**Instructions / Notes**for 2013-14 Accountability Plan Progress Report

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

**Elementary and Middle Schools**

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

**College Preparatory High Schools**

1. **Because of the introduction of college and career readiness standards, schools renewed in 2012-13 or later use revised Accountability Plan measures. (See the appendix in the Guidelines for** [**Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan**](http://www.newyorkcharters.org/documents/Accountability/Accountability%20Plan%20Guidelines%202013.pdf) **for a list of the revised measures.)**
2. **The Institute will gradually phase the new measures into its evaluation of all schools and the SUNY Trustees will take them into account when making renewal decisions. Therefore, the Institute encourages high schools not renewed this year to include the college-and-career-readiness-standard in their Progress Report as optional measures.**
3. Please do not include these instructions or the reference guide below in a submitted report.

Reference Guide to Template Sections

Page

**INTRODUCTION …………………………………………………..……...……4**

**ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL GOALS………………….……5**

**NCLB GOAL……………………………………………………………….…..…25**

**HIGH SCHOOL COHORTS …………………………………….……………26**

**HIGH SCHOOL GOALS………………………..………………….…….……28**

**OPTIONAL GOALS …………………………………………………….………63**

**SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES**

**ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS…………..………66**

**HIGH SCHOOLS……………………………..………..…..………69**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **XXX**  **CHARTER SCHOOL**  **2013-14 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**  **PROGRESS REPORT** |

School Logo

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

Date, 2014

By \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

School Address/

Contact Information

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Name(s), Title(s)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ prepared this 2013-14 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 |

**Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ has served as the school leader since XXX.**

**INTRODUCTION**

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

**School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year**

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

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

**Goal 1: English Language Arts**

Write the school’s English language arts goal here.

**Background**

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

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

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

**2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam**

**Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested[[1]](#footnote-1) | | | Total Enrolled |
| IEP | ELL | Absent |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |

**Results**

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

**Performance on 2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam**

**By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

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

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

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Level 1 | | | Level 2 | | | Level 3 | | | Level 4 | | |  | | |
|  | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | |  | | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  |  | PI | = | | ? | + | | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PLI | = | | ? |  |

**Evaluation**

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

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Results**

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

**2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam**

**Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

**English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District**

**by Grade Level and School Year**

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

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Method**

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

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

**Results**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent Economically  Disadvataged | Number Tested | Percent of Students  at Levels 3&4 | | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect  Size |
| Actual | Predicted |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | |
| **School’s Overall Comparative Performance:** | | | | | | |
| ***Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here*** | | | | | | |

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

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

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

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

**Method**

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Results**

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

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

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | | | |
| 2010-11[[7]](#footnote-7) | 2011-127 | 2012-13 | Statewide Average |
| 3 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| All |  |  |  | 50.0 |

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

**Method**

**Results**

**Evaluation**

**Additional Evidence**

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

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

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

**Action Plan**

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

**MATHEMATICS**

**Goal 2: Mathematics**

Write the school’s mathematics goal here.

**Background**

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

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

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

**2013-14 State Mathematics Exam**

**Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested[[8]](#footnote-8) | | | Total Enrolled |
| IEP | ELL | Absent |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |

**Results**

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

**Performance on 2013-14 State Mathematics Exam**

**By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

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

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

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Level 1 | | | Level 2 | | | Level 3 | | | Level 4 | | |  | | |
|  | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | |  | | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  |  | PI | = | | ? | + | | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PLI | = | | ? |  |

**Evaluation**

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

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Results**

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

**2013-14 State Mathematics Exam**

**Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

**Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Local District**

**by Grade Level and School Year**

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

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

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

**Results**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent Economically  Disadvataged | Number Tested | Percent of Students  at Levels 3&4 | | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect  Size |
| Actual | Predicted |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | |
| **School’s Overall Comparative Performance:** | | | | | | |
| ***Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here*** | | | | | | |

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

**Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year**

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

**Goal 2: Growth Measure[[12]](#footnote-12)**

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

**Method**

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[[13]](#footnote-13)

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

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

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | | | |
| 2010-11[[14]](#footnote-14) | 2011-1214 | 2012-13 | Statewide Average |
| 3 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| All |  |  |  | 50.0 |

**Goal 2: Optional Measure**

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

**Method**

**Results**

**Evaluation**

**Additional Evidence**

**Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

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

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

**Action Plan**

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

**SCIENCE**

**Goal 3: Science**

Write the school’s Accountability Plan science goal here.

