

Instructions / Notes

for 2014-15 Accountability Plan Progress Report (“APPR”)

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

Elementary and Middle Schools

- a) **The New York State Education Department has recalibrated the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in ELA and math. Schools must therefore complete the second 3-8 absolute measure (“Performance Level Index meeting the AMO”) in ELA and math.**
- b) **For the 3-8 Growth Measure in ELA and math, report 2013-14 results using the state’s 3-8 Growth Model. (The 2014-15 results are not yet available.)**

College Preparatory High Schools

- a) **Because of the introduction of college and career readiness standards, schools renewed in 2012-13 or later use revised Accountability Plan measures. (See the appendix in the Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for a list of the revised measures.)**
 - b) **The Institute will gradually phase the new measures into its evaluation of all schools and the SUNY Trustees will take them into account when making renewal decisions. Therefore, the Institute encourages high schools not renewed since 2012-13 to include the college and career readiness standard in their Progress Report as optional measures.**
6. Please do not include these instructions or the reference guide below in a submitted report.

Reference Guide to Template Sections

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	4
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL GOALS.....	5
NCLB GOAL.....	25
HIGH SCHOOL COHORTS	26
HIGH SCHOOL GOALS.....	28
OPTIONAL GOALS	63
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES	
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS.....	66
HIGH SCHOOLS.....	69

The Accountability Plan Progress Report Template Is Below.



**MIDDLE VILLAGE PREPARATORY
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2014-15 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 18, 2015

By Mr. Ronald E. Rivera, Principal

6802 Metropolitan Avenue,
Middle Village, Queens, N.Y. 11379

718-869-2933

rrivera@middlevillageprep.org

Mr. Ronald E. Rivera, Principal, prepared this 2014-15 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Ms. Josephine Lume	Chairman
Mr. Serphin R. Maltese	Vice Chairman
Mr. Michael Michel	Founder, Advisor
Ms .Margaret Ognibene	Treasurer
Ms.Maureen Campbell	Education Committee
Ms Kaiko Hayes	Trustee
Ms. Debbie Kueber	Trustee
Mr. Rosemary Degennaro	Education Committee
Ms. Laura O' Gorman	Education Committee

Ms. Josephine Lume has served as the Chairman of the Board of Trustees since February, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Middle Village Prep is a small, independent, public charter school which serves students in grades 6-8. It is located on the Christ the King Campus. Admission is via lottery with District 24 as a priority.

The mission of the Middle Village Preparatory Charter School (MVP) is to prepare students for success at a selective college prep high school of their choice. The MVP curriculum is a rigorous curriculum designed to meet and surpass the New York State Education Department requirements. Central to the instructional model is a longer school day and increased classroom instructional time that is devoted to curriculum subjects. Students will master skills and attain subject proficiency by the end of the 8th grade. The curriculum of MVP includes a requirement that all students study Latin for three years, a key language for building a strong vocabulary and understanding of romance languages such as Spanish and Italian.

Mathematics and English Language Arts are prioritized by allocating twice the amount of instructional time that is customarily devoted to these critical instructional areas. Science, Social Studies, the Arts, Physical education and Health, along with time allocated for enrichment and extracurricular activities round off the typical daily schedule. It requires that all students take available Regent-level courses, such as Integrated Algebra and Earth Science or Living Environment in grade

Middle Village Preparatory Charter School (MVP) strives for academic excellence by creating an environment for students to succeed in both school and beyond. Our curriculum is a rigorous curriculum designed to meet and surpass the New York State Education requirements. Curriculum is built around a strong emphasis of math, reading, science, social studies and the study of the Latin language. A constructivist approach “where students learn by doing” is maximizing student involvement. MVP expects to enroll an academically diverse population. Therefore; the curriculum will be challenging for students who enter at or above grade level as well as flexible enough to support students who enter the school below grade level.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2011-12														
2012-13														
2013-14							120							
2014-15							120	110						230

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

The ELA Goal for our students is to attain Proficiency and Beyond for all of our students. MVP believes that with dedicated reading and writing time, combined with rigorous literary skills instruction, every student has the ability to excel in reading and writing. The ELA curriculum exposes students to a variety of historical and contemporary text, including novels (both classical and current), poetry, journalism, non-fiction, memoirs and blogs. Our writing program includes both independent journal writing as well as instruction in writing technique. Our ELA Goal is the attaining of proficiency in ELA for all students.

