



University Preparatory Charter School For Young Men

2012-13 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

Monday, September 16, 2013

By: Joseph Munno/Principal

180 Raines Park
Rochester, New York 14613
(585)730-5135
Fax: (585)730-5134)

Mr. Joseph Munno, Principal, prepared this 2012-13 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Dr. Edward Yansen	Board President, Executive Board Committee Chair
Vince Carfagna	Board Treasurer-Finance and Personnel Board Committee Chair, Executive Committee Board Member
Dr. Marie Cianca	Program Accountability Board Committee Chair, Executive Board Committee Member
Melissa Piccarreto	Program Accountability Board Committee Member
Dr. Michael Robinson	Policy and By-laws Board Committee Chair, Executive Board Committee Member, Finance and Personnel Board Committee Member
Maria Scalise	Community and Public Relations Board Committee Chair
Dr. Jeannette Silvers	Program Accountability Board Committee Member
Elizabeth Speares	Board Secretary, Executive Committee Board Member, Community and Public Relations Board Committee Member
Sequetta F. Sweet	Community and Public Relations Board Committee Member
Sam Valleriani	Policy and By-laws Board Committee Member

Mr. Joseph Munno has served as the principal of the University Preparatory Charter School For Young Men since 2010.

INTRODUCTION

Our mission is to eventually establish our current 7-10 grades to a 7-12 single-sex education facility in the city of Rochester with an engaging learning environment and informed practices that are effective for young men. The **University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men** is available to all City of Rochester residents who choose to have their sons educated in a single-sex education environment.

The instructional model employed at the school is more humane, adventurous, and rigorous than the norm. The practices of the faculty and the activities, in which students are engaged in, invigorate teaching and learning. At the center of all efforts is active pedagogy which will inform and support learning expeditions for students and teachers. The development of character and culture, maintaining high performance structures, and continuous reflective efforts to build leadership capacity and school improvement are core practices of the school.

Students exhibit through their learning and in their daily lives respect for self-discovery, responsibility for learning, empathy and caring for others, collaboration as well as competition, and service to the community. Students do not shy away from, but are strengthened, by solitude and reflection; success as well as failure; and compassion.

The school will graduate young men who have the necessary dispositions and skills to be successful as they continue their education, enter the workforce, and assume the challenges of adult citizenship in their community, nation, and world.

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								94	61					
2011-12								81	106	67				
2012-13								69	77	102	53			

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will be proficient readers and writers of the English Language.

Background

The English Language Arts curriculum at University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men is designed to ensure that students become fully literate and learn to read, write, and speak well. The school's ELA curriculum is closely aligned to the New York State English Language Arts Standards and the Common Core State Standards. Considering that a majority of the young men that enter UPrep are reading far below grade level and lack the literacy skills necessary to be successful readers and writers at the secondary and post-secondary level, the ELA curriculum is designed to scaffold the essential literacy skills and critical thinking skills characteristic of good readers and writers while. The ELA curriculum also considers the CCSS and the principles of constructivism as a guide to the planning and implementation of instruction. Through the use of expeditions, project-based learning and inquiry projects, students are provided multiple opportunities to rehearse these skills across the core content areas throughout the school year.

Professional Development is driven by teacher and student needs directly related to meeting the learning standards and their relationship to pedagogy and student work respectively.

Prior to the 2012-2013 school year, UPrep added two literacy specialists to support teachers and students with designing curriculum, developing support programs for struggling students, providing professional development, coaching and co-teaching with teachers, developing and implementing reading and writing incentive programs and differentiated instruction strategies in both the core classrooms and our Academic Intervention Support programs.

Local benchmark assessments for ELA were held for grades 7 - 10 in October 2012 and January 2013. The benchmark assessments for middle school grades were acquired commercially and were designed around the research of past NYS CCSS Assessments. The student data generated from these assessments served as a resource for professional development and refinement of instructional practices.

Three new English Language Arts teachers were added to the staff at the 7th, 10th and middle school RTI grade levels.