**Background**

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

**Goal 3: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

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

**Charter School Performance on 2013-14 State Science Exam**

**By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency | | | |
| Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

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

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

**Goal 3: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

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

**2013-14 State Science Exam**

**Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency | | | |
| Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

**Science Performance of Charter School and Local District**

**by Grade Level and School Year**

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

**Goal 3: Optional Measure**

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

**Method**

**Results**

**Evaluation**

**Additional Evidence**

**Summary of the Science Goal**

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

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

**Action Plan**

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

**NCLB**

**Goal 4: NCLB**

Write the school’s Accountability Plan NCLB goal here.

**Goal 4: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

State the school’s NCLB status this year.

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

**NCLB Status by Year**

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

**APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES**

\*

**In keeping with College and Career Readiness Standards, the Institute has revised many of the high school measures.**

**These measures are in effect for any school that was renewed in 2013 or thereafter. (See the Institute’s 2013 Guidelines.) Only high schools with Accountability Plans based on the Institute’s 2013 Guidelinesneed report on the measures flagged below with the symbol “(§)” and reflecting college and career readiness standards. They *may* report on the other measures as optional measures.**

**The Institute encourages all high schools to report on the flagged (§) measures, as they represent the college and career readiness standards and will be the measures used in the high school’s next Accountability Period.**

# # #

*Note: Add the following section following the School Enrollment section on page 4.*

**High School Cohorts**

**Accountability Cohort**

The state’s Accountability Cohort consists specifically of students who are in their fourth year of high school after the 9th grade. For example, the 2010 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9th grade in the 2010-11 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state’s annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2013-14 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 website for its accountability rules and cohort definitions: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/accountability/home.shtml>)

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

**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 |
| 2011-12 | 2008-09 | 2008 | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| 2012-13 | 2009-10 | 2009 | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| 2013-14 | 2010-11 | 2010 | ?? | ?? | ?? |

**Total Cohort for Graduation**

Students are included in the Total Cohort for Graduation also based on the year they first enter the 9th grade. Prior to 2012-13, students who have enrolled at least five months in the school after entering the 9th grade are part of the Total Cohort for Graduation; as of 2011-12 (the2008 cohort), students who have enrolled only one day in the school after entering the 9th grade are part of the school’s Total Cohort for Graduation Cohort. If the school has discharged students for one of the following acceptable reasons, it may remove them from the graduation cohort: 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 die.

**Fourth Year Total Cohort for Graduation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fourth Year Cohort | Year Entered 9th Grade  Anywhere | Cohort Designation | Number of Students Enrolled on June 30th of the Cohort’s Fourth Year  (a) | Additional Students Still in Cohort [[15]](#footnote-15)  (b) | Graduation Cohort  (a) + (b) |
| 2011-12 | 2008-09 | 2008 | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| 2012-13 | 2009-10 | 2009 | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| 2013-14 | 2010-11 | 2010 | ?? | ?? | ?? |

**Fifth Year Total Cohort for Graduation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fifth Year Cohort | Year Entered 9th Grade  Anywhere | Cohort Designation | Number of Students Enrolled on June 30th of the Cohort’s Fifth Year  (a) | Additional Students Still in Cohort [[16]](#footnote-16)  (b) | Graduation Cohort  (a) + (b) |
| 2011-12 | 2007-08 | 2007 | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| 2012-13 | 2008-09 | 2008 | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| 2013-14 | 2009-10 | 2008 | ?? | ?? | ?? |

# # #

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan English language arts goal.

# # #

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

**Goal 1: 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 English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Regents Comprehensive English exam that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department defines the following pass levels: scoring 65 to meet the graduation requirement for a Regents diploma / 75 to meet the college and career readiness standard.[[17]](#footnote-17) This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that passed the exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to do so.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance.

