals and measures for all schools in 2017-18 in response to the state’s finalization of its Every Students Succeeds Act (“ESSA”) plan. The Institute continues to require schools to report a Performance Index (“PI”) with the target of meeting or exceeding the state’s Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”). This supplants the previous measure of Annual Measureable Objective (“AMO”) attainment. Additionally, the Institute has replaced the No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) goal with the functionally equivalent ESSA goal. For schools serving students in 9th – 12th grades, the changes included the refinement of reporting on Regents Performance Level achievement, the inclusion of additional comparative measures of Regents achievement, the inclusion of growth measures for low performing 8th grade students, the inclusion of an additional index score of college preparation, and the collapse of some stand-alone measures of college preparation into one comprehensive measure. The Institute has organized the goals in this template placing the High School Graduation and College Preparation Goals listed before the subject area achievement goals. This order reflects the relative importance of the goals and indicates the Institute’s general emphasis when evaluating the success of college prep high school programs.
5. Please do not include these instructions or the reference guide below in a submitted report.
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***The Accountability Plan Progress Report Template Is Below. Delete all information above before submitting.***

***\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

|  |
| --- |
| **[SCHOOL NAME]** |
| **2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**  **PROGRESS REPORT** |
| Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on: |
| Date, 2019 |
| By \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| School Address |
| School Phone Number |

[School Logo]

Enter Name(s) and Title(s) prepared this 2018-19 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 BEDS Day enrollment for each school year.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 2014-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# High School Cohorts

## Accountability Cohort

The state’s Accountability Cohort consists specifically of students who are in their fourth year of high school after entering the 9th grade. For example, the 2015 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9th grade anywhere sometime during the 2015-16 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state’s annual enrollment-determination day (i.e., BEDS day) in the 2018-19 school year, and either remained in the school for the rest of the year or left for an acceptable reason. (See New York State Education Department’s SIRS Manual for more details about cohort eligibility and acceptable exit reasons: [http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/ht](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/))

The following table indicates the number of students in the Accountability Cohorts who are in their fourth year of high school and were enrolled at the school on BEDS Day in October and remained in the school until June 30th of that year.

Fourth-Year High School Accountability Cohorts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fourth Year  Cohort | Year Entered 9th Grade  Anywhere | Cohort Designation | Number of Students Enrolled on BEDS Day in October of the Cohort’s Fourth Year | Number Leaving During the School Year | Number in Accountability Cohort as of June 30th |
| 2016-17 | 2013-14 | 2013 | [#] | [#] | [#] |
| 2017-18 | 2014-15 | 2014 | [#] | [#] | [#] |
| 2018-19 | 2015-16 | 2015 | [#] | [#] | [#] |

## Total Cohort for Graduation

Students are also included in the Total Cohort for Graduation (referred to as the Graduation Cohort, Total Graduation Cohort, or Total Cohort interchangeably throughout this report) based on the year they first enter the 9th grade. Students enrolled for at least one day in the school after entering the 9th grade are part of the school’s Graduation Cohort. The school may remove students from the Graduation Cohort if the school has discharged those students for an acceptable reason listed in the SIRS manual, including the following: if they transfer to another public or private diploma-granting program with documentation, transfer to home schooling by a parent or guardian, transfer to another district or school, transfer by court order, leave the U.S., or are deceased.

Fourth Year Total Cohort for Graduation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fourth Year Cohort | Year Entered 9th Grade  Anywhere | Cohort Designation | Number of Students Graduated or Enrolled on June 30th of the Cohort’s Fourth Year  (a) | Number of Students No Longer at the School Who Had Been Enrolled for at Least One Day Prior to Leaving the School and Who Were Not Discharged for an Acceptable Reason  (b) | Total Graduation Cohort  (a) + (b) |
| 2016-17 | 2013-14 | 2013 | [#] | [#] | [#] |
| 2017-18 | 2014-15 | 2014 | [#] | [#] | [#] |
| 2018-19 | 2015-16 | 2015 | [#] | [#] | [#] |