Given the high passing rate on the ELA III exam, as well as all NYS Regents Exam results from June 2012- August 2013 for those students in the 2010 – 2011 cohort, there is, at this time, no evidence of a direct correlation between success rates on the NYS Middle School Assessments and the NYS Regents Assessments offered at the high school level.

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 3-8.¹

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English Language Arts assessment to students in 7th through 8th grade in April 2012. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, presented in the table below. In the 2012 – 2013 school year, “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 scores²” and therefore we are reporting the success rate at achieving competency at a minimum of 75% accuracy on the 2012 – 2013 state assessments for middle school ELA.

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English Language Arts assessment to students in grades 7 through 8th grade in April 2013.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year’s test administration, as well as results from previous years. 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 ²			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
7	68	0	0	0	68
8	77	0	0	0	77
All	145	0	0	0	145

Results

Students in their second year of enrollment at University Preparatory Charter School demonstrated a 66.1 % achievement gap on the NYS Grade 8 ELA Assessment. As with most if not all schools across New York State, UPrep scored much lower on the 2013 assessment compared to previous

¹ 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.

² 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.

assessments. At this point in time, without item analysis data, we are not able to offer either a qualitative or quantitative analysis of the results.

**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
7	8.9	68	0	NA
8	14.1	77	14.1	77
All	23.2	145	14.1	77

Evaluation

The results of the 2012 – 2013 NYS Grade 8 ELA Assessment found 85.7 percent of students failing to meet the target goal of a 75 percent success rate. At this time, without feedback such as item analysis data, we are unable to determine the implications of the results regarding student performance, intervention strategies, and instructional shifts to improve achievement on the 2013 – 2014 assessments based directly on the results of the NYS 8th Grade ELA Assessment.

Additional Evidence

The annual results of student achievement on the NYS Grade 8 ELA Assessments show a slight increase in the success rate between the 2010 – 11 data (this cohort at UPrep for only 1 year) and the 2011 – 2012 school year (1st year of a 2 year enrollment for these students). The results for the 2011 – 2012 school year showed no growth in the success rate though a higher cut-off rate was employed compared to the previous year. As with most, if not all public middle schools across New York State, the success rate significantly fell below the previous year and thus the target goal of a 75 percent success rate was not achieved as well.

As stated by Commissioner King, the results of the 2012-2013 state assessments are in no way a reflection of a school’s quality of instruction or history of work in general prior to the administration of the exam and serve only as an initial benchmark.

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
7	NA	--	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	--	21	102	14.1	77
All			21	102	14.1	77

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 200.³

Results

Thirty percent of UPREP students scored at a level 2 and 14.1 percent met proficiency. A significant number of students (60 %) failed to reach level 2 or higher.

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
77	59.7	25.9	11.6	2.5

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 25.9 & + & 11.6 & + & 2.5 & = & 40.0 \\
 & & & & 11.6 & + & 2.5 & = & 14.1 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 54.1
 \end{array}$$

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

Evaluation

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 who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English Language Arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the 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.⁴

Results

Students enrolled at UPrep for at least two years and took the 2012 – 2013 NYS Grade 8 ELA Assessment, demonstrated a success rate of 14.3 percent while the Rochester City School District 8th grade students demonstrated a 5 percent success rate.

**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 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
7	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	14.3	77	5.7	2053
All	14.3	77	5.7	2053

⁴ 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

The percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 on the State English Language Arts exam is 9.3% greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district. Therefore, UPrep did meet the Comparative Measure Goal.

Additional Evidence

The students at UPrep have outperformed the students in the local school district for two consecutive years of testing on the NYS Grade 8 ELA Assessment. The success rate differential between UPrep and the RCSD increased by 7.6% between April 2012 and April 2013.

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
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	20.5	18.8	14.3	5.7
All	-	-	20.5	18.8	14.3	5.7

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.⁵

Method

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

⁵ 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.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2012-13 analyses are not yet available.

Results

Essential information to complete this section of the Accountability Plan Progress Report has not been provided at this time.