Indicate 65 or 75 passing score.

**English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 /75**

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 /75 |
|
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |

**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. Also, use this section to discuss 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 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.

**English Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 / 75 by Cohort and Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2011-12 | | | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2010 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)**  Each year, 65 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 ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**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 with a Regents diploma / the college and career readiness standard.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2009 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance.

Indicate 65 or 75 passing score

**English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 / 75 among Students**

**Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort [[19]](#footnote-19)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 /75 |
|
| 2007 |  |  |
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |

**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. Also, use this section to discuss 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 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 1: Absolute Measure**

Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

SAME FOR ALL SCHOOLS

**Method**

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

<http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver_REVISED.pdf>  
  
The AMO continues to be SED’s basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 English language arts AMO of **166**.

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

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**English Language Arts Accountability Performance Level (APL)**

**For the 2010 High School Accountability Cohort**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Level 1 | | | Level 2 | | | Level 3 | | | Level 4 | | |  | | |
|  | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | |  | | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  |  | PI | = | | ? | + | | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | APL | = | | ? |  |

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Goal 1: Comparative Measure**  **(§)** Each year, students in the high school *Total Cohort* will exceed the predicted pass rate on the English language arts Regents exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. |

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, as it has for 3-8 schools. The Institute examines the school’s performance in terms of demographically similar high schools state-wide by using a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. The Institute compares the School’s actual performance to the predicted performance of high schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools’ actual and predicted performance, relative to other high schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a small degree, is the target for achieving this measure.

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

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**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 local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Results**

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

Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

**English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | | School District[[21]](#footnote-21) | |
| Percent Passing | Cohort Size | Percent Passing | Cohort Size |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**OR**

**English Regents Accountability Performance Level (APL)[[22]](#footnote-22)**

**of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District[[23]](#footnote-23)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | | School District[[24]](#footnote-24) | |
| APL | Cohort Size | APL | Cohort Size |
| 2008 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**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. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

**Additional Evidence**

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 1: Growth Measure**  **(§)** Each year, under the state’s high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state’s median growth. |

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students during the course of their high school careers and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the similar scores in the eighth grade. The analysis only includes students from whom the eighth grade scores are available. In following the existing 3-8 Growth Model, students with the same scores are ranked and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students’ growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school’s mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it will have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

*The State Education Department has not yet developed the high school Growth Model.*

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

**Method**

**Results**

**Evaluation**

**Additional Evidence**

**Summary of the High School English Language Arts Goal** [[25]](#footnote-25)

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.

Use the first summary if the Accountability Plan is prior to 2012-13; use the second if it is from 2012-13 or later.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)** | **Outcome** |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing the Regents English exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.) | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)** | **Outcome** |
| Absolute | (§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | (§) Each year, 65 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 ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Comparative | (§) Each year, students in the high school Total Cohort will exceed the predicted pass rate on the Regents English exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. | N/A |
| Comparative | (§) Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.) | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Growth | (§) Each year, under the state’s high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state’s median growth. | N/A |

**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.

# # #

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan mathematics goal.

# # #

**MATHEMATICS**

**Goal 2: 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 mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents math exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Regents Geometry, Integrated Algebra and Algebra 2 exams. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department defines the following pass levels: scoring 65 to meet the graduation requirement for a Regents diploma / scoring 80 to meet the college and career readiness standard. [[26]](#footnote-26) This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to achieve the requisite score on any one of the Regents mathematics exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents mathematics exam multiple times or have taken multiple mathematics exams. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a mathematics exam.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance.

Indicate 65 or 80 passing score.

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 /80**

**by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort[[27]](#footnote-27)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 80 |
|
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |

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

**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.

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 / 80 by Cohort and Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | 2011-12 | | | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2010 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade math exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents math exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its mathematics program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to meet the mathematics requirement for graduation with a Regents diploma / the college and career readiness standard.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2009 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance.

