



**Explore Excel  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2012-13 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2013

By Rebecca Daverin, Senior Director of Operations, Explore Schools

**Excel Lower School Campus  
1077 Remsen Avenue  
Brooklyn, NY 11236  
And  
Excel Upper School Campus  
956 East 82<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11236**

The following individuals prepared this 2012-13 Accountability Progress Report:

Karen Francois, Interim Principal, Explore Excel Charter School

Adam Schulman, Operations & Data Manager, Explore Schools

Avanthi Witana, Data Analyst, Explore Schools

Rebecca Daverin, Senior Director of Operations, Explore Schools

Marni Greenstein, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Explore Schools

on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Graeme Daykin	Chair/President
Lizz Pawlson	Member
JR Randall	Member
Hank Mannix	Member
Reena Bhatia	Member
Nekei Afful	Member Ex-Officio

Dana Bogle, who is currently on maternity leave, has served as the Principal since August of 2012.

## INTRODUCTION

Explore Excel Charter School (“Excel”) opened in August of 2011 serving 240 Kindergarten through third grade scholars. Excel opened as an alternative option for PS 114, a local district school located in community school district 17 that earned an “F” on the NYC Progress Report the year before Excel opened. An admissions preference was given to scholars who were attending or zoned to attend a “failing school.”

Excel’s mission is to provide our students with the academic skills and critical-thinking abilities they need to succeed in a college-preparatory high school. Excel offers a co-teaching model that allows for small group and more differentiated instruction. During the 2012-2013 academic year Excel served the following percentages of at-risk groups:

- 4% of students designated as English Language Learners
- 19% of students with IEPs
- 82% of students eligible for free and reduced lunch

### School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2009-10														
2010-11														
2011-12	60	60	62	63										
2012-13	54	55	60	59	59									

**Goal:** Each year, student enrollment will be within 10% of full enrollment as defined in the school’s charter. This will be measured each year by an analysis of student enrollment figures in ATS.

**2012-13 Progress towards attainment of goal:** Met.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

Excel students will meet grade level expectations in English.

### Background

In the 2012-2013 schools year we used the Journeys Anchor curriculum for grades K-1, and Interim assessments in ELA provided by the Achievement Network in grades 2-8. We had four data days during the year that were used to review data to drive instruction and provide additional professional development for teachers.

### 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.<sup>1</sup>

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> grade in April 2013. 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.

**2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>2</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	59				59
4	61				61
5					
6					
7					
8					
All	120				120

<sup>1</sup> Because of the state's new 3-8 testing program, aligned to its high school college and career readiness standards, the Institute is no longer using Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores. Please report results for previous years using the state's published results for scoring at proficiency.

<sup>2</sup> Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

## Results

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (85 out of 120) 16.5% achieved proficiency on the NYS English Language Arts Exam. In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade 12.5% were proficient and in 4<sup>th</sup> grade 21.6% were proficient. The proficiency of students in at least their second year was greater than that of All Students in each grade and overall.

### Performance on 2012-13 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	10.2%	59	12.5%	48
4	19.7%	61	21.6%	37
5				
6				
7				
8				
All	15.0%	120	16.5%	85

## Evaluation

We did not meet the first absolute measure.

For students enrolled in at least their second year, in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students fell short of the goal by 62.5%, 4<sup>th</sup> grade fell short by 53.4% and hence overall Excel fell short by 58.5%. As a second year school many of our scholars came in far below grade level and that combined with the rigor of Common Core Learning standards created a substantial gap. We will discuss our plans to address that gap in the Action plan located in the ELA summary section of this report.

## Additional Evidence

The school was in its second year so there is no historical data.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year
-------	--

	Achieving Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3					12.5%	48
4					21.6%	37
5						
6						
7						
8						
All					16.5%	85

**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 Annual Measurable Objective (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 current year’s English language arts AMO. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>3</sup>

**Results**

Our performance index for the 2012-13 academic year in English Language Arts was 77.