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		72	25.0	28.1	-3.1	-0.22
8		102	20.6	25.5	-4.9	-0.34
All	85.7%	174	22.4	26.6	-4.2	-0.29

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:
<i>Lower than Expected</i>

Evaluation

The 8th grade cohort for the 2011 – 2012 school year did not achieve a positive effect size of 0.3. The data available to determine the effect size for 2012 – 2013 has not been made available at this time.

Additional Evidence

Although the 8th grade cohorts for both the 2010 & 2011 school years did not exceed its predicted level of performance on the State English Language Arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above, there was a 0.32 improvement in the resulting effect size in 2011 -2012 with a corresponding increase in the percentage of students eligible for free lunch.

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	7-8	72	148	20.2	29.3	-0.61
2011-12	7-8	85.7	174	22.4	26.6	-0.29
2012-13						

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁶

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.⁷

Results

Leave Blank

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

The 8th grade cohort consisting of students that are enrolled in at least their second year at UPrep, did not meet the Absolute Measure Goal of a 75% success rate on the NYS Grade 8 ELA Assessment. Currently, data required evaluating whether or not the 2012-2013 AMO was achieved, is not available. UPREP met the goal of the Comparative Measure by exceeding the local district results by a margin of 9.3 percent.

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

⁷ See the Guidelines.

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.	Not Available at this time
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.	Achieved
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.)	Not Achieved
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

Action Plan

Efforts to improve student achievement on the 2013 – 2014 NYS Grade 7 & 8 Mathematics Assessment include but are not limited to the following:

- A Strategically designed RIT/AIS program (Tier 1: High quality instruction, Tier 2: Data-informed and strategies-based, Tier 3: intensive intervention)
- Led by RTI Specialists (New Role) – co teach and co-plan with AIS an core
- Data collection, analysis, use to differentiate instruction, progress monitor (AimsWeb/NWEA Data Analysis System Protocol/Training)
- Full AIS and Core Subject Alignment
- Lesson plan alignment using UPrep Framework
- Weekly class observations and feedbacks and team meetings
- Model classrooms taught by RTI Specialists and will be video taped for PD purposes
- New Student Organization System (Grades 7-8) (Binders with tools, information, accountability and incentives)
- School-wide Independent Reading Program (Incorporated into Squad)
- Portfolios of Student Work (Baseline writing samples inform lesson planning, supports our efforts to analyze student work, provides evidence of application of the writing process and student growth. Math teacher planning a similar portfolio system to use as a resource to assess student progress.)
- Benchmark Assessments in ELA and Math (early Oct., January mid-term week)
- RTI classes at high school level include Regents exam support for student taking exams over
- Continued class observation reports by Don Bartalo
- 21st Century Learning Grant opportunities (focus on grades 7 and 8 to begin in October)

MATHEMATICS

Goal 1: Mathematics

Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

Background

The middle school mathematics curriculum is standards-based with a direct link to the Common Core Standards and the Mathematics Practice Standards. These standards serve as a guide to increase student accountability with rigor, placing a strong emphasis on teaching for deeper understanding of mathematics. Our staff has deconstructed the standards to determine the shifts in instruction compared to the instructional expectations stated in the NYS standards. Instruction, along with professional development, is designed to reflect an emphasis on critical thinking, increasing student exposure to and learning from expository text, student-generated inquiry-based projects and expeditions, technology, using models to represent and solve rich real world problems, and support for students in making connections among other disciplines. Our core subjects are taught in a co-teaching environment to experience connections to the sciences in order to gain a deeper understanding of mathematics through the use of real data generated from real world problems.

The mathematics program at UPREP uses Connected Math in grades 7-8 and the Core Plus program in grades 9 - 11. Both programs are designed to guide teachers in establishing a more student-centered learning environment allowing for an easier transition to a constructivist approach to teaching and learning that values student inquiry as an integral part of learning for understanding.

UPREP has added 3 new math teachers at grades 10 & 11, to an RtI (Response to Intervention) teacher for grades 9-11 an RtI Coach for grades 7-11.

UPREP administers 2 benchmark assessments throughout the school year. The data gathered and analyzed from each assessment is used to discern student progress towards meeting our academic goals, inform our instructional and academic intervention programs, and guide our professional development through collaborative inquiry.