Indicate 65 or 80 passing score

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 / 80 among Students**

**Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort [[28]](#footnote-28)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 /80 |
|
| 2007 |  |  |
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |

**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. Also, use this section to discuss 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 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 2: Absolute Measure**

Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a Regents mathematics exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

SAME FOR ALL SCHOOLS

**Method**

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

<http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver_REVISED.pdf>  
The AMO continues to be SED’s basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds 2013-14 mathematics AMO of **148.**

The APL is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of students in the Accountability Cohort at Levels 2 through 4 to the sum of the percent of students at Level 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible APL is 200. The Regents exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Level 1, 65 to 79 is Level 2, 80 to 89 is Level 3, and 90 to 100 is Level 4.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

**Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL)**

**For the 2010 High School Accountability Cohort**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Level 1 | | | Level 2 | | | Level 3 | | | Level 4 | | |  | | |
|  | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | | ? | | |  | | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  |  | PI | = | | ? | + | | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ? | + | | ? | = | | ? |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | APL | = | | ? |  |

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Goal 2: Comparative Measure**  **(§)**  Each year, students in the high school *Total Cohort* will exceed the predicted pass rate on a Regents mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. |

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, as it has for 3-8 schools. The Institute examines the school’s performance in terms of demographically similar high schools state-wide by using a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of high schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools’ actual and predicted performance, relative to other high schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a small degree, is the target for achieving this measure.

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

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in mathematics of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**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 local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.[[29]](#footnote-29)

**Results**

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

Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | | School District[[30]](#footnote-30) | |
| Percent Passing | Cohort Size | Percent Passing | Cohort Size |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**OR**

**Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL)**

**of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District[[31]](#footnote-31)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | | School District[[32]](#footnote-32) | |
| APL | Cohort Size | APL | Cohort Size |
| 2008 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**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. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

**Additional Evidence**

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 2: Growth Measure**  **(§)** Each year, under the state’s high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state’s median growth. |

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students during the course of their high school careers and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the similar scores in the eighth grade. The analysis only includes students from whom the eighth grade scores are available. In following the existing 3-8 Growth Model, students with the same scores are ranked and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students’ growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school’s mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it will have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

*The State Education Department has not yet developed the high school Growth Model.*

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

**Method**

**Results**

**Evaluation**

**Additional Evidence**

**Summary of the High School Mathematics Goal** [[33]](#footnote-33)

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.

Use the first summary if the Accountability Plan is prior to 2012-13; use the second if it is from 2012-13 or later.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)** | **Outcome** |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a New York State Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.) | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)** | **Outcome** |
| Absolute | (§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | (§) Each year, 65 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 ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Comparative | (§) Each year, students in the high school Total Cohort will exceed the predicted pass rate on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. | N/A |
| Comparative | (§) Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a New York State Regents mathematics exam of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.) | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |
| Growth | (§) Each year, under the state’s high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state’s median growth. | N/A |

**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.

# # #

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan science goal.

# # #

**SCIENCE**

**Goal 3: 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 administers 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**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years’ performance.

**Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65**

**by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort[[34]](#footnote-34)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 |
|
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |

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

**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 | 2011-12 | | | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2010 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

**Goal 3: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent to 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 local school district.

**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 local school district. 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 brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

**Science Regents Passing Rate**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Passing | Cohort Size | Percent Passing | Cohort Size |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |

**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. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

**Additional Evidence**

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.

Include the following section as a separate Accountability Plan subject area goal following the science section.

# # #

**SOCIAL STUDIES**

**Goal 4: Social Studies**

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

**Goal 4: 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**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 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[[35]](#footnote-35)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 |
|
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |

**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 | 2011-12 | | | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2010 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

**Goal 4: 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 local school district.

**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 local school district. 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 | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Passing | Cohort Size | Percent Passing | Cohort Size |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |

**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 4: 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 2010 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[[36]](#footnote-36)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing with a score of 65 |
|
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |

**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 | 2011-12 | | | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | |
| Number in Cohort | | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing |
| 2010 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  | |  |  |  |  |

**Goal 4: 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 local school district.

**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 local school district. 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 | Charter School | | School District | |
| Percent Passing | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing | Number in Cohort |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether the 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.