Fifth Year Total Cohort for Graduation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fifth Year Cohort | Year Entered 9th Grade  Anywhere | Cohort Designation | Number of Students Graduated or Enrolled on June 30th of the Cohort’s Fifth Year  (a) | Number of Students No Longer at the School Who Had Been Enrolled for at Least One Day Prior to Leaving the School and Who Were Not Discharged for an Acceptable Reason  (b) | Total Graduation Cohort  (a) + (b) |
| 2016-17 | 2012-13 | 2012 | [#] | [#] | [#] |
| 2017-18 | 2013-14 | 2013 | [#] | [#] | [#] |
| 2018-19 | 2014-15 | 2014 | [#] | [#] | [#] |

# Goal 1: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

GOAL 1: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Write the school’s graduation goal here.

Goal 1: Leading Indicator

Each year, 75 percent of students in first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn at least ten credits (if 44 needed for graduation) or five credits (if 22 needed for graduation) each year.

## Method

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of the high school cohort and examines students’ progress toward graduation based on annual credit accumulation. The measure requires that, based on the school’s promotion requirements, 75 percent of the first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn the required number of credits.

Present the school’s promotion requirements here; include a list of all core academic subjects and other relevant information, ensuring that the school’s requirements are consistent with the State Commissioner’s Part 100.5 Diploma Requirements.

## Results AND EVALUATION

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. Provide narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts

Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2018-19

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort during 2018-19 | Percent promoted |
| 2017 |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing results from previous years and analysis of trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 1: Leading Indicator

Each year, 75 percent of students in the second year high school Total Graduation Cohort will score at or above proficient on at least three different New York State Regents exams required for graduation.

## Method

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of high school cohorts and examines their progress towards graduation based on Regents exam passage. The measure requires that 75 percent of students in each Graduation Cohort have passed at least three Regents exams by their second year in the cohort. In August of 2019, the 2017 cohort will have completed its second year.

## Results and Evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent of Students in their Second Year Passing Three Regents Exams by Cohort

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | School Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing Three Regents |
| 2015 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2016 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2017 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Present a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 1: Absolute Measures

Each year, 75 percent of students in the fourth year high school Total Graduation Cohort and 95 percent of students in the fifth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate.

## Method

This measure examines students in two high school Graduation Cohorts: those who entered the 9th grade as members of the 2015 cohort and graduated four years later and those who entered as members of the 2014 cohort and graduated five years later. These data reflect August graduation rates. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams required for high school graduation in ELA, mathematics, science, U.S. History, and Global History or met the requirements for the 4+1 pathway to graduation.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The school’s graduation requirements appear in this document below the graduation goal’s first measure pertaining to annual grade-by-grade promotion or credit accumulation.

## Results and evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent of Students in the Total Graduation Cohort who have Graduated After Four Years

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | School  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

Percent of Students in Total Graduation Cohort Who Have Graduated After Five Years

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | School  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating |
| 2012 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2013 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort graduating after the completion of their fourth year will exceed that of the Total Graduation Cohort from the school district of comparison.

## Method

The school compares the graduation rate of students completing their fourth year in the charter school’s Total Graduation Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison.[[2]](#footnote-2) Given that students may take Regents exams through the summer of their fourth year, district results for the current year are generally not available at this time. As such, for purposes of this report schools should include the district’s 2017-18 results as a temporary placeholder for the district’s 2018-19 results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent of Students in the Total Graduation Cohort who   
Graduate in Four Years Compared to the District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | School Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating | Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Cohort pursuing an alternative graduation pathway (commonly referred to as the 4+1 pathway) will achieve a Regents equivalency score and pass an approved pathway assessment required for graduation by the end of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The New York State Board of Regents approved regulations establishing alternative pathways to graduation for all students.  Students may replace one of the required Social Studies Regents exams with an approved alternative assessment. For more information about requirements and approved assessments refer to the NYSED resource online: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/multiple-pathways/>. The school will document the names of the alternative assessments administered and success rate for students in the templates bellow.