**English Language Arts 2012-13 Performance Level Index (PLI)**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	38.3	46.7	13.3	1.7

$$\begin{array}{rcccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & 46.7 & + & 13.3 & + & 1.7 & = & 61.7 \\
 & & & & 13.3 & + & 1.7 & = & \underline{15.0} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 76.7
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

<sup>3</sup> In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

*The State Education Department has not recalibrated the AMO to align with the new English Language Arts 3-8 testing program*

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district (CSD18).

**Method**

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>4</sup>

**Results**

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (85 out of 120) 16.5% achieved proficiency on the NYS English Language Arts Exam. In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade 12.5% were proficient and in 4<sup>th</sup> grade 21.6% were proficient. In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Excel did not outperform the district and in 4<sup>th</sup> grade they matched the district. Therefore, overall Excel did not outperform the district in ELA.

**2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	12.5%	48	20.6%	1398
4	21.6%	37	21.6%	1541
5				
6				
7				
8				
All	<b>16.5%</b>	85	<b>21.1%</b>	2939

<sup>4</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The SED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

## Evaluation

We did not meet the first comparative measure.

For students enrolled in at least their second year, in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students underperformed the district by 8.1%, 4<sup>th</sup> grade performance equaled the district, and hence overall Excel underperformed the district by 4.6%.

## Additional Evidence

The school was in its second year so there is no historical data.

### 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					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3					12.5%	20.6%
4					21.6%	21.6%
5						
6						
7						
8						
All					<b>16.5%</b>	<b>21.1%</b>

#### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>5</sup>

#### Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools

<sup>5</sup> The Institute will begin using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2012-13. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

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 2012-13 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2011-12 results (using free-lunch eligible percentage), the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

**Results**

Waiting on data from CSI

**2011-12 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

<b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b>

**Evaluation**

Waiting on data from CSI

**Additional Evidence**

Waiting on data from CSI

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

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2009-10						
2010-11						
2011-12						

**Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>6</sup>**

<sup>6</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

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 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.

*The State Education Department has not yet reported schools’ mean growth percentiles for the 2012-13 school year.<sup>7</sup>*

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Summary of the English Language Arts 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.	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.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	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 2011-12 school district results.)	N/A

<sup>7</sup> See the Guidelines.

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.	N/A
Growth (Optional)	On the 2012-13 NYS ELA exam each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2011-12 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve
Growth (Optional)	Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one-half the gap between their average NCE on the previous year's TerraNova Reading exam and an NCE of 50 in the current year's TerraNova Reading Exam. 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.	Did Not Achieve

**Action Plan**

We are revamping our approach to literacy by modifying Journeys, the anchor curriculum we use for literacy instruction and providing more support to teachers around lesson planning that is aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards. In terms of the anchor curriculum, we have revamped objectives and unit foci to align to the Common Core and we are implementing the Teachers College writing workshops with the new Common Core aligned units and providing updated professional development to teachers around writing instruction. We are also continuing the coaching models that were implemented last year.

We have also increased teachers' planning time and normed our approach to planning- we are proactively discussing teachers' understanding of standards and anticipating confusion students may experience. We are also reviewing students work in planning meetings when appropriate. The network is deploying resources to develop our leaders and the quality of feedback that Principals, Content Coordinators, and Academic Directors are providing teachers. We are making efforts to support the development of our leaders and the Superintendent is spending his time primarily watching the feedback being provided by school leaders and coaching leaders on their approach to providing feedback.

We also hired a Literacy Coordinator who will provide content based support in planning and instruction to teachers. Additionally she will facilitate planning meetings with teachers and provide feedback and coaching to teachers. And she will work with the Leadership Team to analyze data and to create plans in response to data.

There is also more professional development being provided to teachers on cognitive engagement. And we are continuing our partnership with the Achievement Network, our interim assessment provider.

**Goal 1: Growth Measure (Optional)**

On the 2012-13 NYS ELA exam each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2011-12 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next on the NYS ELA exam.

**Results**

The grade level cohort (43 students out of 61) achieved a proficiency of 18.6% in 2012-2013 compared to 65.1% in 2011-2012.

ELA % Proficient	Prof. 12-13	Prof. 11-12
Grade 3	18.6%	65.1%

**Evaluation**

We did not meet the optional growth measure.