# # #

Include the following section as a separate Accountability Plan goal following the NCLB goal.

# # #

**HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION**

**GOAL 6: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION**

Write the school’s graduation goal here.

**Goal 6: Absolute Measure**

Each year, 75 percent of students in each cohort will pass their core academic subjects by the end of August and the school will promote them to the next grade.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** 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.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of high school cohorts and examines their progress toward graduation based on annual credit accumulation. The measure requires that, based on the school’s promotion requirements, the school will promote 75 percent of its students in each cohort to the next grade by the end of August OR that 75 percent of the first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn the requisite 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**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

**Percent of Students Promoted by Cohort in 2013-14**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent promoted |
| 2010 |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  |

**OR**

**Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts**

**Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2013-14**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent promoted |
| 2012 |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  |

**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. 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 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 6: Absolute Measure**

Each year, 75 percent of students in the second year high school Total Graduation Cohort will score 65 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 cohort have passed at least three Regents exams by their second year in the cohort. In August of 2014, the 2012 cohort will have completed its second year.

**Results**

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Passing Three Regents |
| 2010 |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |

**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. 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**

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 6: Absolute Measure**

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 2010 cohort and graduated four years later and those who entered as members of the 2009 cohort and graduated five years later. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams in English language arts, mathematics, science, U.S. History and Global History. Students have through the summer at the end of their fourth year to complete graduation requirements.

The school’s graduation requirements appear above under the graduation goal’s first measure pertaining to annual grade-by-grade promotion or credit accumulation.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating |
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating |
| 2007 |  |  |
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |

**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. 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 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 6: 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 local school district.

**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 local school district[[37]](#footnote-37). 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.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Designation | Charter School | | School District[[38]](#footnote-38) | |
| Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating | Number in Cohort | Percent Graduating |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  | N/A |

**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. 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 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.

**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** |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort will pass their core academic subjects by the end of August and be promoted to the next grade.  Required for Accountability Plans developed prior to 2012-13 | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/ |
| (§) 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.  Required for Accountability Plans developed in 2012-13 or later |
| Absolute | 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. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/ |
| Absolute | 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. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| 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 local school district. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |

**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.

# # #

Include the following section as a separate Accountability Plan goal following the NCLB goal.

**COLLEGE PREPARATION**

**GOAL 7: COLLEGE PREPARATION**

Write the school’s college preparation goal here.

**Goal 7: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the average performance of students in the 10th grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics.

**Method**

This measure tracks student performance one of the most commonly used early high school college prep assessment. Students receive a scale score in critical reading, writing and mathematics. Scale scores range from 200 to 800 on each subsection with 1600 as the highest possible score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times, the school reports only on a student’s highest score on each subsection. Compare school averages to the New York State average for all 10th grade (sophomore) test takers in the given year.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**10th Grade PSAT Performance by School Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | Number of Students in the 10th Grade | Number of Students Tested | Critical Reading | | Mathematics | |
| School | New York State | School | New York State |
| 2011-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012-13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**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. 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 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 7: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the average performance of students in the 12th grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics.

**Method**

This measure tracks student performance on one of the most commonly used high school college prep assessments.

For the SAT include this description: The SAT is a national college admissions examination. Students receive a scale score in reading, writing and mathematics. Scale scores range from 200 to 800 on each subsection with 2400 as the highest possible score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times during the year, the school only reports a student’s highest score. The school compares its averages the New York State average for all 12th grade (senior) test takers in the given year.

For the ACT include this description: The ACT is a national college admissions and placement examination. Students receive scaled scores in reading, mathematics, English and science. Scaled scores range from 1 to 36 on each section; the school averages the three separate scores to calculate a student’s composite score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times during the year, the school reposts on only a student’s highest scaled score for each section. The school compares its average to the New York State average for all 12th grade (senior) test takers in the given year.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**12th Grade SAT/ACT Performance by School Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | Number of Students in the 12th Grade | Number of Students Tested | Reading | | Mathematics | |
| School | New York State | School | New York State |
| 2011-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012-13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**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. 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 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 7: School Created College Preparation Measure**

Each Year, the school will demonstrate the preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design. Insert school-developed measure.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(See below for measures in more recent Plans.