## Results and Evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percentage of the 2015 Graduation Cohort Pathway Students Demonstrating Success by Exam Type

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exam | Number of Graduation Cohort Members Tested  (a) | Number Passing or Achieving Regents Equivalency  (b) | Percentage Passing  =[(b)/(a)]\*100 |
| [Write name of exam here] |  |  |  |
| [Write name of exam here] |  |  |  |
| [Write name of exam here] |  |  |  |
| Overall | [Total number tested] | [Number passing] | [Percentage passing] |

Pathway Exam Passing Rate

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | School Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing a Pathway Exam |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing passing rates on individual assessments and additional analysis of the data such as: performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year or trends towards meeting the measure’s target.

## Summary of the High School Graduation 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 |
| Leading Indicator | Each year, 75 percent of students in first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn at least ten credits (if 44 needed for graduation) or five credits (if 22 needed for graduation) each year. |  |
| Leading Indicator | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort will score at least 65 on at least three different New York State Regents exams required for graduation by the completion of their second year in the cohort. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of students in the fourth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, 95 percent of students in the fifth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort graduating after the completion of their fourth year will exceed that of the Total Graduation Cohort from the school district of comparison. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Cohort pursuing an alternative graduation pathway will achieve a Regents equivalency score and pass an approved pathway assessment required for graduation by the end of their fourth year. |  |

## 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.

# GOAL 2: COLLEGE PREPARATION

GOAL 2: COLLEGE PREPARATION

Write the school’s college preparation goal here.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by at least one or some combination of the following indicators:

* Passing an Advanced Placement (“AP”) exam with a score of 3 or higher;
* Earning a score of 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate (“IB”) exam;
* Passing a College Level Examination Program (“CLEP”) exam;
* Passing a college level course offered at a college or university or through a school partnership with a college or university;
* Achieving the college and career readiness benchmark on the SAT; or,
* Earning a Regents diploma with advanced designation; or,
* A different school-created indicator approved by the Institute.

## Method

Schools use any method listed here, or any combination thereof, to demonstrate that at least 75 percent of graduates are prepared to engage in rigorous college level coursework. The school should select only those methods listed here that it uses to demonstrate the college readiness of its students and eliminate those that it will not. For instance, high schools that do not deliver an IB Program as part of their high school design do not report on the IB option. The school reports on the number of students who attempted to achieve each indicator, the number who succeeded, and the corresponding percentage. Additionally, the school should report on the overall number of students who graduated after four years, the number of those graduates who achieved any of the relevant measures, and the overall percentage achieving the measure.

## Results and evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percentage of the 2015 Total Cohort Graduates Demonstrating College Preparation by Indicator

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Number of Graduates who Attempted the Indicator | Number who Achieved Indicator | Percentage of Graduates who Achieved Indicator |
| [Write indicator here] |  |  |  |
| [Write indicator here] |  |  |  |
| [Write indicator here] |  |  |  |
| [Write indicator here] |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Overall | [Total number of 2015 Cohort graduates. *Not a sum of entire column*][[3]](#footnote-3) | [Number of 2015 Cohort graduates achieving any indicator] | [Percentage of 2015 Cohort graduates achieving any indicator] |

## Additional Evidence

Provide a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the College, Career, and Civic Readiness Index (“CCCRI”) for the school’s Total Cohort will exceed the Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.

## Method

The state’s finalized ESSA plan includes a College, Career, and Civic Readiness Index that measures the rate of completion among the Total Cohort of a variety of indicators of readiness for the next step after high school. Indicators that are more rigorous and that are therefore more difficult to attain receive greater weight in the new CCCRI (e.g., attaining an Advanced Regents diploma and a score of 4 or higher on an IB exam). Conversely, some less rigorous indicators that were not included in the College and Career Readiness Index under the state’s NCLB accountability system are included in the CCCRI (e.g., completion of a high school equivalency program).[[4]](#footnote-4)

To achieve this measure, the school must have a CCCRI value that equals or exceeds the 2018-19 CCCRI MIP of 130 for all students. The CCCRI is calculated by multiplying the number of students in the cohort demonstrating college, career, and civic readiness by the weighting for the method by which the student demonstrated college, career, and civic readiness, divided by the number of students in the Total Cohort. The highest possible CCCRI is 200.