**Goal 1: Growth Measure (Optional)**

Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one-half the gap between their average NCE on the previous year's TerraNova Reading exam and an NCE of 50 in the current year's TerraNova Reading Exam. 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.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next on the TerraNova Reading exam.

**Results**

Kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade did not make positive gains, but there was a positive gain in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade.

Grade	# of students in cohort	Average NCE 2011-12	Average NCE 2012-13
Kindergarten	42	59	50 (-9)
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	42	49	47 (-2)
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	35	50	52 (+2)

**Evaluation**

We did not meet this optional growth measure.

This year we learned that teachers need additional support with planning and execution as well as additional time for independent reading, word study, and small group instruction. To address this issue, we are providing teachers with a stronger framework for using curricular resources and time to discuss content and execution multiple times per week. We have re-designed our schedule to increase time for small-group instruction, independent reading, and word study.

Excel's Literacy Coordinator, in collaboration with the Explore Schools Literacy Specialist, will be providing support for teachers in these grade levels to ensure effective guided reading practices and to ensure the neediest students are receiving individualized instruction

**Additional Evidence****MATHEMATICS****Goal 1: Mathematics**

Excel students will meet grade level expectations in Math.

**Background**

In the 2012-13 school year we used the TERC/Investigations anchor curriculum in math school-wide and interim assessments in Math created by the Explore Schools Network Math Specialist for

Grades K-8. We had four data days during the year that were used to review data to drive instruction and provide additional professional development for teachers.

**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 mathematics examination for grades 3-8.<sup>8</sup>

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> grade in April 2013. 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.

**2012-13 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>9</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	59				59
4	61				61
5					
6					
7					
8					
All	120				120

**Results**

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (85 out of 120) 38.8% achieved proficiency on the NYS Math Exam. In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade 31.3% were proficient and in 4<sup>th</sup> grade 48.6% were proficient.

**Performance on 2012-13 State Mathematics Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

<sup>8</sup> Because of the state’s new 3-8 testing program, aligned to its high school college and career readiness standards, the Institute is no longer using Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores. Please report results for previous year’s using the state’s published results for scoring at proficiency.

<sup>9</sup> Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	35.6%	59	31.3%	48
4	49.2%	61	48.6%	37
5				
6				
7				
8				
All	42.5%	120	38.8%	85

### Evaluation

We did not meet the first absolute measure.

For students enrolled in at least their second year, in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students fell short of the goal by 43.7%, 4<sup>th</sup> grade fell short by 26.4% and hence overall Excel fell short by 36.2%. As a second year school many of our scholars came in far below grade level and that combined with the rigor of Common Core Learning standards created a substantial gap. We will discuss our plans to address that gap in the Action plan located in the Math summary section of this report.

### Additional Evidence

The school was in its second year so there is no historical data.

### Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3					31.3%	48
4					48.6%	37
5						
6						
7						
8						

All					38.8%	85
-----	--	--	--	--	-------	----

**Goal 1: 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 Annual Measurable Objective (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 current year’s mathematics AMO. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>10</sup>

**Results**

Our performance index for the 2012-13 academic year in Math was 120.

**Mathematics 2012-13 Performance Level Index (PLI)**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	22.5	35.0	33.3	9.2

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccl}
 \text{PI} & = & 35.0 & + & 33.3 & + & 9.2 & = & 77.5 \\
 & & & & 33.3 & + & 9.2 & = & \underline{42.5} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 120
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

*The State Education Department has not recalibrated the AMO to align with the new Mathematics 3-8 testing program*

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

<sup>10</sup> In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district (CSD18).

**Method**

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>11</sup>

**Results**

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (85 out of 120) 38.8% achieved proficiency on the NYS Math Exam. In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade 31.3% were proficient and in 4<sup>th</sup> grade 48.6% were proficient. In 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades Excel outperformed the district, and hence we outperformed the district overall.

**2012-13 State Mathematics Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	31.3%	48	22.2%	1400
4	48.6%	37	22.4%	1539
5				
6				
7				
8				
All	38.8%	85	22.4%	2939

**Evaluation**

We met the first comparative measure.