Background

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 6th through 7th grade in April 2015. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

**2014-15 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6	118				118
7	109			1	110
8					
All	227			1	228

Results

2014-2015 ends the second full year of our school, with our Grade 7 students completing their full second year. As the chart indicates, of the 109 students tested, 44.9% have reached a level of ELA Proficiency and 30.5 % of Grade 6 students reaching Proficiency in ELA.

**Performance on 2014-15 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6	30.5	118	NA	NA
7	44.9	109	44.9	109
8				
All	37.7	227	44.9	109

Evaluation

For students enrolled at least two years, the school did not meet the measure of 75% ELA Proficiency for Second Year Students, falling short by 30.1 % of this goal in Grade 7. However, while not attaining the 75% goal desired for second year performers, the Grade 7 performance in ELA did have a sharp upward improvement, from 2013-2014's 29.3% proficiency to this year's 44.9 % proficiency level. The analysis of our data indicates that there was substantial

¹ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

student improvement which can be attributed to the following effective practices that were implemented this year:

- The use of year 1 ELA test data to assess the ELA needs of each student.
- The conferencing with each student over his/her individual data and making the student aware of their individual Core Curriculum strengths and weaknesses.
- The conferencing with each ELA teacher over each individual students' needs and an emphasis by the teacher on the use of student test data to drive instruction.
- The targeting of instructional support to all students, particularly those who were considered to be "pushable" and "slippable", that is almost at Proficiency.

Additional Evidence

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school's instructional program. For our student population that has been with us for only a year, namely our MVP Grade 6 students, much progress was made. Our total number of admits for Grade 6 numbered 120 students in September of 2014. These children came from at least 32 different schools in District 24, with a collective proficiency score of 20.04 % at levels 3 and 4 in September, 2014.

Substantial progress has been made with these Grade 6 students at our school. The collective proficiency level of this Grade 6 class has risen this year to 30.5 % at ELA Proficiency Level. The data indicates that of those tested, 16 Level 1 students improved to level 2, 3 Level 1 students improved to Levels 3 or 4, 8 Level 2 students improved to Levels 3 or 4 and 10 Level 3 students improved to Level 4.

MVP Grade 7 students also made substantial progress this year at our school. These second year students moved from a **29.3%** Proficiency ELA level to a **44.9** Proficiency ELA level. This occurred when 6 Level 1 students moved to Level 2, 17 Level 2 students moved to Level 3 and a mix of 4 other students moved from their current levels to Level 4.

Ongoing assessments during the school year such as the school's use of the MAP Assessment System to determine Reading and Mathematics Progress and an ongoing discussion between staff members with each other and with their students resulted in this substantial improvement.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	29.3	112	44.9	109
8						
All			29.3	112	44.9	109

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index ("PLI") value that equals or exceeds the 2014-15 English language arts AMO of 97. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.²

² In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

Results The ELA results below indicate that the Cohort that includes both Grade 6 and Grade 7 students, totaling 227 children achieved a total PLI of 127.2, above the required 97 minimum.

English Language Arts 2014-15 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
227	10.05	51.8	27.2	10.5

$$PI = 51.8 + 27.2 + 10.5 = 89.5$$

$$+ 27.2 + 10.5 = 37.7$$

$$PLI = 127.2$$

Evaluation

The School met the measure. This is attributed to the careful monitoring of each students’ data records, and addressing of the ELA Core Standards with our student body.

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.³

Results

MVP Charter School highlights in the table below indicate that our Grade 7, the only grade having completed its’ second year at the school, had an aggregate score of **44.9 %** ELA Proficiency Level. The aggregate District 24 performance for Grade 7 was **31.6 %**

³ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

**2014-15 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
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	44.9	109	31.6	4,047
8				
All	<u>44.9</u>	109	<u>31.6</u>	4,047

Evaluation

MVP Prep exceeded the measure of the aggregate district performance for the Grade 7 ELA Test, resulting in a score 13.3% above District 24's Proficiency Level of 31.6 %.