## Results and evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

CCCRI Performance by Cohort Year

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Graduation Year | Cohort | Number of Students in Cohort | MIP | School CCCRI |
| 2016-17 | 2013 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2017-18 | 2014 |  | 128 |  |
| 2018-19 | 2015 |  | 130 |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school’s CCCRI for the Total Cohort will exceed that of the district of comparison’s Total Cohort.

## Method

The school compares the CCCRI of students from the fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison.

## Results and evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

CCRI of Fourth-Year Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | School District |
| 2013 | N/A | N/A |
| 2014 |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate into a college or university in the year after graduation.

## Method

The ultimate measure of whether a college prep high school has lived up to its mission is whether students actually enroll and succeed in college. Schools track and report the percentage of fourth-year Total Cohort graduates who matriculate into a two or four-year college program in the school year following graduation.

## Results and Evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in a data table that directly address the measure. **Narrative explaining how the school collected the data** **(e.g. National Student Clearinghouse, student surveys)**. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Matriculation Rate of Graduates by Year

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Graduation Year | Number of Graduates  (a) | Number Enrolled in 2 or 4-year Program in Following Year  (b) | Matriculation Rate  =[(b)/(a)]\*100 |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |

## Summary of the College Preparation 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 (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)** | **Outcome** |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by one or more possible indicators of college readiness. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, the CCCRI for the school’s Total Cohort will exceed that year’s state MIP set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the school’s CCCRI for the Total Cohort will exceed that of the district’s Total Cohort. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate into a college or university in the year after graduation. |  |
|  | [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.

# GOAL 3: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 3: 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 2018-19 school year.

HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school administered the Regents English exam that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the college and career readiness standard as scoring at or above Performance Level 4 (meeting Common Core expectations) on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core). This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 4 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Results and Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have achieved at least Performance Level 4 with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on Regents English Common Core Exam

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**[[5]](#footnote-5)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on Common Core ELA Exam |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Percent Achieving at Least Level 4 by Cohort and Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2016-17 | | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Level 4 | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 4 | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 4 |
| 2015 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school administered the Regents English exam that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the cut off for passing and meeting the requirement for graduation as scoring at or above Performance Level 3 (partially meeting Common Core expectations) on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core). This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 3 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Results and Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have achieved at least Performance Level 3 with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on Regents English Common Core Exam

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**[[6]](#footnote-6)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on the Regents English Exam |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Percent Achieving at Least Level 3 by Cohort and Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2016-17 | | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2015 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state’s Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.

## Method

In the state’s revised calculation of the high school Performance Index, schools now receive additional credit for students scoring at Accountability Level 4.[[7]](#footnote-7) To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have a PI that equals or exceeds the state’s 2019-19 English language arts MIP for all students of 191.

The Performance Index is calculated as such: (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 2) + 2\*(percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 3) + 2.5 \* (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 4). Thus, the highest possible PI is 250. The basis for the percent of students is the school’s fourth year Accountability Cohort. The Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) is scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Accountability Level 1, 65 to 78 is Accountability Level 2; 79 to 84 is Accountability Level 3, and 85 to 100 is Accountability Level 4.

## Results and Evaluation

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

English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

For the 2015 High School Accountability Cohort

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Accountability Level | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Level 1 | | | Level 2 | | | Level 3 | | | Level 4 | | |  | | |
|  | [?] | | | [?] | | | [?] | | | [?] | | |  | | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  |  | PI | = | | [?] | + | | [?] | + | | [?] | = | | [?] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | [?] | + | | [?] | = | | [?] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | | (.5)\*[?] | = | | [?] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PI | = | | [?] |  |