**Additional Evidence**

The school was in its second year so there is no historical data.

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

<sup>11</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The SED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

### 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					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3					31.3%	22.2%
4					48.6%	22.4%
5						
6						
7						
8						
All					38.8%	22.4%

#### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>12</sup>

#### Method

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

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2012-13 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2011-12 results (using free-lunch eligible percentage), the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

#### Results

We are waiting on data from CSI.

#### **2011-12 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

<sup>12</sup> The Institute will begin using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2012-13. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

<b>School's Overall Comparative Performance:</b>

**Evaluation**

We are waiting on data from CSI.

**Additional Evidence**

We are waiting on data from CSI.

**Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2009-10						
2010-11						
2011-12						

**Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>13</sup>**  
 Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a

<sup>13</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

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.

*The State Education Department has not yet reported schools' mean growth percentiles for the 2012-13 school year.*

## **Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 2: Growth Measure (Optional)**

On the 2012-2013 NYS Math exam each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2010-11 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next on the NYS Math exam.

**Results**

The grade level cohort (43 students out of 61) achieved a proficiency of 46.5% in 2012-2013 compared to 83.7% in 2011-2012.

Math % Proficient	Prof. 12-13	Prof. 11-12
Grade 3	46.5%	83.7%

**Evaluation**

We did not meet the optional growth measure.

**Additional Evidence****Goal 1: Growth Measure (Optional)**

Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one-half the gap between their average NCE on the previous year's TerraNova Math exam and an NCE of 50 in the current year's TerraNova Math Exam. 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.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next on the TerraNova Math exam.

**Results**

Kindergarten and 2nd grade did not make positive gains. 1<sup>st</sup> grade did reduce the gap by half.

Grade	# of students in cohort	Average NCE 2011-12	Average NCE 2012-13
Kindergarten	43	60	53 (-7)
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	34	41	46 (+5)
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	38	55	53 (-2)

**Evaluation**

We did not meet this optional growth measure.

To address this issue in K-2, we have been working to align our instruction to the new Common Core standards. We have re-mapped the use of our anchor curriculum to align to the standards which will result in more rigorous instruction in K-2. In addition, we are providing professional development to our teachers on the Common Core Standards.

**Additional Evidence**

**Summary of the Mathematics 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.	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.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	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 2011-12 school district results.)	N/A
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.	N/A
Growth (Optional)	On the 2012-2013 NYS Math exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2010-11 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve
Growth (Optional)	Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one-half the gap between their average NCE on the previous year's TerraNova Math exam and an NCE of 50 in the current year's TerraNova Math Exam. 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.	Did Not Achieve

**Action Plan**

In math we want to continue using Investigations, a curriculum that we believe is aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards. We believe our stronger postings in math are the result of an intentional approach, a curriculum that has been tested, and the use of internally created interim assessments. We are revising our unit tests and interims to make them more rigorous and aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards.

We are also putting more emphasis on authentic problem solving and students' approach to non-routine problems. We have increased planning time for teachers and are using planning time as a professional development opportunity to increase teachers' content knowledge and instructional practice. We have doubled the amount of time that we are having conversations about teaching and content and are going to incorporate looking at student work into that process on a regular basis.

## SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Science

Excel students will meet grade level expectations in Science.

#### Background

We have a Science teacher who works closely with the Academic Directors to plan her lessons and utilize FOSS kits in instruction.

#### **Goal 3: Absolute Measure**

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

#### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4<sup>th</sup> grade in spring 2013. 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**

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (37 out of 59) 94.6% achieved proficiency on the NYS Science exam. This was greater than the proficiency of All students.

#### **Charter School Performance on 2012-13 State Science 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
4	91.5%	59	94.6%	37
8				

#### **Evaluation**

We met our goal.

**Additional Evidence**

The school was in its second year so there is no historical data.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4					94.6%	37
8						
All						

**Goal 3: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

We do not have district 18 results.

**2012-13 State Science Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	94.6%	37		
8				

**Evaluation**

We do not have Science scores for the district.