Additional Evidence

Because MVP Charter is only beginning its' third year, we have only one group of students who have been with us for two or more years that were enrolled during the 2014-2015 year. The evidence below indicates that our students outperformed the local district.

**English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3						
4						
5						
6			NA	NA	NA	NA
7	Na	NA	NA	NA	44.9	31.5
8						
All					44.9	31.5

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

Method

The 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 meaningful degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

The Chart below reflects the actual 2014 – 2015 school results for calculating the overall Effect Size for each of the grades tested. Students in Grade 6 had an Effective Size of .36 and in Grade 7 an Effective Size of 1.23 for a combined aggregate score of .80, which is above the minimum required .3.

2014-2015 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6	60%	118	30.5%	25.46%	5.04%	.36
7	59%	109	44.9%	25.92%	18.98%	1.23
8						
All		227	37.72			.80

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

The School met the Comparative Performance Level for both Grades 6 and 7, exceeding the minimum required Effective Size of .3 by .5 above the minimum.

Evaluation

The School met the Comparative Performance Level with a positive Effective Size of .80 on both grades tested.

Additional Evidence

This testing year of 2014 -2015, the students improved their Effective Size results in ELA, attaining a score of .80 as compared to the 2013-2014 testing year, where they attained an Effective Size of 0 (See chart below).

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2011-12		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2012-13		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2013-14	6	70%	118	29.3	29.3	0

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁴

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 2013-14 and also have a state exam score from 2012-13 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2012-13 score are ranked by their 2013-14 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁵

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

⁵ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

Results

Please note that in fact, the State Wide Mean Growth Percentile has arrived in a more timely way. Therefore, at this point in time, the data for year 2014-2015 has been released. The school's mean growth percentile in 2014 – 2015 in ELA was at 60.3 %, 10.3% in excess of the Statewide Median of 50.0.

2014- 2015 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4		50.0
5		50.0
6	57.0	50.0
7	63,5	50.0
8		50.0
All	60.3	50.0

Evaluation – The Aggregate Mean Growth Percentile for the school in ELA exceeded the required 50 percentile needed to be at level.

Additional Evidence

No data exists before 2013 for our students since the school at the present time, is at the end of its' second year of existence. Note that last year, in 2013- 2014, our grade 6, as indicated below was under the State-wide median of 50.0.

These charts therefore, indicate a Mean Growth Percentile increase from 2013-2014 to 2014- 2015. The school increased its' Mean Growth Percentile by 17.8 %

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Median
	2011-12 ⁶	2012-13	2013-14	
4				50.0
5				50.0
6		NA	42.5	50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All			42.5	50.0

⁶ Grade level results not available.

Goal 1: Optional Measure
Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.
Method
Results
Evaluation
Additional Evidence

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

This year our school came nearly 15% points closer to our ultimate goal of 75% for our year 2 students. Given the quantum leap the students took from 29.3 % proficiency to 44.9%, we feel that they are poised for another quantum leap in 2015-2016 toward the 75% mark.

Our Absolute, Comparative Measures with the Districts and the Regressive Analysis indicate that our students are showing strong progress.

Our 2014- 2015 ELA Growth Results were above the .50 percentile mark this year and showed a marked improvement over our indicated 2013-2014 results.

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.	Achieved
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 2013-14 school district results.)	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.	Achieved
Growth	Note that at the present time, our 2014 -2015 ELA Growth results have not been determined yet. However, MVP ELA Progress this year will likely indicate a growth percentile above the .50 percentile for the year.	Achieved

Action Plan

Because we have been using the data to track all of our students' progress, we were able to move 17 of our Level 2 students this year into Levels 3 and 4. Our data indicates that there is an up and coming group of students in Level 2 that can be moved into Levels 3 and 4 this coming year by tracking their ELA performance on a weekly basis and reinforcing the students ability to comprehend the Core Standards by conferencing with them and with their teachers in order to ensure that the data drives the instruction.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

MVP pays particularly close attention to the depth and reliability of the understanding students development of mathematical concepts. Our initial focus on procedural skill lays the groundwork for deeper mathematical understanding in the older grades. We use a student-centered investigative approach in which key mathematical concepts are embedded in engaging problems to help students develop conceptual understanding as well as hard skills. This rigorous course prepares students to take and pass Regents-level courses, such as Integrated Algebra by the 8th grade.