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 3-8.⁸

Method

The school administered the New York State Grade 8 mathematics assessment to students in 7th through 8th grade in April 2013 grade. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this

⁸ 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.

measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2010-12, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

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 ⁹			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
7	68	0	0	0	68
8	75	0	0	2	77
All	143	0	0	0	145

Results

Students enrolled in at least their second year of studies at UPREP, achieved a 5.3 percent success rate on the NYS Math 8 Assessment.

**Performance on 2012-13 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
7	5.9	68	NA	NA
8	5.3	75	5.3	75
All	11.2	143	5.3	75

Evaluation

The cohort in their second year of enrollment at UPREP did not meet the Absolute Measure goal of 75 percent proficiency. A direct correlation between the assessment results and school

⁹ 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.

instructional and instructional support programs cannot be determined since data (such as item analysis) has not been made available at the time this report was written. In addition, as stated earlier in this report, the NYS Commissioner of Education has stated that the NYS Middle School Assessments do not reflect the history of work of students and their teachers.

Additional Evidence

With a dramatic increase in the number of students achieving proficiency on the NYS Grade 8 Mathematics Assessment in 2011-2012 compared to the cohort of 2010-2011 (a 26.2% improvement in achieving proficiency), there was an unpredicted dramatic turn of events in 2012-2013 with the 8th grade cohort dropping to a 5.3 percent proficiency rate.

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
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	14.8	61	41	101	5.3	75
All	14.8	61	41	101	5.3	75

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 200.¹⁰

Results

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

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

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
75	53.3	41.3	4	1.3

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 41.3 & + & 4 & + & 1.3 & = & 45.6 \\
 & & & & 4 & + & 1.3 & = & 5.3 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 50.9
 \end{array}$$

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

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.

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.¹¹

Results

The aggregate school performance for UPREP was 5.3 percent compared to the district aggregate performance of 3.5 percent for those students tested in the same grade.

¹¹ 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](#).

**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 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
7				
8	5.3	75	3.5	2074
All	5.3	75	3.5	2074

Evaluation

UPREP met the Comparative Measure Goal by performing at a level of proficiency that is 1.8% greater than all of the students in the same tested grades in the local school district. It is the second consecutive year that UPREP has met this goal.

Additional Evidence

In comparison to the RCSD, UPREP reached a higher level of proficiency by a slight margin in 2012 – 2013 with a significant improvement over the local district in 2011-2012. The results of the 2010-2011 testing (which was the first year of instruction at UPREP), the local district had slightly greater results on this assessment.

**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					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
7						
8	14.6	19.9	41	19.9	5.3	3.5
All	14.6	19.9	41	19.9	5.3	3.5

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.¹²

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

Neither the 7th nor 8th grade cohort exceeded the predicted performance level by an Effect Size of 0.3.

2011-12 Mathematics 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		72	44.4	42.2	2.2	0.10
8		101	40.6	40.2	0.4	0.02
All	85.7%	173	42.2	41.1	1.1	0.05

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

The Comparative Measure Goal was not met in either the 7th or 8th grade cohorts

¹² 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.

Evaluation

UPREP showed significant growth towards reaching this benchmark of exceeding the predicted outcome by an Effect Size of 0.3 compared to the previous year (2010 – 2011) testing results.

Additional Evidence

A comparison of the test results of UPREP to similar schools statewide cannot be made at this time. SUNY has not been able to provide UPREP with a list of similar schools to use for comparison.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2009-10						
2010-11	7-8	72	155	24	46.3	-1.01
2011-12	7-8	85.7	173	44.2	42	0.10
2012-13	7-8					

Goal 1: Growth Measure¹³

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.

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

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

Results

Leave Blank

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

The Comparative Measure Goal requiring UPREP students to achieve a higher proficiency rate than the local district was achieved for the second consecutive year. The Absolute Measure Goal was not met yet significant progress was made in reaching this goal for 2011 – 2012. The Comparative Measure Goal of exceeding the predicted proficiency rate by 0.3 was not achieved. Here again, significant growth towards reaching this goal was demonstrated by students enrolled in at least their second year at UPREP.