**Method**

Provide a brief description of the measure.

**Results**

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** The percent of graduating students that meets the state’s aspirational performance measure (APM), currently defined as the percentage of students in a cohort who graduate with a score of 80 or better on a math Regents exam AND 75 or better on the English Regents exam, will exceed the statewide average.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

Recognizing that remediation rates in New York’s colleges are far too high, the Board of Regents has reviewed data showing the gap between high school expectations and college attainment. They reviewed data comparing the graduation rate for the 2005 cohort with the "college and career ready" graduation rate – defined as the percentage of students in the cohort who graduated with a score 80 or better on a math Regents exam and 75 or better on the English Regents exam. The Regents view these data as an important indicator of future student success. Students who graduate high school – but do so with a score below 80 on a math Regents exam and below 75 on the English exam – are likely to require remediation in college.

**Results**

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

**Percent of Graduates Meeting the Aspirational Performance Measure[[39]](#footnote-39)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | Statewide[[40]](#footnote-40) |
| 2008 |  | 35.3 |
| 2009 |  | 35.3 |
| 2010 |  | N/A |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** The percent of graduating students who graduate with a Regents diploma with Advanced Designation will exceed the local district.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

In establishing measures to be used by schools, districts and parents to better inform them of the progress of their students, the Regents have also set as an additional aspirational measure of achievement the percent of graduating students who earned a Regents diploma with Advanced Designation (i.e., earned 22 units of course credit; passed seven-to-nine Regents exams with a score of 65 or above; and took advanced course sequences in Career and Technical Education, the arts, or a language other than English).

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**Percent of Graduates with a Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation[[41]](#footnote-41)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Charter School | School District[[42]](#footnote-42) |
| 2007 |  |  |
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  | N/A |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by passing an Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam or a college level course.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

Discuss the achievement indicators used to demonstrate college preparation.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**Graduates Passing a Course Demonstrating College Preparation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Number of Graduates | Percent Passing the Equivalent OF a College Level Course[[43]](#footnote-43) |
| 2007 |  |  |
| 2008 |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |

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

**Goal 7: School Created College Attendance or Achievement Measure**

Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design. Insert school-developed measure.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

|  |
| --- |
| **(§)** Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation.  REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER |

**Method**

Provide a brief description of the measure.

**Results**

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

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

**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.

Use the first summary if the Accountability Plan is prior to 2012-13; use the second if it is from 2012-13 or later.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)** | **Outcome** |
| Comparative | Each year, the average performance of students in the 10th grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| Comparative | Each year, the average performance of students in the 12th grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| College Preparation | Each Year, the school will demonstrate the preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| College Attainment | Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
|  | Write in optional measure here | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)** | **Outcome** |
| Comparative | Each year, the average performance of students in the 10th grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| Comparative | Each year, the average performance of students in the 12th grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
|  | **(§)** The percent of graduating students that meets the state’s aspirational performance measure (APM), currently defined as the percentage of students in a cohort who graduate with a score of 80 or better on a math Regents exam AND 75 or better on the English Regents exam, will exceed the statewide average. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| **(§)** Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by passing an Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam or a college level course. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| **(§)** Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation. | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve/  Not Applicable |
| **(§)** Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation. |  |
|  | Write in optional measure here | Achieved/  Did Not Achieve |

**Action Plan**

Provide a 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.**APPENDIX B: 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.

**2013-14 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate**

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

**2013-14 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Percent of Respondents Satisfied |
|  | % |
|  | % |
|  | % |
|  | % |
|  | % |

**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.

**2013-14 Student Retention Rate**

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

Provide a narrative describing the year’s attendance rate.

**2013-14 Attendance**

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

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

**APPENDIX C: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES**

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

**ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS**

**Absolute Measure**

In 2013-14, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.