Background

The students have been using the Mathematics curriculum by Sadlier during the past two years. The instruction model has been an Inclusion model with Special Education services being administered in a mixed class of IEP and Gen Ed students. A certified Special Ed teacher Co-Teaches with a Gen Ed teacher to deliver mathematics services in two of the four classes on grades 6 and 7. Assessment in mathematics starts off initially with a MAP Assessment at the beginning of each year to determine current student mathematics levels. Assessment then becomes ongoing, with weekly, monthly and End of Trimester Assessments, with a series of Mock Mathematics tests prior to the State Exam. Professional development is also ongoing and is administered monthly. First year math staff proved to be highly effective, delivering a 69% proficiency rate in 2013-2014. These excellent staff were moved into staff development positions in order to train the new teachers hired in 2014 – 2015.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

Method The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 6th and 7th grade in April 2015. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

**2014-15 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁷			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6	118				118
7	109			1	110
8					
All	227			1	228

Results

The table below illustrates that two grades were tested this year of 2014-2015 but only one grade, grade 7 has been enrolled for at least their second year. Their performance of proficiency was 68.9% at Proficiency.

**Performance on 2014-15 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6	48.3	118	NA	NA
7	68.9	109	68.9	109
8				
All	58.6%	217	68.9	109

⁷ 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.

Evaluation

The school goal for mathematics proficiency level is 75% at Proficiency or higher by the end of the students second year. The chart above indicates that Grade 7 hit a Proficiency level of 68.9%. Therefore, the students missed their mark by approximately 6% points. This may have been attributed to the removal from the classroom of key math personnel from the grade 6 level for purposes of staff development.

Additional Evidence

The school is maintaining a high level of performance in mathematics with the incoming 2013 class, maintaining its' hold on the 69th percentile. Mathematics teachers have collaborated and planned a strong comprehensive approach to grade 7 mathematics and we have hired the best teachers available. The program has proven to be effective not only for Gen Ed students but also for IEP students who for the first time are having success in mathematics.

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

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6			69.3	118		
7					68.9	109
8						
All			69.3	118	68.9	109

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2014-15 mathematics AMO of 94. 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 200.⁸

Results

This year's PLI is 153 for the 227 students in this cohort. This exceeds the Mathematics AMO of 94

Mathematics 2014-15 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
227	7	35	41	18

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc} \text{PI} & = & 35 & + & 41 & + & 18 & = & 94 \\ & & & & 41 & + & 18 & = & \underline{59} \\ & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 153 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

The PLI achieved by the 2014-2015 student cohort at MVP exceeded the AMO target of 94 by 59. These strong results can be attributed to the selection of excellent staff, the use of data to drive the mathematics instruction and the positive learning environment that exists for our students at MVP.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

Method

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of 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

⁸ In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.⁹

Results

The Chart below shows a comparison of MVP Charter Prep’s performance of students in attendance for at least their second year. 68.9 % of them are at Proficiency, while only 41.1 % of the District students achieved Proficiency.

**2014-15 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
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	68.9	109	41.1	4138
8				
All	68.9	109	41.1	4138

Evaluation

Our school exceeded the aggregate district performance of District 24 by 27.6 percentage points. Our Grade 7 students, the only ones with us after two years, have succeeded in performing at this level.

Additional Evidence

No previous historical comparisons can be made between MVP Charter School and District 24 students is possible, since the school had no students in attendance for a full two years prior to this year. This year however, we can compare our 2014 -2015 results with District 24 as shown in the chart below.