## Additional Evidence

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

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Due to availability of comparative data, this measure uses the school’s Total Cohort results and not the Accountability Cohort results. In order to meet or exceed Common Core expectations, a student must achieve Performance Level 4 or 5. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 4 or Higher on English Regents

of Fourth-Year Total Cohorts by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Level 4 or 5 | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 4 or 5 | Number in Cohort |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort at least partially meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Due to availability of comparative data, this measure uses the school’s Total Cohort results and not the Accountability Cohort results. In order to at least partially meet Common Core expectations, a student would need to pass the exam and score at Performance Level 3 or higher (i.e. scoring at least 65). Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 3 or Higher on English Regents

of Fourth-Year Total Cohorts by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Level 3 or Higher | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 3 or Higher | Number in Cohort |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

English Regents Performance Index (PI)**[[8]](#footnote-8)**

of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| PI | Cohort Size | PI | Cohort Size |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 3: Growth Measure

Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will meet the college and career readiness standard (currently scoring at Performance Level 4 and fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its English language arts program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to meet the English requirement for the college and career readiness standard.

## Results And Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort not proficient in 8th grade who achieved Performance Level 4 with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 4 on Common Core exam among Students

Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort **[[9]](#footnote-9)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Achieving Level 4 on Common Core exam |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Goal 3: Growth Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its English language arts program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to meet the English requirement for graduation.

## Results And Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort not proficient in 8th grade who achieved Performance Level 3 or higher with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 3 on Common Core exam among Students

Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort **[[10]](#footnote-10)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Achieving Level 3 on Regents English Exam |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Goal 3: Optional Measure

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

## Method:

## Results and Evaluation:

## Additional Evidence:

## Summary of the High School 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, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, the Performance Index (PI) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state Measure of Interim Progress (MIP) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students from the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort partially meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the Performance Index (PI) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (Using 2016-17 school district results.) |  |
| Growth | Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |
| Growth | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at least Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |

## 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.

# GOAL 4: MATHEMATICS

Goal 4: Mathematics

Write the school’s mathematics goal here.

HIGH SCHOOL mathematics

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school administered the Regents mathematics exam(s) that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the college and career readiness standard as scoring at or above Performance Level 4 (meeting Common Core expectations) on any Regents Common Core mathematics exams. This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 4 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Results and Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have achieved at least Performance Level 4 with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on a Regents Mathematics Common Core Exam

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**[[11]](#footnote-11)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Percent Achieving at Least Level 4 by Cohort and Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2016-17 | | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Level 4 | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 4 | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 4 |
| 2015 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school administered the Regents mathematics exam(s) that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the cut off for passing and meeting the requirement for graduation as scoring at or above Performance Level 3 (partially meeting Common Core expectations) on the Regents mathematics exams. This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 3 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Results and Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have achieved at least Performance Level 3 with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on a Regents Mathematics Common Core Exam

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**[[12]](#footnote-12)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation |  | Number in Cohort | Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on a Regents Mathematics Exam |
| Fourth  Year |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Percent Achieving at Least Level 3 by Cohort and Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2016-17 | | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2015 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) on the Regents mathematics exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state’s Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.

## Method

In the state’s revised calculation of the high school Performance Index, schools now receive additional credit for students scoring at Accountability Level 4.[[13]](#footnote-13) To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have a PI that equals or exceeds the state’s 2018-19 mathematics MIP for all students of 151.

The Performance Index is calculated as such: (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 2) + 2\*(percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 3) + 2.5 \* (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 4). Thus, the highest possible PI is 250. The basis for the percent of students is the school’s fourth year Accountability Cohort. Regents Common Core mathematics exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Accountability Level 1, 65 to 79 is Accountability Level 2 (65 to 77 for Algebra II); 80 to 84 is Accountability Level 3 (78 to 84 for Algebra II), and 85 to 100 is Accountability Level 4.