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.	Achieved
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.)	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.	N/A

Action Plan

Efforts to improve student achievement on the 2013 – 2014 NYS Grade 7 & 8 Mathematics

Assessments include but are not limited to the following:

- Addresses Mathematics practice standards transforming math instruction in both regular education and RTI – major shift
- Improved systems have been put in place for data collection, analysis, use to differentiate instruction and progress monitoring using AimsWeb.
- A math coach has been added to the staff with the responsibilities of co-constructing, implementing, and monitoring an RtI (Response to Intervention) program in grades 7-8 (as well as grades 9-11).
- All staff received professional development around and will plan instruction with a direct connection to the CCSS and the Mathematics Practice Standards to increase opportunities for students to develop a deeper understanding of math.
- Our Systems Analyst (hired as an independent consultant) will monitor the pedagogy throughout the school year to provide both a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the daily instruction. The System Analysts Reports will be used as a source for determining professional development needs and to provide a constant, true picture of the quality & effectiveness of daily instruction.
- Weekly meetings with our math staff will include close reading of and activities related to the use of the National Committee of Teachers of Mathematics' *Essential Understandings Series*. These resources provide the math team with fundamental principles of teaching mathematics for deeper understanding.
- Math teachers will co-teach lessons throughout the school year to practice the pedagogy discussed and experienced in weekly meetings and formal professional development.
- Commercial assessments that are constructed based on research around the CCSS will be used twice a year for our benchmark assessments and a source of student data to drive professional development, our Response to Intervention Program, and instruction in general.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Background

The middle school science curriculum is standards-based with a direct link to the Common Core Standards. Our staff has deconstructed the standards to determine the shifts in instruction compared to the instructional expectations stated in the NYS standards. Instruction, along with professional development, is designed to reflect an emphasis on critical thinking, increasing student exposure to and learning from expository text, student-generated inquiry-based projects and expeditions, and supporting students in making connections among other disciplines. Our core subjects are taught in a co-teaching environment to experience connections to mathematics, ELA, & the social sciences in order to gain a deeper understanding of science and math concepts and skills.

UPREP administers 2 benchmark assessments throughout the school year. The data gathered and analyzed from each assessment, is used to discern student progress towards meeting our academic goals, inform our instructional and academic intervention programs, and guide our professional development through collaborative inquiry.

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 the 8th grade in the spring of 2013. The state 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

The 8th grade students in at least their second year of enrollment at UPREP, performed at 65.8 % proficiency on the NYS Science 8 Assessment and therefore did not meet the Absolute Measure goal of 75% proficiency.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	All Students	8.2	26	52.1	13.7	65.8	73
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	8.2	26	52.1	13.7	65.8	73

Evaluation

Students in at least their second year of enrollment fell short of the targeted proficiency goal by 9.2%. A slight improvement was made towards meeting the Absolute Measure Goal of 75% proficiency.

Additional Evidence

The 2012-13 results are a slight improvement over the 2011-12 results. The instruction and instructional support programs at UPrep have proven to support student success on the NYS Science 8 Assessment. Improvement in planning for and delivering standards-based instruction continues to be our emphasis in professional development and guided practice in our efforts to meet the Absolute Measure Goal of 75% proficiency.

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
8	45	60	65	100	65.8	73
All	45	60	65	100	65.8	73

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

The exact results of students tested in the same grade from the local district are not available at this time. Historically, the local district averages a proficiency rate of less than 40%.

**2012-13 State Science 8 Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
7				
8	65.8	75	?	2074
All	65.8	75	?	2074

Evaluation

Although the local district results are not available for the 2011 state science assessment, there is no record of the 8th grade students in the local district of residence ever having a proficiency rate close to 45% let alone 65%. We are confident that the 8th grade students at UPREP had greater success than the local district and therefore met the Comparative Measure Goal.

Additional Evidence

See above

Summary of the Science Goal

The Absolute Measure Goal was not met. UPREP continues to move closer to reaching this goal. The proficiency rate gap is less than 10%.

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.	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

Local District Data not available at this time.