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

⁹ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

**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					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3						
4						
5						
6						
7					68.9	41.1
8						
All						

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

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 meaningful degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

For 2014 – 2015, the Overall Effective Size of all of MVP Charter School students at Levels 3 and 4 calculate to be an aggregate Size of 1.47 this year (See below).

2014 – 2015 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6		118	48.3	34.45	13.85	.57
7		109	68.8	29.5	39.3	2.37
8						
All		227	58.5	31.9	26.7	1.47

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

For 2014 -2015, the school exceeded its' Effective Size, attaining a score of 1.47, well in excess of the .3 requirement needed.

Evaluation

The school met and exceeded the Effective Size minimum with a score of 1.47, well above the required score of .3

Additional Evidence

Since our first year of testing began last year in 2013, the Effective Size in Mathematics has exceeded the bare minimum of .3. Last year's performance for our only tested grade yielded a 69.3 % Proficiency rating, which propelled the school to a high Effective Size.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2011-12						
2012-13						
2013-14	6	70	112	68.4	38.8	1.76

Goal 2: Growth Measure¹⁰

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 2013-14 and also have a state exam score in 2012-13 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2012-13 scores are ranked by their 2013-14 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.¹¹

The school's mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level in Mathematics was 69.3

2013-14 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4		50.0
5		50.0
6	69.3	50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All		50.0

Evaluation

The school's Mean Growth for 2013 -2014 exceeded the 50.0 median mark by 19.3 .

¹⁰ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

¹¹ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

Additional Evidence

Our only testing year with data is 2013-2014, when, in Mathematics, we achieved a Mean Growth Percentile of 69.3. No other tests were taken prior to 2013 – 2014.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2011-12 ¹²	2012-13	2013-14	Statewide Median
4				50.0
5				50.0
6			69.0	50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All			69.0	50.0

Goal 2: Optional Measure

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

Method

Results

Evaluation

Additional Evidence

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Our Accountability Goals are the following: MVP pays particularly close attention to the depth and reliability of the understanding students development of mathematical concepts. Our initial focus on procedural skill lays the groundwork for deeper mathematical understanding in the older grades. We use a student-centered investigative approach in which key mathematical concepts are embedded in engaging problems to help students develop conceptual understanding as well as

¹² Grade level results not available.

hard skills. This rigorous course prepares students to take and pass Regents-level courses, such as Integrated Algebra by the 8th grade.

Looking at our mathematical goals above, the school has paid particular attention to individual student progress in Mathematics. Emphasis was placed on small group and individual student instruction in a student centered classroom. Students, throughout the year were challenged with hands-on mathematical projects and conceptual problems in a collaborative learning classroom environment. The result was a maintaining of the achievement level from 2013 –2014 into the following test year of 2014-2015.

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.	Achieved/
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 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved/

\Action Plan

The school has hired a two new math specialists who has a proven track record in middle/high school mathematics. We believe that the school raises the instructional quality for the students by hiring the best available people possible. In addition, we have created a collaborative Mathematics team that will seamless address the entering Grade 6 students mathematics needs, stabilizing their performance in their first year at MVP and monitoring and enhancing their performance in year two and preparing them for the Algebra Regents in grade 8. This assembling of personnel is succeeding and will bring our graduating students to solid mathematical performance by year 8.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Write the school's Accountability Plan science goal here.

Background

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

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2015. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

Results

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

**Charter School Performance on 2014-15 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

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

Evaluation

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

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

Additional Evidence

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

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

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4						
8						
All						

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Results

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

**2014-15 State Science 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 Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8				

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

**Science Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4						
8						
All						

<p>Goal 3: Optional Measure</p> <p>Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.</p>
<p>Method</p>
<p>Results</p>
<p>Evaluation</p>
<p>Additional Evidence</p>

Summary of the Science Goal

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

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at	Achieved/

	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.	Did Not Achieve
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

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

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB
Write the school's Accountability Plan NCLB goal here.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure
Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

Method

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

Results

State the school's NCLB status this year.