## Results and Evaluation

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

Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

For the 2015 High School Accountability Cohort

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Accountability Level | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Level 1 | | | Level 2 | | | Level 3 | | | Level 4 | | |  | | |
|  | [?] | | | [?] | | | [?] | | | [?] | | |  | | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  |  | PI | = | | [?] | + | | [?] | + | | [?] | = | | [?] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | [?] | + | | [?] | = | | [?] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | | (.5)\*[?] | = | | [?] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PI | = | | [?] |  |

## Additional Evidence

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

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exams will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Due to availability of comparative data, this measure uses the school’s Total Cohort results and not the Accountability Cohort results. In order to meet or exceed Common Core expectations, a student must achieve Performance Level 4 or 5. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 4 or Higher on a Mathematics Regents

of Fourth-Year Total Cohorts by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Level 4 or 5 | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 4 or 5 | Number in Cohort |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort at least partially meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exams will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Due to availability of comparative data, this measure uses the school’s Total Cohort results and not the Accountability Cohort results. In order to at least partially meet Common Core expectations, a student would need to pass the exam and score at Performance Level 3 or higher (i.e. scoring at least 65).Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 3 or Higher on a Mathematics Regents

of Fourth-Year Total Cohorts by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Level 3 or Higher | Number in Cohort | Percent Level 3 or Higher | Number in Cohort |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) in Regents mathematics of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Mathematics Regents Performance Index (PI)**[[14]](#footnote-14)**

of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| PI | Cohort Size | PI | Cohort Size |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 4: Growth Measure

Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will meet the college and career readiness standard (currently scoring at Performance Level 4 and fully meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its mathematics program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to grow to meeting the mathematics requirement for the college and career readiness standard.

## Results And Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort not proficient in 8th grade who achieved Performance Level 4 with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 4 on a Mathematics Regents Exam among Students

Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort **[[15]](#footnote-15)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Achieving Level 4 on Common Core Exam |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Goal 4: Growth Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its mathematics program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to move to meeting the English requirement for graduation.

## Results And Evaluation

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort not proficient in 8th grade who achieved Performance Level 3 or higher with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 3 on a Mathematics Regents Exam among Students

Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort **[[16]](#footnote-16)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Achieving Level 3 |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Goal 4: Optional Measure

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

## Method:

## Results and Evaluation:

## Additional Evidence:

## Summary of the High School MATHEMATICS Goal [[17]](#footnote-17)

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, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |
| Absolute | Each year, the Performance Index (PI) in mathematics of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state Measure of Interim Progress (MIP) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exam will exceed the percentage of comparable students from the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort partially meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exam will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations. |  |
| Comparative | Each year, the Performance Index (PI) in Regents mathematics of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (Using 2016-17 school district results.) |  |
| Growth | Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |
| Growth | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at least Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. |  |

## 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.

# GOAL 5: 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.

# HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE

Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents science exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

New York State schools administer multiple high school science assessments; current Regent exams are Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. The school administered Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. It scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100; students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass any one of the Regents science exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents science exam multiple times or have taken multiple science exams. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a science exam.

## Results and Evaluation

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**[[18]](#footnote-18)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing passing rates on individual assessments, and additional analysis of the data such as performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.

Science Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 by Cohort and Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2016-17 | | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2015 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

Goal 5: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort passing a Regents science exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the school district of comparison.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school high school Total Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Due to the availability of comparative data, this measure uses the school’s Total Cohort results and not the Accountability Cohort results. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available district results.

## Results and evaluation

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Science Regents Passing Rate

of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Passing | Cohort Size | Percent Passing | Cohort Size |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth, showing year the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

# Goal 6: SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 6: Social Studies

Write the school’s Accountability Plan social studies goal here.

Goal 6: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents U.S. History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

New York State administers two high school social studies assessments: U.S. History and Global History. In order to graduate, students must pass both of these Regents exams with a score of 65 or higher. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass the two exams by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken the exams multiple times and have until the summer of their fourth year to pass it. Once students pass it, performance on subsequent administrations of the same exam do not affect their status as passing.

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance.

U.S. History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**[[19]](#footnote-19)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and 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

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the state data such as performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

U.S. History Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 by Cohort and Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2016-17 | | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2015 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

Goal 6: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent to students in the high school Total Cohort passing the Regents U.S. History exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the school district of comparison.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school high school Total Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Due to the availability of comparative data, this measure uses the school’s Total Cohort results and not the Accountability Cohort results. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, school presents the most recently available district results.