Action Plan

The results of the students' performance on the state ELA assessments as well as the mathematics and science assessments and an analysis of the data in conjunction with an overall assessment of teaching and learning at UPREP that includes the results of the 2010 -2011 state visit/report, led the leadership team to implement the following changes in staffing, structure of the learning environment, professional development, and student support systems:

- Continue with a reduced teacher-student ratio in the core subject areas and our RtI programs to 1:12 and 1:10 respectively in all grade levels through the implementation of a co-teaching model.
- Continue to develop and maintain a blended curriculum in the core subject areas to support students in making connections among different disciplines.
- Rehire and continue to utilize a System Analyst to gather data around instructional practices (including professional development, accountability systems, and benchmark data) and evidence of teacher and student behaviors essential to meeting our instructional goals.
- Focus professional development on responding to student work, understanding and implementing the Common Core Standards and the Mathematics Practice Standards
- Establish a strong RtI Program with our new hires of two RtI Coaches in ELA and mathematics

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB

Write the school's Accountability Plan NCLB goal here.

Goal 5: 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

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
2010-11	Good Standing/School in Need of Improvement
2011-12	Good Standing/School in Need of Improvement
2012-13	Good Standing/School in Need of Improvement

APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES

Only high schools with Accountability Plans based on the Institute’s 2013 Guidelines need report on the measures flagged below with the symbol “(§)”. 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 college and career readiness standards. If a school was not renewed in 2013, it is not required to include these measures.

#

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 2009 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9th grade in the 2009-10 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state’s annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2012-13 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 their 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 9 th 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
2009-10	2006-07	2006	??	??	??
2010-11	2007-08	2007	??	??	??
2011-12	2008-09	2008	??	??	??
2012-13	2009-10	2009	??	??	??

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 2011-12, 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 (the 2008 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 9 th Grade Anywhere	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 th of the Cohort's Fourth Year (a)	Additional Students Still in Cohort ¹⁴ (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2009-10	2006-07	2006	??	??	??
2010-11	2007-08	2007	??	??	??
2011-12	2008-09	2008	??	??	??
2012-13	2009-10	2009	??	??	??

Fifth Year Total Cohort for Graduation

Fifth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 th Grade Anywhere	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 th of the Cohort's Fifth Year (a)	Additional Students Still in Cohort ¹⁵ (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2010-11	2006-07	2006	??	??	??
2011-12	2007-08	2007	??	??	??
2012-13	2008-09	2008	??	??	??

#

#

#

¹⁴ 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.

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.

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.

(S) 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.

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; and scoring 75 to meet the college and career readiness standard.¹⁶ 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 2009 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 (75) by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort¹⁷

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 (75)
2012-2013	51	80% (

Evaluation

¹⁶ The statewide adaptation of the Common Core 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.

¹⁷ Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

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

Eighty percent of the 2011 cohort passed the New York State ELA III Regents exam prior to their fourth year in the cohort.

English Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 (75) by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2009						
2010						
2011					50	80%
2012						

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.

(S) 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.

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.

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 ¹⁸

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. This is an opportunity to show 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.

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 its 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 2012-13 English language arts AMO of **163**.

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

¹⁸ Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

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 2009 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

(S) Each year, students in the high school *Total Cohort* will exceed the predicted pass rate on a Regents mathematics exam 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 will conduct 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 2012-13 analysis is not yet available.

Results

Leave Blank

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
 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.

(S) 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.

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.¹⁹

Results

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

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 ²⁰	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2007				
2008				
2009			N/A	N/A

OR

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

**English Regents Accountability Performance Level (APL)²¹
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District²²**

Cohort	Charter School		School District ²³	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008				
2009			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

The 2011 cohort exceeded the minimum level of proficiency on the NYS Regents exam in English Language Arts III by 15% prior to their fourth year in the cohort.

English Language Arts Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 (80) by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2009						
2010						
2011					51	80
2012						

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 will examine 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

²¹ For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s APL, see page 32.

²² See page 30 above for an explanation of the APL.

²³ District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

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 ²⁴

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 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
	(§) 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.	

²⁴ If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

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
	(§) 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.	
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 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 2011-12 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
	(§) 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 2011-12 school district results.)	
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.