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status	
2012-13	Good Standing/	Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School
2013-14	Good Standing/	Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School
2014-15	Good Standing/	Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School

APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES

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

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

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

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

High School Cohorts

Accountability Cohort

The state’s Accountability Cohort consists specifically of students who are in their fourth year of high school after the 9th grade. For example, the 2011 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9th grade in the 2011-12 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state’s annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2014-15 school year, and either remained in the school for the rest of the year or left for an acceptable reason. (See New York State Education Department’s website for its accountability rules and cohort definitions: www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/)

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 30 th
2012-13	2009-10	2009	??	??	??
2013-14	2010-11	2010	??	??	??
2014-15	2011-12	2011	??	??	??

Total Cohort for Graduation

Students are included in the Total Cohort for Graduation also based on the year they first enter the 9th grade. Prior to 2012-13, students who have enrolled at least five months in the school after entering the 9th grade are part of the Total Cohort for Graduation; as of 2011-12 (the 2008 cohort), students who have enrolled at least one day in the school after entering the 9th grade are part of the school's 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 ¹³ (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2012-13	2009-10	2009	??	??	??
2013-14	2010-11	2010	??	??	??
2014-15	2011-12	2011	??	??	??

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 ¹⁴ (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2012-13	2008-09	2008	??	??	??
2013-14	2009-10	2009	??	??	??
2014-15	2010-11	2010	??	??	??

¹³ 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.

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

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

GOAL 1 : ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(S) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career readiness standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Comprehensive English exam that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department defines the following pass levels: scoring 65 to meet the graduation requirement for a Regents diploma / 75 to meet the college and career readiness standard.¹⁵ 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 2011 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Indicate 65 or 75 passing score.

English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 /75
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort¹⁶

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 /75
2009		
2010		
2011		

¹⁵ The statewide adaptation of new State Standards includes incorporating college and career readiness performance standards for the English language arts exam. The state has benchmarked student ELA test performance to the likely need for remedial course work when students enter college by comparing student 3-8 test results and Regents results to their post-secondary experience at SUNY and CUNY. Besides raising the cut scores for proficiency in the 3-8 testing program, the state has begun to set college and career readiness standards for passing Regents.

¹⁶ Based on the highest score for each student on the English 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 cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

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

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

Cohort Designation	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2011						
2012						
2013						
2014						

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will meet the college and career readiness standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

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

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2011 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Indicate 65 or 75 passing score

English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of **65 / 75** among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort ¹⁷

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 75
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 in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

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

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

SAME FOR ALL SCHOOLS

Method

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

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

The AMO continues to be SED’s basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds the 2014-15 English language arts AMO of **170**.

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 exam in Comprehensive English is 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. The Regents Common Core Examination in English is scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is level 1, 65 to 78 is level 2; 79 to 84 is level 3, and 85 to 100 is level 4.

Results

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

**English Language Arts Accountability Performance Level (APL)
For the 2010 High School Accountability Cohort**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	?	?	?	?

$$PI = ? + ? + ? = ?$$

APL = ?

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(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.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.¹⁸

Results

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

**English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2009				
2010				
2011			N/A	N/A

OR

**English Regents Accountability Performance Level (APL)¹⁹
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2009				
2010				
2011			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.

¹⁸ The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65.

¹⁹ For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school's APL, see page 31.

Additional Evidence

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

<p>Goal 1: Optional Measure Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.</p>
<p>Method</p>
<p>Results</p>
<p>Evaluation</p>
<p>Additional Evidence</p>

Summary of the High School English Language Arts Goal²⁰

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

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

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing the Regents English exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	Outcome
------	---	---------

²⁰ If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	(§) Each year, students in the high school Total Cohort will exceed the predicted pass rate on the Regents English exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State.	N/A
Comparative	(§) Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

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

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan mathematics goal.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career readiness standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents math exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Algebra I (Common Core) exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Geometry, Integrated Algebra and Algebra 2 exams. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department defines the following pass levels: scoring 65 to meet the graduation requirement for a Regents diploma / scoring 80 to meet the college and career readiness standard.²¹ This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to achieve the requisite score on any one of the Regents mathematics exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents mathematics exam multiple times or have taken multiple mathematics exams. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a mathematics exam.