**Additional Evidence**

This is our first year administering the exam.

**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					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4					94.6%	
8						
All					94.6%	

**Summary of the Science 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
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.	N/A

**Action Plan**

We are taking an intentional approach to developing the Science teacher’s ability to effectively use FOSS kits in instruction. Our Dean of Culture is coaching the teacher and helping her to further develop her classroom management skills to modify/differentiate her approach for each grade level.

**NCLB**

**Goal 4: NCLB**  
Excel will make adequate yearly progress.

**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 which indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

**Results**

The school has not received its NCLB status for the 2012-2013 school year.

**Evaluation**

The school has not received its NCLB status for the 2012-2013 school year.

**Additional Evidence**

The school has not received its NCLB status for the 2012-2013 school year.

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2010-11	
2011-12	
2012-13	

## 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

Excel will have high satisfaction rates from key stakeholders

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the Parent Survey section of the NYC DOE report card in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher (out of 10) in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect. The school will only have met this goal if two thirds or more parents participate in the survey.

### Method

The school used the NYC DOE annual survey.

### Results

#### 2012-13 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

40% of parents/ guardians responded to the survey.

The average parent/ guardian rating for each of these four categories were:

Academic Expectations – 8.4

Communications – 8.5

Engagement – 8.2

Safety & Respect – 8.4

### Evaluation

We will set up computers to better facilitate online completion and give families more access to the survey. We sent home additional surveys this year and we believe the timing of those surveys decreased the response rate for the DOE survey. While we will continue to send home additional surveys and use these data to drive our decision making, we will be more strategic with the timing of all surveys in an effort to increase the response rate for this survey.

### Goal S: Teacher Satisfaction

Excel will have high satisfaction rates from key stakeholders

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year, teachers will express satisfaction with the school's program, Teacher Survey section of

the NYC DOE report card in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher (out of 10) in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect. The school will only have met this goal if two thirds or more teachers participate in the survey.

### **Method**

The school used the NYC DOE annual survey.

### **Results**

#### **2012-13 Teacher Satisfaction Survey Response Rate**

96% of teachers responded to the survey.

The average teacher rating for each of these four categories were:

Academic Expectations – 6.7

Communications – 6.5

Engagement – 5.9

Safety & Respect – 6.9

### **Evaluation**

Goal not met.

Through this survey and other internal surveys we learned that teachers didn't feel supported and this year we hired a literacy coordinator to address this concern and increase the level of support teachers are receiving. Additionally the Interim Principal is making an effort to engage teachers more during Professional Develop time and soliciting feedback on PD initiatives and work in general. We are administering regular staff surveys and addressing concerns in real time. Additionally we are offering parent workshops that give teachers the opportunity to engage with families about curriculum. Space was also a huge concern last year, so we worked with the DOE to amend our Building Utilization Plan and increased our space allocation by 1.5 FTE. This has given us more space for related services and small group instruction.

#### **Goal S: Absolute Measure**

Each year, student enrollment will be within 10% of full enrollment as defined in the school's character. This will be measured each year by an analysis of student enrollment figures in ATS. Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

### **Method**

Our end of year enrollment will be used to measure this goal.

## Results

The full time equivalent enrollment for all students according to our Per Pupil Allocation reconciliation was 298.307; full enrollment would be 300; therefor our FTE was within 10% of full enrollment

## Evaluation

Goal met.

### **Goal S: Absolute Measure**

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

## Method

The average daily attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days all students attended by the total number of students were enrolled.

## Results

94.3%

## Evaluation

Goal not met.

We are implementing a more comprehensive plan for following up with families and incentivizing good attendance with awards and community circle celebrations.

### **Goal S: Absolute Measure**

Each year the school will have in place and maintain effective systems, policies, procedures and other controls for ensuring that legal and charter requirements are met.

## Evaluation

Goal met.

### **Goal S: Absolute Measure**

Each year the school will take corrective action, if needed, in a timely manner to address any internal control or compliance deficiencies identified by its external auditor, SED, or the Institute.

**Evaluation**

Not applicable.