(S) 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.

Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Geometry and Integrated Algebra 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; and scoring 80 to meet the college and career readiness standard.²⁵ 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

UPREP students enrolled in at least their second year of studies at UPREP in the 2011 and 2012 cohorts have met both the Absolute Measure Goal of 75% passing a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year. In addition, UPREP exceeded the College and Career Standard of 65% of the cohort performing at 80% proficiency on a New York State math exam although the goal is not an existing goal in the charter.

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 (80) by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort²⁶

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of of 65 (80)
2007		
2008		
2009		

²⁵ The statewide adaptation of the Common Core 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.

²⁶ Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

Evaluation

Both the 2011 and 2012 high school cohorts met and exceeded the Absolute Measure Goal by a 5% or 7% margin respectively. The 2011 cohort met the College and Career Ready Standard while the 2012 cohort exceeded the standard by 2%.

Additional Evidence

The 2011 cohort has been very successful on NYS Regents math exams over the past two years. Over 80% of the cohort has passed both the NYS Regents Integrated Algebra and Geometry exams prior to their fourth year in the cohort.

Eighty percent of the 2012 cohort has passed a NYS Regents exam (Integrated Algebra) prior to their fourth year in the cohort.

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 (80) by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2009						
2010						
2011			61	82	51	82
2012					102	80

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort that 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.

(S) 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.

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 or Advanced Regents diploma.

Results

As the data tables above illustrate, most students that did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade math exam in either the 2011 or 2012 cohort at UPREP have passed one or more NYS Regents math exams. It is important to note that there is more evidence suggesting there is no correlation between performance on the NYS 8th grade math exam and NYS Regents math exams than evidence that suggests the contrary.

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 ²⁷

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. This is an opportunity to show 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.

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:

²⁷ Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver_REVISED.pdf

The AMO continues to be its 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 2012-13 mathematics AMO of **142**.

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 tables that directly address the measure.

**Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL)
For the 2009 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 2: Comparative Measure
(S) 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 will conduct 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 2012-13 analysis is not yet available.

Results

Leave Blank

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of 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.

(S) 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.

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 exams up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.²⁸

Results

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

²⁸ 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.

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 ²⁹	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2007				
2008				
2009			N/A	N/A

OR

Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL) of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District³⁰

Cohort	Charter School		School District ³¹	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008				
2009			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. This is an opportunity to show 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.

²⁹ District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

³⁰ See page 38 above for an explanation of the APL.

³¹ District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

Method

This measure will examine 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 ³²

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 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
	(\$) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80	

³² If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

	on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort that did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade English language arts 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
	(§) 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 a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a New York State 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.	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 percent of 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 2011-12 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
	(§) 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 2011-12 school district results.)	
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 the NYS Regents Living Environment and Earth Science exams. 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 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.

Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort³³

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
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.

³³ Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

Additional Evidence

Both the 2011 and 2012 cohorts reached 90% proficiency on the NYS Regents Living Environment exam prior to their 4th year in the cohort. UPREP offers Regents review courses during the school day and throughout the school year to prepare those students that scored lower than 65% the support they need to pass the exam in January or in June 2014.

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

Cohort Designation	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2009						
2010						
2011			61	90	51	65
2012					102	91

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort passing a Regents science exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the 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 exams 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 tables that directly address 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
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 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. This is an opportunity to show 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 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.

**U.S. History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort³⁴**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2007		
2008		
2009		

³⁴ Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

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

The accelerated students in the 2012 cohort took the NYS U.S. History Regents exam. 100% of the students met or exceeded proficiency and therefore the Absolute Measure Goal. The students are in their third year of the cohort.

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

Cohort Designation	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2009						
2010						
2011					16*	100%
2012						

- Only 16 students in the 2011 cohort took this exam. The 16 students are in an accelerated class within the 2011 cohort.

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 exams up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents the most recently available district results.

Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address 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
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 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. This is an opportunity to show 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 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.