Results

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

Indicate 65 or 80 passing score.

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65/80
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort²²

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 80
2009		
2010		
2011		

²¹ The statewide adaptation of the revised State Standards includes incorporating college and career readiness performance standards for the English language arts exam. The state has benchmarked student mathematics test performance to the likely need for remedial course work when students enter college by comparing student 3-8 test results and Regents results to their post-secondary experience at SUNY and CUNY. Besides raising the cut scores for proficiency in the 3-8 testing program, the state has begun to set college and career readiness standards for passing Regents.

²² Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics 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 cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

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

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

Cohort Designation	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2011						
2012						
2013						
2014						

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(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.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

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

Results

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

Indicate 65 or 80 passing score

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 / 80 among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort ²³

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of <u>65</u> / <u>80</u>
2008		
2009		
2010		

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

SAME FOR ALL SCHOOLS

Method

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

²³ 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 SED’s basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds 2014-15 mathematics AMO of **154**.

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. The Regents Common Core exams in mathematics are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is level 1; 65 to 73 is level 2, 74 to 84 is level 3, and 85 to 100 is level 4.

Results

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

**Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL)
For the 2010 High School Accountability Cohort**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	?	?	?	?

$$PI = ? + ? + ? = ?$$

APL = ?

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(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.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.²⁴

Results

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2009				
2010				
2011			N/A	N/A

OR

Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL) of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District²⁵

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2009				
2010				
2011			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.

²⁴ The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65.

²⁵ See page 39 above for an explanation of the APL.

Additional Evidence

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

<p>Goal 1: Optional Measure Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.</p>
<p>Method</p>
<p>Results</p>
<p>Evaluation</p>
<p>Additional Evidence</p>

Summary of the High School Mathematics Goal ²⁶

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

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

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a New York State Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	Outcome
------	---	---------

²⁶ If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	(§) Each year, students in the high school Total Cohort will exceed the predicted pass rate on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State.	N/A
Comparative	(§) Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a New York State Regents mathematics exam of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

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

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan science goal.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2011 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 Cohort²⁷

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
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 in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

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

²⁷ Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

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

Cohort Designation	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2011						
2012						
2013						
2014						

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Results

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

**Science Regents Passing Rate
of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
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 in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

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

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

SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 4: Social Studies

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

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2011 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 Cohort²⁸**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
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 in specific grades and

²⁸ Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

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

Additional Evidence

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

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

Cohort Designation	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2011						
2012						
2013						
2014						

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Results

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

U.S. History Passing Rate of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
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 in specific cohorts and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

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

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2011 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 Cohort²⁹**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
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 in specific grades and

²⁹ Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

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

Additional Evidence

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

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

Cohort Designation	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2011						
2012						
2013						
2014						

Goal 4: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort passing the Regents Global History exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the local school district.

Method

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

Results

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

Global History Passing Rate of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort
2009				
2010				
2011				

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

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

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

GOAL 6: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Write the school's graduation goal here.

Goal 6: Absolute Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

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

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

Results

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

Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

Percent of Students Promoted by Cohort in 2014-15

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		

OR

**Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts
Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2014-15**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2013		
2014		

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 2015, the 2013 cohort will have completed its second year.

Results

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

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2011		
2012		
2013		

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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 2011 cohort and graduated four years later and those who entered as members of the 2010 cohort and graduated five years later. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams in English language arts, mathematics, science, U.S. History and Global History. Students have through the summer at the end of their fourth year to complete graduation requirements.

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

Results

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

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2009		
2010		
2011		

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2008		
2009		
2010		

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. 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 district³⁰. 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	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2009				
2010				
2011				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.

³⁰ 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](#).