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

U.S. History Passing Rate

of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Passing | Cohort Size | Percent Passing | Cohort Size |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Evaluation

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

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

Goal 6: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents Global History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass the Global History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken the exam multiple times, and had until the summer of their fourth year to pass it. Once students pass it, performance on subsequent administrations of the same exam do not affect their status as passing.

## Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2015 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance.

Global History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**[[20]](#footnote-20)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Fourth  Year | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |

## Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and 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

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the state data such as performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Global History Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 by Cohort and Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2016-17 | | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2015 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

Goal 6: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort passing the Regents Global History exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the school district of comparison.

## Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school high school Total Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison. Due to the availability of comparative data, this measure uses the school’s Total Cohort results and not the Accountability Cohort results. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available district results.

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

Global History Passing Rate

of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Fourth  Year | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort |
| 2013 | 2016-17 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |

## Evaluation

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

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

# GOAL 7: ESSA

Goal 7: ESSA

Write the school’s Accountability Plan ESSA goal here.

Goal 7: 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

State the school’s ESSA status this year. 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 ESSA status during each year of the current Accountability Period.

Accountability Status by Year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Year | Status |
| 2016-17 |  |
| 2017-18 |  |
| 2018-19 |  |

# 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.

2018-19 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

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

2018-19 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.

2018-19 Student Retention Rate

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2017-18 Enrollment | Number of Students Who Graduated in 2017-18 | Number of Students Who Returned in 2018-19 | Retention Rate  2018-18 Re-enrollment ÷  (2017-18 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 |
| 2016-17 | [%] |
| 2017-18 | [%] |
| 2018-19 | [%] |

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.

2018-19 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 |
| 2016-17 | [%] |
| 2017-18 | [%] |
| 2018-19 | [%] |

# 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.

# HIGH SCHOOLS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

Growth Measure

Each year, the group of students in their second year in the school who have taken a norm-referenced reading test for two years will reduce by one-half the difference between the average of their first year in the school and an NCE of 50. If the cohort already achieved an average NCE of 50 in the first year, it will show an increase in their average NCE.

## Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same cohort of students from their first year to their second year in high school on a norm referenced reading test. Each cohort consists of those students who have norm-referenced reading test results for their first two years in the school. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in the first year and the 50th NCE in the second. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year.

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

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure, e.g. the number of cohorts that achieved their target, and overall performance.

First to Second Year Cohort Growth on the Norm Referenced Reading Test

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Average NCE | | | Target  Achieved |
| First Year Baseline | Second Year Target | Second Year Result |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |

## Evaluation

Provide narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure; i.e. whether the cohort achieved its target. In addition, the evaluation may include how close the cohort came to its target.

## Additional Evidence

Narrative provides an analysis of year-to-year cohort performance including the previous year.

# HIGH SCHOOLS: SUBJECT AREA MEASURES

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exam | Cohort | | | |
|  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Integrated Algebra |  |  |  |  |
| Geometry |  |  |  |  |
| Algebra 2 |  |  |  |  |

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exam | Cohort | | | |
|  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Living Environment |  |  |  |  |
| Earth Science |  |  |  |  |
| Chemistry |  |  |  |  |
| Physics |  |  |  |  |

1. The state’s guidance for the 4+1 graduation pathway can be found here: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/multiple-pathways/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Schools can retrieve district level graduation rates from the SED’s Information and Reporting Services office. News releases and an Excel workbook containing these data are available from the [IRS Data Release webpage](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130617/home.html). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This number should match the number of graduates reported under the high school graduation goal. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For more detail about the weighting of college readiness methods for calculation of the CCCRI, see pages 64-65 of the state’s finalized ESSA plan [here](http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/programs/essa/nys-essa-plan.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For more details on the score ranges used to determine Accountability Levels as distinguished from Performance Levels, see [www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s PI, see page 28. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Based on the highest score for each student on a mathematics Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Based on the highest score for each student on a mathematics Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. For more details on the score ranges used to determine Accountability Levels as distinguished from Performance Levels, see [www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s PI, see page 29. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Based on the highest score for each student on the mathematics Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-20)