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

**2013-14 English Language Arts Performance**

**by Grade Level and Years Attending the School**

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

**Comparative Measure**

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

While schools are required to compare themselves to the local school district, there may be individual schools that also provide a compelling comparison. These comparisons might be schools in the same neighborhood, with the same demographics, or have similar programs. The first table features a grade level breakdown for 2013-14; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

**2013-14 English Language Arts Performance of   
Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level**

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

**English Language Arts Performance of**

**School and Comparison Schools by School Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | Grades | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year  and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on State Exam by Year | | | | | | | |
| Charter School | | School 1 | | School 2 | | School 3 | |
| Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested | Percent | Number  Tested |
| 2011-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012-13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Growth Measure** **(national norm-referenced assessment)**

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

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they made towards the desirable outcome of grade level or an NCE of 50. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the same norm-referenced exam in 2012-13 and 2013-14. It includes students who repeated the grade. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students who took the exam in both years.

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

**Results**

**Cohort Growth on XXX Test from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50 | | | Target  Achieved |
| 2012-13 | Target | 2013-14 |
| A |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| B |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| C |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| All |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

**Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Reading Test**

**by School Year**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| School Year | Cohort met target? |
| 2011-12 |  |
| 2012-13 |  |
| 2013-14 |  |

**Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | Cohort Grades | Number of Cohorts Meeting Target | Number of Cohorts |
| 2010-11 | ?-? |  |  |
| 2011-12 | ?-? |  |  |
| 2012-13 | ?-? |  |  |
| 2013-14 | ?-? |  |  |

**ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE**

**2013-14 Science Performance**

**by Grade Level and Years Attending the School**

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

**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 n 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 |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  | YES/NO |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  | 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 SCHOOL: SUBJECT AREA MEASURES**

**Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exam | Cohort | | | |
|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Math A |  |  |  |  |
| Math B |  |  |  |  |
| Integrated Algebra |  |  |  |  |
| Geometry |  |  |  |  |
| Algebra 2 |  |  |  |  |

**Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exam | Cohort | | | |
|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Living Environment |  |  |  |  |
| Earth Science |  |  |  |  |
| Chemistry |  |  |  |  |
| Physics |  |  |  |  |

1. Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Institute will continue using ***economically disadvantaged*** instead of ***eligibility for free lunch*** as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](http://www.newyorkcharters.org/operate/first-year-schools/accountability-plan/) for an explanation. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Grade level results not available. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In contrast to NYSED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The Institute will continue using ***economically disadvantaged*** instead of ***eligibility for free lunch*** as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](http://www.newyorkcharters.org/operate/first-year-schools/accountability-plan/) for an explanation. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s business portal: portal.nysed.gov. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Grade level results not available. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Number of students who had been enrolled for at least one day prior to leaving the school and who were not discharged for an acceptable reason. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Number of students who had been enrolled for at least one day prior to leaving the school and who were not discharged for an acceptable reason [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The statewide adaptation of new State Standards includes incorporating college and career readiness performance standards for the English language arts exam. The state has benchmarked student ELA test performance to the likely need for remedial course work when students enter college by comparing student 3-8 test results and Regents results to their post-secondary experience at SUNY and CUNY. Besides raising the cut scores for proficiency in the 3-8 testing program, the state has begun to set college and career readiness standards for passing Regents. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65. The New York State Accountability Report provides the district results for students scoring at or above 75. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s APL, see page 31. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. See page 30 above for an explanation of the APL. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The statewide adaptation of the revised State Standards includes incorporating college and career readiness performance standards for the English language arts exam. The state has benchmarked student mathematics test performance to the likely need for remedial course work when students enter college by comparing student 3-8 test results and Regents results to their post-secondary experience at SUNY and CUNY. Besides raising the cut scores for proficiency in the 3-8 testing program, the state has begun to set college and career readiness standards for passing Regents. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65. The New York State Accountability Report provides the district results for students scoring at or above 75. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. See page 38 above for an explanation of the APL. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. 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-37)
38. District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Schools can retrieve state 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-39)
40. Statewide results for the 2010 cohort are not yet available. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Schools can retrieve information about diplomas conferred 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/20120611/home.html). [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam, or a college level course [↑](#footnote-ref-43)