Additional Evidence

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

Summary of the High School Graduation Goal

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

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort will pass their core academic subjects by the end of August and be promoted to the next grade. Required for Accountability Plans developed prior to 2012-13	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
	(§) Each year, 75 percent of students in first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn at least ten credits (if 44 needed for graduation) or five credits (if 22 needed for graduation) each year. Required for Accountability Plans developed in 2012-13 or later	
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort will score at least 65 on at least three different New York State Regents exams required for graduation by the completion of their second year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the fourth year high school Total Graduation Cohort and 95 percent of students in the fifth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Comparative	Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort graduating after the completion of their fourth year will exceed that of the Total Graduation Cohort from the local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable

Action Plan

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

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

COLLEGE PREPARATION

GOAL 7: COLLEGE PREPARATION

Write the school's college preparation goal here.

Goal 7: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Results

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

10th Grade PSAT Performance by School Year

School Year	Number of Students in the 10 th Grade	Number of Students Tested	Critical Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2012-13						
2013-14						
2014-15						

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 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 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
2012-13						
2013-14						
2014-15						

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

Goal 7: School Created College Preparation Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(See below for measures in more recent Plans.)

Method

Provide a brief description of the measure.

Results

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

Evaluation

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

(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.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

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

graduate high school – but do so with a score below 80 on a math Regents exam and below 75 on the English exam – are likely to require remediation in college.

Results

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

Percent of Graduates Meeting the Aspirational Performance Measure³¹

Cohort	Charter School	Statewide ³²
2009		37.2
2010		38.1
2011		N/A

Evaluation

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

(§) The percent of graduating students who graduate with a Regents diploma with Advanced Designation will exceed the local district.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

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

Results

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

³¹ 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](#).

³² Statewide results for the 2011 cohort are not yet available.

Percent of Graduates with a Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation³³

Cohort	Charter School	School District ³⁴
2009		
2010		
2011		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.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

Discuss the achievement indicators used to demonstrate college preparation.

Results

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

Graduates Passing a Course Demonstrating College Preparation

Cohort	Number of Graduates	Percent Passing the Equivalent OF a College Level Course ³⁵
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

³³ 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](#).

³⁴ District results for the 2011 cohort are not yet available.

³⁵ Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam, or a college level course

explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Goal 7: School Created College Attendance or Achievement Measure

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

Provide a brief description of the measure.

Results

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

Evaluation

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

Summary of the College Preparation Goal

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

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

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	Outcome
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 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	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/

	design.	Not Applicable
College Attainment	Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

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

Action Plan

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

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following section contains a Parent Satisfaction optional goal, as well as examples of possible optional measures.

Goal S: Parent Satisfaction
Write the school's goal here.

Goal S: Absolute Measure
Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school's program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

Method

Provide a narrative explaining how the school developed, administered, collected and analyzed the survey. The school presents results as a percentage of all families in the school, not as a percentage of respondents only.

Results

Provide a narrative of parents' responses.

2014-15 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

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

2014-15 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.

2014-15 Student Retention Rate

2013-14 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2013-14	Number of Students Who Returned in 2014-15	Retention Rate 2014-15 Re-enrollment ÷ (2013-14 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
2012-13	%
2013-14	%
2014-15	%

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.

2014-15 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
2012-13	%
2013-14	%
2014-15	%

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 2014-15, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.

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

2014-15 English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

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

Comparative Measure

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

While schools are required to compare themselves to the local school district, there may be individual schools that also provide a compelling comparison. These comparisons might be schools in the same neighborhood, with the same demographics, or have similar programs. The first table features a grade level breakdown for 2014-15; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

**2014-15 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
2012-13									
2013-14									
2014-15									

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 2013-14 and 2014-15. It includes students who repeated the grade. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students who took the exam in both years.

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

Results

Cohort Growth on XXX Test from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2013-14	Target	2014-15	
A					YES/NO
B					YES/NO
C					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Reading Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort met target?
2012-13	
2013-14	
2014-15	

Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2011-12	?-?		
2012-13	?-?		
2013-14	?-?		
2014-15	?-?		

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

2014-15 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	
2010					YES/NO

2011					YES/NO
2012					YES/NO
2013					YES/NO

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

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

HIGH SCHOOLS: SUBJECT AREA MEASURES

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2008	2009	2010	2011
Integrated Algebra				
Geometry				
Algebra 2				

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2008	2009	2010	2011
Living Environment				
Earth Science				
Chemistry				
Physics				