**Global History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort³⁵**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2007		
2008		
2009		

³⁵ Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

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

The 2011 cohort has met the Absolute Measure for Regents Global Studies prior to their 4th year in the cohort. Half of the 2012 cohort (accelerated students) passed the NYS Regents exam in Global Studies I/II prior to their 4th year in the cohort.

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

Cohort Designation	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2009						
2010						
2011			*24/51	71%	51	94%
2012					*50/102	92%

* Only the accelerated students in each of the cohorts took the exam.

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 exams 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 tables that directly address 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
2007				
2008				
2009				

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. This is an opportunity to show 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.

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

Method

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of 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

Both the 2011 and 2012 cohorts met the Absolute Measure for the High School Graduation Goal. 98% of the 2011 cohort earned enough credits to be promoted to the next grade. 100% of the 2012 cohort earned enough credits to be promoted to the next grade.

Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2012-13

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2011	51	98%
2012	102	100%

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 2013, the 2011 cohort will have completed its second year.

Results

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

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2009		
2010		
2011		

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 2009 cohort and graduated four years later and those who entered as members of the 2008 cohort and graduate 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 to complete their graduation requirements.

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

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
2007		
2008		
2009		

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2006		
2007		
2008		

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 district³⁶. 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 ³⁷	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
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.

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

³⁶ 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](#).

³⁷ District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

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.	Achieved
	(§) 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.	
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
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.	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.	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 on one of the most commonly used early high school college prep assessments. 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. School averages are compared 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 10 th Grade	Number of Students Tested	Critical Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2010-11						
2011-12						
2012-13						

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 reports 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 12 th Grade	Number of Students Tested	Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2010-11						
2011-12						
2012-13						

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.

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.

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 tables that directly address the measure.

Percent of Graduates Meeting the Aspirational Performance Measure³⁸

Cohort	Charter School	Statewide ³⁹
2007		34.7
2008		35.3
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.

(S) The percent of graduating students will graduate with a Regents diploma with advanced designation will exceed the local district.

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.

³⁸ 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](#).

³⁹ District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

Percent of Graduates with a Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation ⁴⁰

Cohort	Charter School	School District ⁴¹
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.

(S) 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.

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 ⁴²
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.

⁴⁰ 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](#).

⁴¹ District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

⁴² Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam, or a college level course

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.

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

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.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 10 th 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 12 th 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
	(S) 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
	(S) 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

	(S) 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
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
	(S) 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
	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.

2012-13 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

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

2012-13 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.

2012-13 Student Retention Rate

2011-12 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2011-12	Number of Students Who Returned in 2012-13	Retention Rate 2012-13 Re-enrollment ÷ (2011-12 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
2009-10	%
2010-11	%
2011-12	%
2012-13	%

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.

2012-13 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
2009-10	%
2010-11	%
2011-12	%
2012-13	%

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 2012-13, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the (Time Adjusted) Level 3 cut score 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.

2012-13 English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

Grade	Percent of Students at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at 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.

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 2012-13; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

**2012-13 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
2009-10									
2010-11									
2011-12									
2012-13									

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 2011-12 and 2012-13. 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 Cohort Growth on XXX Test from Spring 2012 to Spring 2013

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2011-12	Target	2012-13	
1					YES/NO
2					YES/NO
3					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?
2010-11	
2011-12	
2012-13	

Cohort Growth on XXX Test from Spring 2012 to Spring 2013

Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		2011-12	Target	2012-13	
K					YES/NO
1					YES/NO
2					YES/NO
3					YES/NO
4					YES/NO
5					YES/NO
6					YES/NO
7					YES/NO
8					YES/NO
9					YES/NO
10					YES/NO
11					YES/NO
12					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2009-10	?-?		
2010-11	?-?		
2011-12	?-?		
2012-13	?-?		

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

**2012-13 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 in the school. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in the first year and the 50th NCE in the second. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year.

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

Results

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

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		First Year Baseline	Second Year Target	Second Year Result	
2008					YES/NO
2009					YES/NO
2010					YES/NO
2011					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			
	2006	2007	2008	2009
Math A				
Math B				
Integrated Algebra				
Geometry				
Algebra 2				

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2006	2007	2008	2009
Living Environment				
Earth Science				
Chemistry				
Physics				